II:

WHY OUTING CAME ABOUT

Outing is as old as Christian intolerance. Many continue to fear it as a fate almost worse than death. There are three historical stages in the technique of outing, all of which may come into play nowadays. First, gossip and innuendo circulate in any community. Ancient Greek and Roman politicians learned to denigrate their opponents with not too subtle allegations of sexual misconduct, as it was then defined. This included adolescent homosexual prostitution, adult male passivity, effeminacy in dress, gait and speech, and orgiastic excesses of all sorts. Today, as in ancient Greece and Rome, gossip of this sort is often ephemerally recorded in graffiti on walls. Second, an element not present in pagan civilization is the Judeo-Christian taboo against and condemnation of any and all forms of homosexual activity. This persists, often in secular guise, today. The third is the deliberate exposure of "closeted" homosexuals by movement activists weary of their hypocrisy and treason to the cause.

In contrast with the visibility of a handicap or physical illness, visibility in the sense here used is primarily others' knowledge that the subject is homosexual (or bisexual) or has engaged in homosexual activity. The negative reactions of others (physical avoidance, difficulty in obtaining or holding a job, inability to make close friends) result from perception of the
homosexual subject as "immoral" or "mentally ill." For the individual visibility spawns social and economic problems that can be avoided by the simple expedient of remaining--invisible. But for the movement the collective invisibility of its constituents creates political problems that can be resolved only by their becoming--visible. Secondarily, visibility means public awareness of the phenomenon of love for one's own sex and of its role in history and in society. For many centuries Christian civilization opted to deny the very existence of homosexuality as orientation and sought in every way to blot homosexual behavior out of consciousness.

Until the 1970s most lovers of their own sex preferred to remain invisible, and allowed others to do likewise for fear of the penalties which society would not hesitate to inflict on them. Outing meant being apprehended by the authorities of church or state and exposed as a "bugger" or "sodomite." Such a revelation made the accused infamous: it was tantamount to a civil death. Often the only recourse was exile or suicide.

The church, the state, and Christian society committed countless atrocities against queer nationals. But perhaps their worst, their ignoblest crime against us was a crime against the truth: to force every individual with homoerotic feelings to become a lifelong hypocrite. Even if one shunned overt physical contact, one had to lie and deceive, to live in constant fear and anxiety lest one's inner nature and desires be discovered. One might be disowned by family and friends, expelled from school, church, or
military, ruined socially and boycotted economically, and driven into exile or even to suicide. Those publicly labeled "sodomites" were exposed to all the cruelty and vindictiveness of an intolerant society. Not just criminal prosecution, but merciless, unrelenting ostracism—the end of their civil existence—were the almost inevitable consequence (Gruter and Masters, 1986). Loss of employment, expulsion from school, eviction from apartment, loss of custody of children, and denial of visiting rights in a hospital or prison as well as rejection by kith and kin were commonplace as recently as twenty years ago for known "perverts."

The basis questions that have been debated from Homeric times to the present day are: 1) the morality of sexual acts, 2) the motives for sexual acts, and 3) the moral responsibility of those who perform sexual acts (Cantarella, 1980). The medical and biological disputes over "homosexuality" are all secondary, if not an evasion of the issue of the morality of pleasure derived from erotic contact with one's own sex. The vicissitudes of society's judgment on this subject have in turn motivated the arguments over the ethics of outing.

Pagan Greek and Roman Tolerance and Visibility

Outing in the sense that it has now acquired had no meaning in the pagan world because the Greeks and Romans were fully aware of homosexual conduct but neither outlawed it nor ostracized those so inclined. Exclusive homosexuality was a personal idiosyncrasy, mentioned in passing and without reproach. As a rule the Greeks,
from the late seventh century onwards, encouraged upper-class men in their early twenties to take a boy of twelve or so to love and train until the man married at thirty and the boy, now grown and bearded, took in turn a boy of his own. Thus by sanctioning pederasty and encouraging late marriage for males they hoped to curb overpopulation and to refine the initiation and instruction of the young. In Sparta a boy who failed to attract a lover by the end of his twelfth year was considered a failure, but in turn enormous pressure, amounting almost to social ostracism, was applied to bachelors who failed to marry by thirty. All the famous Spartans about whom we have sufficient biographical information engaged in pederasty, and roughly half of the great Athenians did likewise. Plato averred that what distinguished Greeks from barbarians was nude gymnastics, philosophy, and pederasty. The Romans, who often gave lip service to the stern family-centered, patriarchal mos maiorum (ancestral customs), never institutionalized pederasty in this way. They did, however, tolerate male prostitution and homosexual relations between masters and slaves, both of which became very common. Occasionally upper-class males had affairs with one another, usually pederastic.

In earlier works such as the Phaedrus Plato, who matured late and never married, argued that pederastic attachments encouraged the soul to sprout wings and the intellect to become active. Maintaining that abstinence between lovers was best, he recognized that even good lovers might occasionally lapse into physical intimacy. Another student of Socrates, the puritanical Xenophon,
insisted that Spartans whom he so admired avoided physical intimacy with their beloved boys. Their lawgiver Lycurgus, he asserted, had forbidden it. The well-educated, skeptical Cicero was not deceived by such claims, and Spartans were generally thought to be virile boy-lovers. Holding that some passive-effeminate types were born that way and that others acquired the habit, Aristotle felt that the purer form of friendship would not lead to homosexual activity. But these few philosophers, appealing as they did solely to an ideal of "self-restraint" or "civic virtue," went unheeded. Myriads of poets and artists celebrated pederastic love and the beauty of the adolescent male in song and sculpture, and historians faithfully reported the love affairs of prominent statesmen and military leaders. Nevertheless, forms of male homosexuality (as well as of heterosexuality) that involved force, intimidation, or the selling of the body of a free youth, were penalized or outlawed. Oral-genital relations were so frowned upon in Greece as well as in Rome that a reputation for indulging in them brought social ostracism if not worse. Those who actually or reputedly engaged in these stigmatized forms of homosexual activity could be and were in this sense outing and at times even convicted. Orators regularly accused their opponents of violating these norms. The Athenian orator Aeschines vilified Timarchus for having been a hustler in a male brothel in the port of Piraeus. Cicero even accused Mark Anthony of having as a boy lived in the house and served as the "wife" of a tough gang leader Curio.
Judeo-Christian Intolerance and Invisibility

While the Greeks cultivated *paiderasteia* as a fundamental institution of male society and an attribute of gods and heroes, in two centuries under Persian rule (538-332) Biblical Judaism came to reject and penalize male homosexuality in all forms. Jewish religious consciousness deeply internalized this taboo, which became a distinctive feature of Judaic sexual morality, setting the worshippers of the god of Israel apart from the gentiles whose idols they despised. This divergence set the stage for the confrontation between Judaism and Hellenism. The age-asymmetrical homosexuality of the Greeks must have particularly exacerbated the abhorrence of incest that forms the unconscious infrastructure of Judaic morality. Following the onset of the Hellenistic period with the conquests of Alexander the Great, this antagonism grew marked and bitter, and hardened into the later implacable condemnation and persecution by the Christian Church.

The underlying paradox of sexual psychology is the simple fact that it is impossible to know what another human being feels. One may observe the sexual behavior of others directly or indirectly through narratives, jokes and the like, but one can never experience either the sexual urge that compels others to behave as they do, or the sexual pleasure that they derive from actions that strike the observer as ridiculous, demeaning, and degrading. This incomprehension joined with the proximity of the sexual organs to the urinary system and the end of the gastrointestinal tract makes for oscillation between ridicule and disgust. The Greeks seem to
have experienced disgust only minimally and therefore relished the humorous aspect maximally, while the Judaic mentality found every aspect of homosexuality too disgusting for public mention even in a humorous or satiric context. The invisible wall separating the two cultures generated the intense, paranoid homophobia that accompanied the Judean resistance to Hellenization in the Maccabean period and was bequeathed to Christianity when it broke from Judaism to become an independent world religion.

A feature of Plato's thinking in regard to homosexuality that has not been noticed until now is its incorporation of non-Greek elements. The myth of Aristophanes in the Symposium derives, as was shown almost eighty years ago by Ziegler (1913, pp. 571-572) from a Babylonian myth preserved by Eusebius of Caesarea in a quotation from Berossus. Ziegler equally argued that the myth of the creation of Adam and Eve in Genesis was a Judaic, monotheistic--and heterosexualizing--version of the same. Greek pederasty rather assumed that bisexuality was the potential if not the norm, that an adult male could be both boy-lover and husband with no inner conflict or social ambiguity. The myth in the Symposium (189d-e, 191e-192c) instead implies three "exclusive" types, the heterosexual male-and-female, the male homosexual, and the lesbian. It is noteworthy that the male homosexual and the lesbian are distinct sexes, not a variant of one "third sex."

