



Etiology

by Matthew D. Johnson

Encyclopedia Copyright © 2015, glbtq, Inc.
Entry Copyright © 2004, glbtq, inc.
Reprinted from <http://www.glbtq.com>

Etiology may be defined as a science or doctrine of causation, particularly with respect to the medical sciences. While the earliest etiologies of homosexuality date from European antiquity