But in the Laws Plato adopted the Persian (and Judaic, though he could scarcely have known this) attitude toward pederasty and homosexuality in general. In fact, the definition in the Laws
(636c) anticipates, albeit clumsily, the modern notion of homosexuality as *behavior*: sexual intercourse with an individual having the genitalia of the same sex. The more abstract thinking of the Greeks thus equated male homosexuality and lesbianism, as the meta-Babylonian etiology of homosexuality as *orientation* had *not* done. One might ask what had alienated Plato in his old age so much from Athenian (and Hellenic) mores that he could urge the complete suppression of sexual contact between members of the same sex. Disappointment in love and growing ressentiment toward those younger and more attractive than himself may have motivated him. It is true that Plato did not so much urge penal sanctions against homosexual activity of either sex as think that universal condemnation could banish it from consciousness, much as it does incestuous wishes and urges, and so create an exclusively heterosexual citizenry. In its totality, although Plato made concessions to the Greek ideal of *paiderasteia* as a psychological component of education and of male bonding and echoed the contempt which his countrymen felt for the *kinados* (passive-effeminate male), he never felt comfortable with the practice of boy-love. His own approach to the phenomenon was Oriental and not Greek. The same is true of Xenophon, who had spent much time in Persia. It is thus doubly incorrect to represent the Platonic ideas as characteristic of Greek mores of his own time; they are rather an intrusion of Semitic and Iranian elements that in no way mirrored the distinctive beliefs and practices which the Hellenes had developed.
in the preceding three centuries. That the non-Hellenic attitude was to prevail in later centuries no one could have anticipated in Plato's time.

At the heart of the "sodomy delusion" lies the Judaic rejection of Hellenism and of paiderasteia, one of the distinctive features of the culture brought by the Greek conquerors of Asia Minor. It is a fundamental, ineluctable clash of values within what was destined to become Western civilization. Only in the Maccabean era did the opposition to Hellenization and everything Hellenic lead to the intense, virtually paranoid hatred and condemnation of male homosexuality accompanied by fantasies of divine retribution on the sinners who practiced it that Judaism bequeathed to the nascent Christian Church. In this instance, it was the conquered race whose morality prevailed over that of the conqueror. This circumstance also explains why "liberation theology" in its historic context is useless to Queer Nation: the revolt against Syrian rule—which succeeded only because Rome was already extending its hegemony to the Eastern Mediterranean--was accompanied by a paroxysm of homophobia, not to speak of the outlawing of all sexual intimacy with non-Jews. "Liberation" from Hellenism plunged lovers of their own sex into a starless, unending night of oppression. Within Western man two souls struggle for hegemony: the Hellenic and the Judaic, and their duel mirrors a cultural schizophrenia in regard to homoeroticism.

The transformation was the work of Hellenistic Judaism, which blended the Mosaic and Platonic definitions to arrive at the more
abstract concept of homosexual behavior as blameworthy in pseudo-Phocylides 192 and Romans 1:26-27. Christian moral theology subsequently condemned sodomia ratione sexus as a "crime against nature," where it does not matter which sex it is, but rejected and suppressed the notion of homosexuality as orientation. In other words, homosexuality as exclusive attraction to one's own sex was invisible and unknown to the Christian mind from the late Middle Ages onward. It disappeared from the intellectual repertory of Western civilization, and had to be rediscovered in the nineteenth century thanks to Karl Heinrich Ulrichs and Károly Mária Kertbeny. Some modern historians--the Social Constructionists--argue unconvincingly that before Kertbeny coined the term in 1869, "homosexuals" did not even exist.

Pagans viewed non-reproductive eroticism, as long as it did not involve force against a citizen or undue pressure on a subordinate, as a matter of taste. Whether one preferred boys or women made as little difference as whether one preferred fish or fowl. In contrast, at the very moment when Christianity was emerging from Hellenistic Judaism, the latter had already formulated a moral code that limited sexual expression to heterosexual marriage and there solely for the purpose of procreation, and forbade abortion and infanticide. There was nothing left for St. Paul or St. Augustine or St. Thomas Aquinas to invent. They could, it is true, add their own motivations and morbid fantasies, but the fundamental belief system was adopted from Hellenistic Judaism without change, even while many other
provisions of the Mosaic Law were discarded forever. The distinctive feature of Christian sexual morality—the one which it does not share with Judaism—was its asceticism, but this by its very nature could be no more favorable to homosexual expression than the Judaic code, although in due time it furnished a convenient pretext to those wishing to evade marriage and the burdens of heterosexual life. Judaism with its positive attitude toward heterosexuality had never offered such an alternative. Gnosticism bequeathed to Christianity a fundamental rejection of Eros that made even heterosexual intercourse for procreation little more than a necessary evil and homosexual activity a wholly unnecessary and unjustifiable one.

As edited by the Jewish priests in the fifth pre-Christian century, the Mosaic Law (Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13) prescribed death for lying with another male as "an abomination." It stipulated that "their blood is upon them," which meant that the perpetrators were to die unavenged: executing them entailed no guilt or pollution. Later the Talmud (b.Sanhedrin 73a) went so far as to ordain that one had the right to kill another individual to prevent his committing the crime. In the New Testament (Romans 1:26-27), St. Paul, employing a Platonic concept that had already penetrated Hellenistic Judaism, condemned the inversion of sexual roles by males and also by females, who had escaped censure by the Jewish scriptures, as "contrary to nature."

No sooner had they converted the Roman emperors than the triumphant Christians introduced the Levitical death penalty for
sexual acts between males. Although the punishment was seldom enforced during the anarchy of the Dark Ages, it was reimposed toward the end of the thirteenth century and became normative for Christian society--Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant. This crucial shift from toleration and visibility to intolerance and invisibility underlies the conflict unresolved to this day. From this dual heritage stems our current dilemma--the irreconcilable clash between the Greco-Roman humanism of antiquity and the Judeo-Christian condemnation that prevailed in after ages. It is and remains one of the fundamental contradictions within Western civilization.

**Christian Middle Ages**

Ever since its triumph under Constantine the Great in 323, institutionalized Christianity has uncompromisingly condemned homosexual activity. Constantine's sons first ordained death by the sword. In the sixth century the Byzantine emperor Justinian in his summary of Roman law prescribed the more excruciating penalty of burning at the stake to keep God from inflicting "famines, earthquakes, and pestilences" on a society that neglected to punish sodomites. After an interval of neglect, Roman law in the form of Justinian's *Corpus* was revived in Western Europe during the eleventh century. No church father ever defended, much less commended any form of eroticism with one's own sex. In the entire *Patrologia Graeca* and *Patrologia Latina*, collecting the writings of the Church Fathers from the sub-apostolic age to 1453 and 1215 respectively, there is not one sentence on the subject of
homosexuality that is even slightly positive. All that gay Christian apologists of the late
twentieth century can cherish is the pathetic wish that it had been otherwise. Sanctions in canon
law inspired secular authorities to impose ever more severe penalties. These ranged from
penances to fines and banishment and from flogging and exposure in the pillory to castration,
drowning, stoning, hanging, and burning at the stake.
Too disorganized to persecute sexual misconduct vigorously during the Dark Ages, the Western
church lost no opportunity once it gained the moral and political strength in the thirteenth
century. Then Western society, which had fully recovered and reorganized its institutions,
reached the all-time high-water mark for intolerance: its unrelenting sanctions forced force
everyone involved in homosexual activity not just to hide his "sinful" behavior, but to perjure his
sexual identity--to become a lifelong prevaricator and hypocrite. In writing the *Summa
Theologica*, St. Thomas Aquinas incorporated (I-II, q. 31, 7) a passage from Aristotle's
*Nicomachean Ethics* (VII v 3-4, 1148b) which recognized that some individuals are naturally
attracted to their own sex, but altered it to insist that the inclination was always secondarily
acquired. Thus he precluded any understanding of homosexuality as an exclusive *orientation*,
and stigmatized such individuals as sinners against nature.
Christian intolerance bred the cruelest and most absurd fantasies about homosexual *behavior*.

Toward 1360 a South Italian jurist, Luca da Penne, wrote in his *Commentaria in Tres Libros*
Codicis, Book XII, 60(61), 3:

If a sodomite had been executed, and subsequently several times brought back to life, each time he should be punished even more severely if this were possible: hence those who practice this vice are seen to be enemies of God and nature, because in the sight of God such a sin is deemed graver than murder, for the reason that the murderer is seen as destroying only one human being, but the sodomite as destroying the whole human race. . . .

Homosexuality became invisible to the Christian mind, yet the object of a thousand obscene fantasies. It was nowhere, yet everywhere threatened society with destruction. It was blotted out of the annals of the past, unrecorded in the present, forbidden to exist in the future. Records of trials were burned along with the culprit, so that no trace of the crime should remain. Yet enveloped in the impenetrable darkness of ignorance and superstition, it existed silent and unseen, a phantom eluding the clutches of an intolerant world.

From the end of the thirteenth century onward, conforming to the asceticism of Latin Christendom, Church and state fanatically persecuted and society remorselessly ostracized those whom they labeled sodomites. Branded as infamous, shunned and detested, we were thought like witches and heretics to be in league with the demonic powers of another world. In the eyes of the Church we were not just sinners, but criminals and outcasts with no rights or
feelings that Christian society needed to respect in any way. The very subject of love for one's own sex was banished from Christian consciousness; it was deemed a "crime so abominable that it is not fit to be discussed, named, or even obliquely mentioned in any country where the Christian religion is practiced." Even in the 1990s, publishers continue to issue textbooks of classical history that say not a word about the homosexuality (or bisexuality) of the Greeks and Romans.

While it was always against the law to rob stagecoaches and trains, the highwayman or train robber gained an almost romantic image in life and in literature, but the sodomite earned universal hatred and execration. The crime of sodomy was never idealized or romanticized, it rather inspired only loathing and disgust.

Not all outings resulted in death, but public humiliations, tortures, and executions sufficed to terrorize the population so that no one came out except perhaps indirectly to intimates worthy of trust. From the thirteenth century through the eighteenth the Inquisitors' highly publicized "show" trials "relaxed" sodomites to the secular arm for execution, usually by hanging or burning at the stake. If only some two or three thousand refugees from Sodom suffered its auto-da-fés, the executions attracted myriads of spectators. Tribunals doomed legions of others to exile, galleys, flogging, and other lesser penalties and humiliations. Operating on their own but inspired by Christian moral theology, secular courts, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, sent several thousand more victims to the stake, to the gallows, or in England to the
pillory. Although a handful had felt safe enough to write homoerotic verse as late as the twelfth century, by the late Middle Ages the only refuge for lovers of their own sex was the darkest, most impenetrable corner of the closet.

Crucial to understanding the attitude toward homosexual behavior and those who engaged in it is the concept of *infamy of fact* (Franklin, 1954). This was the stigma attached to those who violated specific canons and ordinances of the Church, and in the case of the sodomite it entailed perpetual infamy, which is to say lifelong exclusion from the sacral community of Christian belief. The persistence of medieval infamy into modern times, not some "instinctive aversion" to homosexual activity, fully explains the ostracism and persecution which lovers of their own sex have endured down to the end of the twentieth century.

No question is more intriguing than that of saints who were "heretics in the flesh." If Christianity had been but one of several competing faiths in the Middle Ages, those enamoured of their own sex would have had scant motive for adopting it. But because it became the religion of the state, the only one (other than Judaism) tolerated at all, many whose nature destined them for a spiritual vocation had to profess a faith that defamed and denied their innermost longings. Although Wayne R. Dynes holds that evidence is insufficient to out even one saint, John Boswell suggests that there were a good many and searches for proof. The greatest Latin father, St. Augustine, confessed to a homosexual phase before his conversion, but that adolescent phase hardly
counts. Boswell argues passionately that the Orthodox patron saints of the Byzantine military, Sergius and Bacchus, the commander of a military academy in Syria and his subordinate, who were martyred in 303 when they refused the emperor's command to worship pagan gods, were lovers after converting. The Yale historian even claims to have the text of Orthodox rites from the eighth and ninth centuries in which the clergy blessed the union, if not the marriage, of male couples—what in Serbian is called *pobratimstvo* "blood brotherhood." Even Dynes admits that the eleventh century St. Moses the Hungarian is an example of an early Russian Orthodox saint who had homosexual impulses but who may never have acted on them. Sold as a slave by the prince of Kiev to a Polish noblewoman, Moses adamantly resisted her sexual advances. The exasperated master ordered him flogged and castrated, and a triumphant Moses, who very nearly expired during his ordeals, ended his days as a monk in the Kievan Crypt Monastery. The monk Aelred, abbot of Rievaulx (c.1110-1167), as Bennett Hill pointed out in the only entry on homosexuality in Joseph R. Strayer's 12-volume *Dictionary of the Middle Ages* (1989), epitomized homoeroticism in his writings, although as Dynes insists, there is no proof that he yielded to his cravings. Dante placed his detested enemy, Pope Boniface VIII, as well as his cherished teacher Brunetto Latini in hell for sodomy. Edward Gibbon commented wryly on the accusations hurled at the trial of the anti-pope John XXIII, who reigned from 1410 to 1415: "The most scandalous charges were suppressed; the vicar of Christ was only
accused of piracy, murder, rape, sodomy, and incest.” Evidence to convict any of these clerics beyond a reasonable doubt is lacking, as indeed it is for certain Renaissance popes like Pius II. But there is more than enough probable cause to believe that some saints committed the crime of Sodom. An eleventh-century pope and St. Amselm, a twelfth-century Archbishop of Canterbury, counseled against hunting down clerical sodomites as certain fanatics were already urging--a task relinquished to inquisitors in the thirteenth century.

**Renaissance and Reformation**

The Renaissance was permeated with the homophilia of the classical culture which it revived. The civilization-building élan of the Greeks and Romans in their Golden Ages gave the West a powerful, nay incomparable cultural impetus. Protected by powerful patrons, a few revered Italian artists managed like certain of the social elite to flourish in spite of their reputation for sodomy. The new era brought little relief for the mass of less privileged sodomites, though sometimes a de facto tolerance prevailed briefly in certain clandestine "bohemian" urban circles. From time to time the Inquisitors actually ferreted out a number in Italy and Spain so that all remained in dread.

The Renaissance, especially in Italy, then the most influential country in art and learning, saw the passage of new laws against sodomy. The city-states developed efficient methods of surveillance and of record keeping, though the apparent increase of outings and of trials may reflect in part better documentation.
The keeping of records meant that the victims were more likely to be stigmatized for the rest of their lives than before, when gossip might eventually die down. One alternative was to flee, if possible before the trial began, so that the number of homosexual exiles and émigrés mounted. As in most previous societies, pederasty was the prevalent form that homosexuality took there, though not the sole one.

Even in periods of the worst intolerance, those who defended or at least excused the homosexual failings of their contemporaries could point to the roster of great men and women who loved their own sex. In his tragedy *Edward II*, published posthumously in 1594, Christopher Marlowe, who quipped that St. John was Jesus' boy, already voiced such a defense:

Great Alexander lovde Ephestion,

The conquering Hercules for Hilas wept,

And for Patroclus sterne Achilles droopt:

And not kings onelie, but the wisest men,

The Romaine Tullie loved Octavius,

Grave Socrates, wilde Alcibiades.

A character in the *Aloisia Sigea* of Nicolas Chorier (circa 1660) cited no fewer than thirty examples. Written in 1630 and published in 1652, the satirical *Alcibiade fanciullo a scola* had given all the arguments for pederasty which the pedant Philotimus, a thinly disguised Socrates, deploys to convince his pupil, the handsome youth Alcibiades, to yield to his amorous advances.

As one can read even in the hypercritical *Encyclopedia of*


*Homosexuality* (1990), whose Chief Editor cautiously refused to include any characters who were not clearly homosexual, four Italian Renaissance artists and one poet were clearly outed in their own lifetimes. One even came out on his own. Leonardo da Vinci, the best exemplar of the universal man (*uomo universale*), perhaps the greatest genius of all time, was anonymously accused. The *Uffiziali di Notte*, the officials appointed by the commune of Florence, as in other Italian states, to oversee morals, claimed that he had sexual relations with four males, including one from the princely family of the Medici and a seventeen-year-old model. The unmarried Botticelli, one of the most distinguished of the pre-Raphaelite painters, was like Leonardo denounced to the *Uffiziali di Notte* for having sexual relations with one of his young assistants, but his age and artistic reputation saved him from prosecution. A lesser-known but more ebullient painter, Giovanni Antonio Bazzi, when asked what name should be announced when his horse won the race at Florence, shouted "Sodoma, Sodoma!" in an apparent disregard for public opinion or perhaps misplaced confidence that he would be tolerated because of his artistic talent. Although the authorities did not move against him, the mob fagbashed him. The celebrated goldsmith Benvenuto Cellini was outed by a rival artist exclaiming before Grandduke Cosimo of Florence, "Oh keep quiet, you filthy sodomite!" He was eventually placed under house arrest for sodomy, which gave him the occasion to compose his famous *Autobiography*. The historian and poet Varchi did not even take the trouble to conceal his homosexuality,
composing openly homoerotic sonnets, some addressed to the young aristocrat Giulio della Stufa, whose parents forbade him to see Varchi.

In the sixteenth century, Copernicus' daring heliocentric speculations were published only thanks to the efforts of a sodomitical disciple, Georg Joachim von Lauchen, surnamed Rheticus after his homeland. Outed more than once, he died at Košice in Slovakia, which was safely under Ottoman rule (Voss 1931; Zinner 1943, pp. 231-232, 244, 259, 262). Although the lives of scientists are frequently more obscure than those of writers and artists, there is evidence that Sir Isaac Newton, who completed the Scientific Revolution with his laws of gravitation, was attracted to his own sex.

By elevating marriage above celibacy, and making all single males suspect, the Protestants in some respects outdid their Catholic antagonists. Harking back to Biblical Judaism, where marriage and fatherhood were the norm for the religious elite, they rejected clerical celibacy. Moreover, they rhetorically flagellated the Catholic clergy, including inmates of nunneries, for indulging in perverse sexual acts among themselves and with the laity. All mainstream reformers also condemned simple fornication more than had the medieval church, which had ordained mitigation with confession and penance. In their polemics, a principal advantage of abolishing monasticism and allowing marriage of priests and bishops was preventing clerical sodomy. Reformers also tried to abolish prostitution which the unreformed Church had
condoned as a lesser evil than adultery or the "crime against nature." But in making that option less available, they probably did increase the likelihood of homosexual sodomy. Protestant churches and states perpetuated the Catholic policy of publicly executing sodomites whom they too detested as enemies of God and man.

**Ancien Régime, French Revolution, and Romanticism**

Triumphing as the disastrous religious wars ended in 1648, the Scientific Revolution had created a new faith in human reason. Enlightened Europeans began to view the human body and its sexuality more positively. The Christian rejection of this world, the flesh, and its pleasures yielded to a belief in progress and even in mankind's perfectability. But if *philosophes* disowned the entire Judeo-Christian tradition as irrelevant if not abominable, they did not for that reason eschew the deeply ingrained homophobia that stemmed from it. On the threshold of the eighteenth century Pierre Bayle began to discredit the belief in miracles, witches, demons, and comets as harbingers of misfortune. Among the skeptical or the enlightened, the dogma that sexuality save when directed toward procreation within the holy bonds of matrimony was an evil certain to provoke the wrath of the deity yielded to a positive evaluation of pleasure. A positive legacy of the the Age of Exploration was that comparisons with non-European cultures discovered and described by seafarers and travelers left no custom or convention unqueried and so undermined the belief in the uniquely "revealed truth" of Christianity.
Although the learned and privileged often carried on affairs in the lax atmosphere of the Old Regime's royal entourages, the mass of the population remained oppressed. The Paris police kept lists of known sodomites, a ledger that under Louis XVI, in 1783, grew to 40,000 names. Yet the individuals recorded on the list were rarely if ever prosecuted. Some, including members of the nobility, were exposed to the public in two Revolutionary pamphlets of 1791. As Louis Crompton showed in *Byron and Greek Love* (1985), down to 1816 the bugger unfortunate enough to be apprehended by the British authorities was usually not hanged, but had to face an ordeal perhaps worse than the gallows--the pillory. Scenes of mob violence against the ill-fated perpetrator undoubtedly moved Jeremy Bentham to propose decriminalization of sodomy, but even this intrepid legal reformer and philosopher dared not publish his extensive writings on the subject.

One of the most promising developments of the Enlightenment was its critique of the penal practice of the Old Regime: cruel and unusual punishments and the use of torture during interrogations. Of both sodomites endured more than their share. A new conception of rights to "life, liberty and property" (which the thinkers of the Enlightenment set in opposition to the supposedly revealed laws of the Old Testament) sanctioned individual freedom: the state should not hinder the pursuit of pleasure so long as it infringed the rights of no third party. Nevertheless, even among those *philosophes* who professed to endorse free love, the fewest dared to advocate homosexual
relations, notably the materialist Julien Offray de la Mettrie, the uncertain author of the novel *Thérèse philosophe*, Mirabeau somewhat ambivalently in the *Erotika Biblion*, and the Marquis de Sade in *La philosophie dans le boudoir*. Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) did so obliquely in his bitter denunciation of asceticism in the second chapter of *Introduction to Principles of Morals and Legislation*, but his major defense of what he styled pederasty remained in manuscript, unpublished and unread. A year after his death, however, a book (now apparently lost) advocating repeal of the British statutes against buggery was printed on the Continent, and its arguments in turn inspired the still to be identified author of the poem *Don Leon* (1836), which celebrated in verse not only pagans but also "Christians of the highest stamp" who were impassioned of their own sex. At this time Western society still knew homosexuality only as behavior--disgusting, immoral, unnatural behavior. The *philosophes* advocated repeal of the laws punishing it for the simple reason that such activity in private harmed no one, and the sanctions themselves were motivated by the superstition and fanaticism of the Old Regime. Accordingly the new Penal Code adopted by the Constituent Assembly in France in September and October of 1791 omitted the offense of sodomy.

Enamored of liberty and hating the Church, revolutionaries struck down the penalties for sodomy when they swept away the ancient laws. Attacking the clergy as well as the nobility, they demolished the Old Regime and repealed codes permeated with cruelty, superstition and fanaticism. Their attempts to establish
a "Religion of Reason" failed disastrously, but the Church never recovered from the abolition of tithes and the confiscation of its estates. Girondins and Jacobins alike denounced and persecuted it. As the victorious French armies liberated Belgium and Northern Italy, they implemented the revolutionary reforms and rescinded laws against sodomy.

Promulgating a new penal code that made no mention of sodomy as part of the complex of codes enacted for his empire in 1810, Napoleon extended it to Holland, western Germany (which he reorganized as the Confederation of the Rhine), Spain, in fact to virtually the whole of western Europe. But in spite of the abolition of legal sanctions, the social ones—the infamy that attached to the bugger or pédéraste, as the enlightened called those whom the clerics had dubbed sodomites—remained. In consequence those erotically involved with their own sex created a "freemasonry of love," joining an underground network of connoisseurs of forbidden pleasure, clandestine and invisible to respectable society. This underworld was invisible to the mass of the citizenry, but visible to those "in the know"—the participants themselves and the police, in particular the morals squad, which kept a watchful eye on all unconventional sexual activity.

Social historians have failed to explain, indeed have often neglected even to ask, why attitudes toward homosexuality changed little throughout this whole dynamic age. Raging since the thirteenth century in Western civilization, homophobia had survived the Protestant Reformation and the Enlightenment intact. The death
penalty for buggery, as English law termed it, remained on the books in Russia until 1769, in
France until 1791, in Holland until 1811, in England itself until 1861, in South Carolina until
1870, in Scotland until 1887. A key element in this system lay in punishing a few "notorious
examples" to terrify millions of others. Even before the mass persecutions of the twentieth-
century totalitarian states, legal inertia and conservatism made the punishment relatively even
more severe than it had been under the Old Regime. To crown the edifice of illogic, earlier
penalties were replaced by long sentences in a prison inhabited solely by others of the same sex.
As penal codes were revised, they came to impose a longer term of confinement for consensual
sodomy than for armed robbery, theft of funds from a charitable institution, or beating and
neglecting a small child.

So far from abating this legacy of intolerance, Victorian morality and bourgeois respectability
exacerbated it. The transition from an agrarian Christian society to an industrialized, secular one
entailed a psychological transformation of the first magnitude. The *philosophes*’ successful
campaign against religious intolerance had led after the French Revolution to abolition of the
right of the state to impose its religion upon its subjects. At the same time, however, it left an
enormous residue of hostility that had previously been vented on adherents of other faiths with
no better object than the sexually depraved. Such outcasts became convenient scapegoats for
moral indignation. Furthermore, guilt must have burdened the bourgeois mind for having
violated the
theological prohibition of greed and avarice. Ideologists of capitalism had tried to rationalize these vices as "enlightened self-interest" and then to sanctify them as the "profit motive." Taking over the concern of enlightened despots for manpower, nationalists echoed theological condemnations of birth control to stigmatize those who did not produce children as unpatriotic and brand them as effeminate, weak, and cowardly.

The secular asceticism introduced by the Calvinists and propagated by the Methodists also played a role in the outlawing of erotic pleasures. The ideal victim upon whom the middle classes could unleash their repressed guilt, frustration, hatred, and envy was the sexual non-conformist. The Abrahamic religions had all inherited the Judaic taboo on homosexuality, reinforced in the case of Christianity—as it was not in Islam—by a pronounced ascetic tendency. This now revived with a vengeance given the increasing sacralization of sexual life.

This mélange of guilt, self-interest and the need for a psychological scapegoat best explains "Victorian morality." It was powerfully reinforced by women's unconscious fears of male sexual aggression. The "moral purity" leagues (Fout, 1992) could in the name of Christian asceticism seek to prohibit all sexual expression outside of "lifelong monogamous heterosexual marriage."

True, they sometimes condoned sexual intimacy between husband and wife intended to express tenderness rather than to spawn offspring. Certain teleological interpretations of Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) made procreation the sole "purpose" of sexuality and every
non-procreative form of sexual gratification "perverse" and "unnatural." These gave a scientific cast to the traditional Christian belief that reproduction alone morally legitimated sexual pleasure.

Ironically, the wealth and privileges of the haute bourgeoisie demanded a psychological compensation in the form of a revived and heightened sexual asceticism. Single women and male homosexuals fell the chief victims bearing the full brunt of medieval intolerance. Bourgeois morality doomed both to lifelong abstinence--the fate of a medieval monk or nun or a prisoner in solitary confinement. The psychological valve that vented society's uncompromising scorn and rejection on them if they lapsed from this ideal allowed industrialists and speculators to enjoy their fortunes, and all the pleasure and power that money could buy, in psychological and political safety.

Lovers of their own sex were, in fact, the last of those defamed and persecuted by the medieval Church: infidels, heretics, Jews, witches, lepers, to demand--much less receive--the rights promised them by the ideology of the Enlightenment. Even when an organized movement in their favor began, the bourgeois and clerical parties ignored or opposed its demands. After thirty years of patient lobbying, Magnus Hirschfeld, the founder of the German movement, concluded that the bourgeois parties were unable or unwilling to reform the penal laws in accord with the findings of modern biology and psychology.

The Homophile Movement
In opposition to the norms of bourgeois society, German Romanticism brought a new intellectual current--one that left behind the narrow rationalism of the eighteenth century. Thinkers such as Carl Gustav Carus and Eduard von Hartmann introduced the concept of the unconscious, preparing the way for depth psychology and for the introspectiveness that led to the recognition of homosexuality as an orientation--a spontaneous, involuntary, erotic attraction to members of one's own sex. The first to write on this hitherto forbidden subject was an obscure Swiss milliner, Heinrich Hoessli, whose two-volume work *Eros* fielded a concept not before defended or celebrated, a harbinger of modern androphilia: *Männerliebe* "male love." It was this that his successors analyzed by looking inward into their own emotions and outward at the clandestine subculture of those with whom they interacted, socially and sexually, and then differentiated from others whose sensuality was directed elsewhere.

The end of the nineteenth century and the Edwardian age saw powerful international countercurrents to conformity in politics and in the arts. Forces long fermenting beneath the surface challenged society’s whole approach to sexual mores. New, tolerant attitudes toward sexual and particularly homosexual expression gained ground in enlightened quarters, so that the homophile movement joined a growing front of advocates of sexual reform. The historical preconditions for the founding of an organized movement for the rights of homosexuals were:

1. The new approach "in depth" to the human psyche initiated
by German Romanticism.

2. The biological debate over human evolution begun by Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

3. The emergence of the Social Democracy as a organized political force opposed to the interests of the haute bourgeoisie and of the state power which the latter controlled.

All these together created a climate of opinion that legitimated an organization which for the first time in modern history openly rejected asceticism as the basis of sexual morality, challenged the Christian condemnation of homosexual activity, and sought understanding and toleration for lovers of their own sex.

The Hanoverian jurist Karl Heinrich Ulrichs began the homophile movement in Germany in 1864 (Hirschfeld 1914, pp. 952-967; Kennedy 1988, pp. 56-63), but remained alone because no one else was yet willing to speak out publicly for such an unpopular cause. He invented the word *Urningtum* to describe the aggregate of those attracted by their psychic nature solely to their own sex (which he explained by the Kabbalistic notion of "a female soul trapped in a male body" and vice versa), but with no further predicate and under the assumption that they amounted to a few thousand in the whole of Germany. His corollary was that such individuals were not culpable and should not be punished as male homosexuals were under Prussian law and were to be throughout the German Empire when it received a uniform penal code in 1871.

Not until 1897 did a few brave pioneers take the next step, to organize publicly for education and lobbying. Ulrichs' successor,
the Jewish physician Magnus Hirschfeld, founded the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee in a suburb of Berlin. It became the homosexual wing of the sexual reform movement. This movement grew slowly at first, then flourished under the Weimar Republic until Hitler assumed power in 1933 and crushed it. This unprecedented step marked a new phase in the struggle for the emancipation of a minority from the hatred, intolerance, and invisibility in which medieval ignorance and fanaticism had tenaciously enshrouded it into the twentieth century.

But the arguments of movement spokesmen were not received at once, in fact the past 128 years have witnessed a still unfinished conflict between the old and the new in sexual psychology and sexual politics. The major problem--of which Foucault never had the slightest inkling--has been the non-reception of the new apologetic concepts created by defenders of love for one's own sex. This negative outcome stemmed directly from the fact that for Western society homosexual orientation was an incomprehensible anomaly--a phenomenon with which official science could not deal (Westrum et al., 1982) and which could only call into question one of the fundamental taboos of Western civilization. In this taboo Christianity has invested so much of its moral credit that if it were ever forced to renounce its claims in this sphere, it would be well advised to file a petition in bankruptcy.

The infamy which the medieval Church imposed on those guilty of "crimes against nature" was what the homophile movement had to discredit in the eyes of the public. Our defenders, it is true,
often preferred to evade the challenge by posing the issue in medical or biological terms—or as one of "civil rights for a minority that had been the object of discrimination." But in the final analysis there is no alternative to challenging the religious dogmas underlying that stigma, and the fundamental notion of the "sinfulness" of homosexual acts. To maintain that what is "sinful" should not be criminal is no solution, because it leaves the social sanctions and penalties unchanged—the ostracism, the economic boycott, the random violence inflicted precisely because the perpetrators feel that society is failing to punish the culprits in a deserved manner.

As he gained more knowledge through interviews and questionnaires, Hirschfeld raised his estimate of the homosexual population step by step from 0.2% to 2.2% of the whole, making it a not insignificant segment of society. The movement that he headed had a centralized leadership unknown to its later American counterpart. Like his predecessor Ulrichs, Hirschfeld firmly believed homosexuality innate. He adamantly argued that it could not be an acquired condition. His remained the position of the German movement to the bitter end.

The Scientific-Humanitarian Committee championed Ulrichs' theory that homosexuality was inborn and unmodifiable. It even added the notion of an evolutionary "third sex" intermediate between the male and the female. These views, which derived homosexuality from intersexuality, were increasingly challenged by the insight which depth psychology brought to the dynamics of
sexual orientation. No one, however, could, in the last analysis, explain why particular individuals become exclusively homosexual or exclusively heterosexual while others oscillated along a bisexual continuum. On the other hand, authorities like Richard von Krafft-Ebing who adhered to not then discredited Lamarckian theories of the heritability of acquired characteristics interpreted homosexuality as the outcome of "degeneration of the central nervous system." This untenable construct was adopted only gradually and with a homophobic gloss by theologizing psychiatrists and other retrograde segments of the population.

The homosexual rights movement had its own dialectic. The survival of medieval infamy on the one hand profoundly contradicted the official ideology of the Enlightenment that called for universal human rights, freedom of conscience, and separation of state and church on the other. The politicization of the homosexual subculture was thus an absolutely new phenomenon. Abundantly documented though the subculture itself is for mid-nineteenth century Europe and the United States, the political consciousness awakened by Ulrichs (who founded the movement) and Kertbeny (who invented the word) spread very slowly from Germany to the rest of the world. The older consensus, which surfaced in the Don Leon poems (1823-36) and elsewhere, that lovers of their own sex belonged to a "freemasonry of pleasure" that should never betray its secrets to a hostile world clashed with the new public stance. The contemporary demand for outing stems from the irreconcilability of the two positions: the older one, which
sanctioned clandestinity and invisibility, and the newer, which calls for a public, visible presence for the queer nation.

The German pioneers launched the struggle for homosexual visibility—a subject that merits an article if not a book. Theirs was not just a campaign for repeal of the sodomy laws, cornerstone of intolerance that these were and are. It was a concerted effort to end the taboo on the public discussion of love for one’s own sex and the monumental distortion and falsification of history, biography, literature and art that ensued from this prohibition. The Scientific-Humanitarian Committee entertained proposals that urgently called for a mass self-outing, or as we would say voluntary coming out, on the part of homosexuals, initiatives mentioned in the Monatsbericht des Wissenschaftlich-humanitären Komitees for November and December of 1905. However, from that time 85 years passed—with few concrete results. Even in Germany few acceded to the appeal of movement activists to come out, simply because the person engaging in overt activity could be prosecuted if revealed to the police. The social risk was too great and the immediate political return too slight. Consequently, all who could remained invisible, except for a handful of daring poets and artists whom prestige and eminent patrons shielded from a vindictive society.

In its thirty-six years the German homophile movement never held a single public demonstration, parade, or rally. The Scientific-Humanitarian Committee’s conferences were sedate. Even attendees did not necessarily identify as homosexual. In turn-of
-the-century Berlin, the police kept a list of homosexuals similar to that long maintained by the Paris police. This time, however, the keeper "was one" himself, Leopold von Meerscheidt-Hüllessem. A secret collaborator of Hirschfeld's, he even intended to publish the dossier in order to reveal to the world once and for all the absurdity of §175 of the Reich Penal Code. In effect the first would-be outer, he was prevented only by the intervention of higher powers, many themselves implicated. Elsewhere, only in Austria and the Netherlands did the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee find imitators. When attempts were made in democratic France and the United States to found such groups, they were promptly suppressed by the police. Furthermore, when open-minded psychiatrists had the opportunity to meet homosexual subjects in their homes and places of work, they quickly realized that these were sane, functional human beings who had nothing in common with the catatonics and schizophrenics whom the physicians had since their days in medical school observed in clinics and insane asylums. But in deference to Victorian morality, from the early 1890s onward the psychiatric profession simply turned its back on the plight of those snared in the net of an ascetic morality. They tacitly sanctioned continued prosecution and punishment by the bourgeois-liberal state, now increasingly conservative and defensive as social democratic parties gained ground. From the second decade of the twentieth century, legislatures imposed new disabilities on us in civil and administrative law, supplementing the old criminal sanctions, on
the grounds that we were mentally ill—in addition to being sinners, criminals and outcasts. This analysis of the relationship among the churches, the psychiatric profession, and the state power should be the essence of a scientific interpretation of the tenacity of Christian homophobia in modern times, the non-reception of the arguments of the homophile movement, and the perpetuation of the criminality and social infamy against which the queer nation is struggling to this day.

Reception and Non-Reception of the Movement

The medicalization of sodomy had begun with Paolo Zacchia and his Quaestiones medico-legalales (1621-50), but in a quite different sense from the one in which the Social Constructionists understand it. Zacchia, the chief physician at the papal court, and his successors were concerned with applying their art to uncovering the telltale evidence of the guilt of the accused, that is to say they placed forensic medicine at the service of the sodomy delusion. Between 1630 and 1880 casuistic writings were published—first in Latin, then in the vernacular—that anticipate Krafft-Ebing in all details except in seeking to exculpate the subject on the grounds of his abnormal mental state. Casper's Handbuch der gerichtlichen Medizin (1857) and Tardieu's Étude médico-légale sur les attentats aux moeurs (7th edition 1878) were the last major writings in the older tradition. But from the time that Ulrichs began to nudge them in the other direction, enlightened forensic experts worked to undermine and overthrow the delusion. Westphal, Krafft-Ebing and their epigones shifted the focus of attention to the mental state
that impelled the accused to commit the crime—which the Church in its infinite wisdom had been unable to detect in all of the preceding six hundred years. In other words, instead of testifying for the prosecution, the forensic psychiatrist now came forward as an expert witness for the defense, arguing that the sexual orientation of the defendant absolved him from moral responsibility for his action.

The authority independent of the churches which medical science enjoyed in the public mind, and the privilege accorded the medical expert to treat matters otherwise banned from public mention, was crucial in undermining the taboo that had kept the whole subject out of consciousness for six centuries. Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia sexualis* (first edition 1886) reached a readership far beyond the audience of "jurists and forensic psychiatrists" for whom it was ostensibly destined, and made the educated classes aware of the phenomena of abnormal sexuality, even if in a one-sided and not always insightful manner.

This new, quite unexpected role of the psychiatrist heightens the significance of the debate that took place at the session of the Berlin Society for Psychiatry and Nervous Diseases on June 8, 1891. There Friedrich Jolly (1844-1904), Westphal’s successor at the psychiatric division of the Charité, and the other leading Prussian experts on forensic psychiatry debated the question of whether homosexuality was a mental illness and decided unanimously in the negative; the concluded correctly that it did not constitute grounds for relieving the defendant from responsibility for
violations of §175 of the Reich Penal Code (Kronthal, 1891).

They based this judgment on four reasons:

1. There is no failure of cognition or clouding of the conscious mind.
2. There is no irresistible impulse.
3. The subject has no delusion as to the character of his own or the partner's sexual organs.
4. The subject is aware that his sexual orientation differs from that of the majority of the population.

Common as it is to all healthy, adult human beings, the periodic recurrence of the sexual drive entails no element of pathology. The notion that homosexual acts are "contrary to nature" is a legacy of polytheistic belief in a mother goddess of fertility whose will is contravened by sterile modes of sexual congress. This concept modern science has abandoned along with all other residues of teleological thinking. It operates instead with a model of the universe that is absolutely indifferent to man, his actions and purposes.

The outcome of the discussion in Berlin and psychiatric articles in the same vein did not prevent the "new homophobia" from emerging in the 1890s. It found its fullest expression at the Fifth International Congress of Criminal Anthropology at Amsterdam in 1901. There Arnold Aletrino, who spoke in defense of the "uranist," was roundly abused by Cesare Lombroso and the psychiatrists who not only insisted the homosexuality was "always a disease," but urged that police take measures to silence
propaganda in favor of toleration and lock up homosexuals when they put their theories into action. This conference marked the beginning of the pseudo-medical and pseudo-scientific defamation of homosexuality that little by little supplanted the old theological one.

Characteristically enough, theologians almost entirely ignored the writings of the homosexual emancipation movement and of psychiatrists and psychoanalysts sympathetic to it, which they conveniently dismissed as "perverted filth." Practitioners of the occult and the supernatural are, however, exceedingly brazen, and their technique of deception entails reformulating their archaic, discredited notions in scientific terms superficially plausible to the modern mind. By the 1940s the clergy and others came to appreciate that the psychoanalysts, after borrowing so much from the homophile advocates, had turned their backs on the sexual reform movement. Now they could furnish a weapon that would allow defenders of tradition to modernize their opprobrium. So the belief that sodomy was "an unnatural and disgusting vice" yielded to clerical insistence that homosexuality was "a loathsome and contagious disease."

New Outings and Their Consequences

The last decade of the nineteenth century and the first of the twentieth saw the most spectacular outings yet--sensationalized by the yellow press. The invention of printing had made possible the issuing of broadsheets--single printed leaves, sometimes containing crude illustrations--that conveyed scandalous or marvelous doings.
to a credulous public. Early in the eighteenth century periodicals and towards its end regular newspapers took over this function. The so-called "penny press" reached millions by the end of the nineteenth century. To be sure, Victorian prudery restrained explicit discussion of sexual matters, and the victims sometimes had the option of libel suits. Nevertheless, the "lords of the press" who sought to drive circulation figures up became expert in suggestive innuendo. They remained within the law—if only just—if not the bounds of propriety, while conveying spicy tidbits to readers versed in the not-so-subtle code. Such scandals, potentially ruinous for politicians and businessmen, titillated respectable bourgeois. Today this legacy of the "yellow press" survives in the tabloids sold in supermarkets and on late-night television.

In what was perhaps the most famous outing of all history, and certainly of the fin de siècle, the Irish wit, poet, dramatist, novelist, and writer of fairy tales Oscar Wilde was destroyed whenouted by a not very intelligent Scottish aristocrat, the Marquess of Queensberry. At the height of his popularity, Wilde fell madly in love with the very handsome but morally flawed Lord Alfred Douglas ("Bosie"). In 1895 Queensberry, Bosie's father, who in 1867 had formulated the standard rules for boxing, left a card at their club addressed "To Oscar Wilde posing as a somdomite [sic]." Douglas pushed Wilde into a suit for libel. Under cross-examination Wilde was maneuvered into confessing that he was sexually attracted to males. He was convicted for gross indecency
with several hustlers whom Queensberry had managed to dredge up from London's sexual underworld. He was sentenced to two years' hard labor—the maximum penalty under the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1885, which had first criminalized gross indecency. His marriage collapsed, and his possessions were auctioned to defray the costs of his defense. His plays could no longer be performed on the London stage. Most of his friends abandoned him. The ear infection that he contracted in Reading Gaol killed him three years after his release.

The scandal reverberated throughout the Western world. In North America it abetted intolerance, while in France Wilde's treatment drew merited comment on British hypocrisy and intolerance. A great artist, it was felt, should not have been subjected to such indignities. The trial also made lovers of their own sex throughout the civilized world for the first time conscious that they were an oppressed group. It catalyzed the resistance that led, two years after Wilde's conviction, to the founding in 1897 in Germany of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee, the world's first homosexual rights organization. Thus Wilde's outing awakened gay political consciousness in the twentieth century, as the almost contemporary Dreyfus affair sparked Zionism in reaction to anti-Semitism.

In Imperial Germany the multi-millionaire industrialist and friend of the Kaiser Alfred Krupp, whose case in some ways resembled that of our own Malcolm Forbes, was driven to suicide. Then in the Harden-Eulenburg affair of 1907-09, a Jewish journalist
exposed the Kaiser's powerful intimate as the center of a clique that had been infiltrated by a
French diplomat relaying information to the Quai d'Orsay. The American author Edward
Irenaeus Prime-Stevenson dared to intimate in print during the scandal and the German critic and
littérature Alfred Kerr not long after it that Wilhelm II himself was homosexual, as it were the
queen bee in the hive.

The World Wars
The mass slaughter of the two world wars eroded Victorian confidence in liberal values and
traditional ethics more than the criticisms of Edwardian philosophers and historians. The
precariousness of life persuaded many, especially soldiers daily facing death, to live for the here
and now. Enforced deprivation of every kind, on the home front quite as much as on the
battlefield, stripped "abstinence" of its moral grandeur. Colonial peoples saw the conflicts as a
civil war within the white race, while Marxists hailed them as the inevitable prelude to the fall of
capitalism.
Released in the trenches from caution and tradition by the extraordinary danger and carnage and
liberated by their own heroism, a great many came out to one another. The booming twenties
saw a greater disregard for traditional morals than the depressed thirties, when fascist and
Communist attacks on sexual promiscuity and bourgeois decadence pushed even the democratic
societies to greater conformity. In contrast with the witchhunts conducted by the American
services in the Second World War, during
the First the intelligence services of the belligerents made no concerted effort to hunt down and 
expose the individuals engaged in these activities. The concept of "homosexuality" as 
orientation was in 1914 still too new and unfamiliar, except perhaps in Germany and Austria, to 
serve as the basis for any state policy. Given the mass slaughter, all men, of whatever sexual 
orientation, were, in any case, desperately needed if only as cannon fodder.

The Fourteen Points, President Wilson's formulation of Allied war aims, promised self-
determination to the emerging nationalities long submerged in the Austro-Hungarian, Russian, 
and Ottoman Empires. It was on the basis of this new Central European concept of ethnic 
"minorities," as opposed to the old British parliamentary usage, that Hirschfeld's ally Kurt Hiller 
(1885-1972), in the spring of 1918, defined homosexuals as a biological minority within every 
population equally deserving of legal toleration and protection.

In the aftermath of the First World War, a few intellectuals such as Radclyffe Hall in England 
and André Gide in France came out. Even so most others, such as Thomas Mann and A. E. 
Housman, revealed their inner selves only to initiates in the "freemasonry of pleasure" or at least 
to the educated and sophisticated few through subtle or not so subtle poetic and artistic 
intimations. Like those who had come out in Germany during the homophile emancipation 
movement from 1897 to 1933, they were mostly professionals or intellectuals. In France, Proust 
and Gide set the pace in 1921 and 1924. But perhaps in all of Western history since
the fall of Rome, not more than two or three thousand came out before the 1970s. Invisibility perpetuated hostile stereotypes and grossly distorted caricatures, but enabled all those who avoided this image to pass as "straight."

The half-Jew Marcel Proust realized that like diaspora Jewry we constituted a hated and persecuted race. The first American to come out fully to the public was the poet Robert Duncan, who startled America by his bravery in using his own name in an article he published in the anarchist magazine *Politics* in 1944. He argued that like Negroes and Jews, homosexuals were an oppressed minority. To be sure, the risks of everyday life and the oases of refuge could vary from one generation and one locality to the next.

Unlike Central Europe, the Western democracies rejected such departures from convention as homosexual rights and veered toward prewar normalcy. The totalitarian regimes that gained power in the Soviet Union and in Germany between the wars instituted a new wave of repression of homosexuals. With National Socialists and Communists in the lead, they imprisoned thousands who did not escape their clutches by flight, by hiding even more deeply, or by suicide. Hitler crushed the German homosexual movement in 1933, and in 1935 enacted even more punitive laws. Of all categories of prisoners in the Nazi concentration camps male homosexuals--the men with the pink triangle--had the lowest survival rate (Johansson and Percy, 1990). Reversing the toleration of the post-revolutionary regime, Stalin clamped down on Russian homosexuals in 1933-34 (branding them as "fascists") as brutally as Hitler persecuted the
German ones (Lauritsen and Thorstad, 1974). All totalitarian states instituted methods of
surveillance and control exceeding in rigor those of previous regimes. The final chapter in this
tale was written by the Stalinists and pseudo-Maoists of the 1970s who castigated homosexuality
as "bourgeois decadence"—as if Victorian morality represented a lost ideal which a future
socialist order should revive.

The psychoanalysts who after the National Socialist seizure of power fled from Central Europe
to America themselves imbibed the homophobia of their new homeland. Their patients were
ideologically disarmed because the United States had no movement that could have given them a
positive identity and esprit de corps. During the Second World War, the psychiatrists
encouraged the American military to exclude and stigmatize homosexuals. When theologians
saw an alliance offered them by the reactionaries in the psychoanalytic camp, who gained
ascendancy in the United States after Hitler's suppression of the sexual reform movement and
Freud's death, they welcomed the new ideas as pseudomedical rationalizations of their long-
cherished religious antipathy to homosexuals. From then onward, writers on "pastoral
psychology" confidently quoted psychoanalytic authorities to insist that "homosexuality is
always a serious disease," that "homosexual love is hate," and similar nonsense.

In sum, while a few more individuals felt liberated enough to come out in public during the
"Roaring Twenties" than during the "Nightmare Years" of the thirties, on the whole the turmoil and
catastrophes after 1914 and even more between 1933 and 1945 inflicted more setbacks than gains. The homosexual emancipation movement collapsed, the "new homophobia" gained ground among the half-educated, and despite endless pronunciamentos that the war was being fought to guarantee human rights and freedoms, queer nationals in the English-speaking world remained a pariah community, invisible and defenseless.

But the "new homophobia" was not confined to theory; it soon learned to put its barely masked intolerance into practice. The Italian inventors of electroshock therapy, Ugo Cerletti and Lucio Bini, as one may see from the collection of articles that announced it to the world in *Rivista sperimentale di freniatria* in 1940, never employed it on patients suffering from psychosexual disorders. This tactic was innovated by American psychiatrists who used the new procedure to torment their homosexual patients, often ones forcibly subjected to their custody. This difference shows that in order to establish precisely where the Americans went beyond their European mentors, the historian must track ideas and practices from their point of origin to the very moment at which the ship carrying them docked in New York harbor. The inability of American "gay historians" to do so precludes their ever understanding what happened and keeps their approach provincial and naive.

The 1940-60 period saw the full reception of the "new homophobia" by the American political and religious establishment. The complex of moves cannot have stemmed from oversight or from a
layman's misunderstanding of psychiatric concepts; it went wholly unopposed by the medical profession. In fact, as late as 1956 a committee of psychiatrists reviewing a military code penalizing even those who merely "associated with homosexuals" would not suggest that the regulations be changed, but only expressed apprehension that "some innocent persons might be punished."

**Homosexuals in the Military**

Like the celibate clergy, the military has always attracted those disinclined to settled family life, of whom many preferred their own sex. They experience an all-male environment remote from civilian life and intense male bonding in the face of danger, which seem to accentuate homoeroticism. A British career officer writes from personal recollection: "Where officers are concerned the officers' mess has often been the preferred and almost the only real home of unmarried men. This was especially obvious in my early days in the Army, when early marriage was actively discouraged, made difficult in some regiments, virtually forbidden until what would now be regarded as much too great an age. . . . Elderly bachelors, as they seemed to me, warming their beinds as they monopolised the fire, booming away about old campaigns, were a familiar feature of the military landscape" (Richardson 1981, p. 33). The Romans did not allow troops on active duty to marry, and until the late nineteenth century the British forbade their officer corps to marry.

The list of celebrated commanders who loved their own sex, from nearly all the Greeks and Macedonians through Julius Caesar
and Mark Antony down to modern times, is too long to be recited here (see Rowse 1977). At Marathon, at Thermopylae, at Salamis the pederastic spirit guarded the cradle of Western civilization from Persian despotism. The Sacred Band, composed of pairs of lovers united by fidelity in combat, liberated Greece from Spartan tyranny and died to the last man fighting for Greek liberty at Chaeronea. It found imitators outside the Hellenic world, in Semitic Carthage with its African warriors.

Even in the Christian Middle Ages Richard the Lion-hearted had twice to do public penance for sodomy, and the Knights Templar were formally accused of it, though the question remains moot. Louis XIV’s brother "Monsieur" and another of his best generals, the prince de Condé, were homosexual, as was his most formidable opponent Prince Eugene of Savoy. Not so was the British general who fought beside Eugene, John Churchill, first duke of Marlborough, but his wife supposedly had a long affair with their sovereign Queen Anne. In the great struggle of the mid-eighteenth century, the Seven Years War (for us the French and Indian War), which determined that the English rather than the French would rule both North America and India, England’s chief ally and one of the greatest generals and statesmen of all time, Frederick the Great of Prussia, was bisexual and his brother Henry exclusively homosexual. Prince Henry was even considered by a monarchist circle around George Washington for king of the newly independent nation, and Charley Shively maintains that Washington himself, who was ably aided by another Prussian homosexual, Baron von Steuben, may have
been compromised with his own sex. Washington's favorite aide, Alexander Hamilton, is also suspect at the very least of having exploited the Commander in Chief's infatuation with him, as Paul Hardman argues in *Homoaffectionalism: A Study of Male Bonding from Gilgamesh to the Present* (1993). Of course, situational homosexuality was even more rife among sailors and crews of pirate ships who in those days were often at sea for many months, even years at a time. Even if the ancient Greek tradition that lovers fought more bravely as warrior pairs than did woman-lovers was dead, the military never lacked homoerotic heroes. Many loved overseas adventures, the most famous modern British hero of that ilk being General "Chinese" Gordon, who died a hero's death at Khartoum. The hero of Mafeking, Lieutenant-General Sir Robert Baden-Powell, founded the Boy Scouts in Great Britain in 1908, an organization that quickly spread to almost every civilized country. A recent biography has outed him as a pederast, rather amusingly just before the current quarrel over the exclusionary policy of the American branch. General Lyautey, who conquered Morocco for France in the early twentieth century, undoubtedly, however, expressed a minority position when he declared that he could effectively command only officers with whom he had slept. Viscount Montgomery of Alamein, the British general who drove the Axis armies out of North Africa, has been exposed as a self-hating "closet case" in the original meaning of the term (see p. [8 of the manuscript]).

The coming of the theological-forensic concept of homosexuality influenced the military, but in a negative direction.
It was precisely in those countries where the law still penalized "crimes against nature," rather than in ones that had adopted the Code Napoléon which did not, that the military authorities were preoccupied with the supposed problem. But remarkably enough, at the outbreak of the First World War an unusual number of homosexual men streamed into the German army and volunteered for service, including many who had been living virtually in exile for fear of §175, the article of the penal code that proscribed male homosexuality. "Many of them must have been attracted by the possibility of living for a long time in an exclusively masculine environment which even without any coarse, sensual activity, exercises upon the majority of the homosexuals the satisfying and releasing influence of erotic satisfaction." Others were motivated by the tragic wish or hope to end their lives gloriously on the battlefield rather than disgrace and dishonor themselves and their families if their sexual orientation became known, or even worse, if they were prosecuted for infractions of the penal code.

German officers who had run afoul of blackmailers or been convicted of "lewd and unnatural conduct" were mercilessly expelled from the service, a practice retained even during the war. Some hoped to regain their former military positions, but had to file a special request to the throne, which in nearly every case Wilhelm II, himself homosexual and surrounded by courtiers of the same stripe, hypocritically rejected. Some persevered in submitting their applications, but the most that they ever achieved was to be inducted as volunteers without an officer's rank, and they could
never hope for promotion. The German military authorities adhered to the standpoint that a homosexual predisposition or homosexual activity were grounds for court-martial. Such cases multiplied during the war. Officers were immediately sent home to be tried by a military court; and unless the accused was able to dispel every last trace of doubt, he was certain to be discharged. Despite the fact that officers were usually punished rather mildly for most other misdemeanors, homosexuality was more severely penalized among them than among non-commissioned officers and private soldiers, in order to maintain strict discipline. The belief was commonly held that a homosexual officer could not preserve the proper distance from his subordinates and might therefore provoke insubordination. Officers attracted to their own sex, however, were very popular because they did not conform to the authoritarian norm of masochism toward one's superiors but merciless sadism toward one's inferiors. Non-commissioned officers usually were let off with a disciplinary penalty--two weeks in the brig--and then returned to the front owing to the chronic scarcity of cannon fodder in the German army as the Marne, the Somme and then Verdun cut a bloodily swath through its ranks (Hirschfeld 1934, pp. 125, 128, 133).

In the First World War, the American, like the other Allied armies, made no attempt to screen out recruits with homosexual inclinations or predilections. A sexual offense could make the individual "unfit" for military service and result in his incarceration, but merely being a homosexual had as yet no meaning. The Navy did, however, did employ decoys to entrap
personnel in Newport, Rhode Island—an episode that almost proved politically ruinous for Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin Delano Roosevelt. However, by the late 1930s the "new homophobia" was arriving in America with the exodus of Jewish psychiatrists and psychoanalysts from Central Europe. Their advice was welcomed by military professionals and adopted to justify exclusionary or punitive measures. Medical science thus served perfectly to rationalize existing prejudices that could no longer be formulated and justified exclusively in Biblical or theological terms.

The systematic psychiatric screening of inductees began in 1941 at the instigation of Harry Stack Sullivan, an influential thinker in the field who was also a closeted homosexual who lived with his lover. It involved a concerted effort to ferret out "sodomists," as they were termed by the military, while the run-of-the-mill psychiatric examiners who ran the programs tended to favor aggressive detection of "perverts." There were two main rationales for screening out "sodomists," whom the newer terminology styled variously as "sex deviates," "habitual homosexuals," "pathics," "sexual perverts," "confirmed perverts," and "moral perverts." First was the claim that the psychiatrically unfit of 1917-18 (when inductees had been screened only for physical defects) furnished a large share of inmates of Veterans Administration hospitals. This burden on the taxpayer should not be repeated by admitting such misfits into the uniformed services. Secondly, it was held that homosexual recruits would have a bad effect on the morale of "normal" soldiers, a claim that the
American armed services are still voicing today. The result of these measures was to make the homosexual excludable as a personality type, for one needed only to be "prone" to engage in the tabooed behavior to fall under the ban.

After the United States entered the war in December 1941, with an urgent need to draft every available man, the psychiatric interviews tended to become negligent and perfunctory. When manpower was scarce in the initial phase of mobilization, the services made no great effort to screen out either male homosexuals or lesbians. Widespread naïveté on the subject of sexual inversion further undercut the enforcement of such policies of exclusion. Only 5,000 were rejected at induction centers.

By the beginning of 1943, however, the Navy (followed by the Army), adhering to psychiatrists' recommendations, established policies to eliminate such individuals from the service, provided that they were not deemed essential. As the tide of battle turned the bureaucracy that had been created to rid the armed services of sexual deviates geared up to deal with the "problem." It was recognized that a great many homosexuals had slipped through the earlier screening. A concerted effort was begun to identify them, to concentrate them in hospitals, and eventually to drum them out of the service with an undesirable or dishonorable discharge. By 1944, Army and Navy administrators, replacing the archaic label "sodomists" with the modern "homosexuals," enjoined officers to turn them all over, including even so-called "latent" ones, to psychiatrists for observation and diagnosis. Military authorities,
however, retained the last word in the disposal of the cases. Those caught in homosexual acts or admitting to them were pressured to name their previous sexual partners. In this way an atmosphere resembling that of the Spanish Inquisition developed. It was noticed that many women in the armed forces had a noticeably "mannish" appearance, and they too were subject to surveillance and ultimately separation from the service in greater proportion than males (Bérubé 1990).

Ominously for the future, these policies foreshadowed the dismissal of homosexuals even from civilian government employment under the "loyalty-security program" from 1947 onwards, the Report of the Senate subcommittee of 1950, and the ban which the armed forces have maintained for the last fifty years. Even men and women with exemplary records have been discharged from the services, and appeals to the courts have largely brought adverse decisions.

On taking office in 1993 President Clinton had to face the problem, aggravated as it was by the homophobic stance of his two predecessors and of virtually the whole professional officer corps. The military, in league with the obscurantist clergy and the right wing of the Republican Party, have become the bedrock of opposition to gay rights. Even the Vatican, in a document released on June 25, 1992, counseled secular states to persist in excluding homosexuals from the military, a clear admission that such a policy is grounded in the rationalization of religious intolerance. Homophobia portends to be a cause unifying the right in the coming
decades--like anti-Semitism in Europe between 1880 and 1945. Yet even our foes have been pressed to concede that lovers of their own sex can perform loyally and competently--so long as they remain in the closet. Their motto would seem to be: Only the hypocritical may serve.

At the same time the negative labeling of so many who yearned to serve their country drove some into an adversary stance. An inadvertent result of the persecution of homosexuals in the Second World War and its perpetuation in the "loyalty-security program" of the Cold War was the emergence of a new political consciousness in the gay underworld--animated by the sentiment "we're fed up and we're not going to take it any more."

**The Enduring Conflict**

In the last analysis two moralities stand opposed: a Christian one and a pagan one. The Christian one derives from ancient Judaism and its abreaction to Zoroastrianism and Hellenism, the antithesis from Greco-Roman paganism and its legacy to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. The medical and biological discussion of the past hundred and twenty-eight years is a classic instance of intellectual shadow-boxing; what has always been debated is the morality and legitimacy of homosexual acts.

Down to the mid-twentieth century Western society had still not received the ideas of the homophile movement, but lingered in the grip of medieval hatred and obscurantism that precluded any rational state policy. We, the invisible, the persecuted, the rightless, had to found our movement anew and to make it visible
and influential, this time in another country, a colony of the Old World, but one that in three hundred years had evolved its own political structure and cultural setting. The story of that movement, and of how its struggle for visibility has led to the current demand for outing, will be told in the following chapters.
References


Salerno.


Zinner, Ernst. 1943. *Entstehung und Ausbreitung der Copernicanischen Lehre*  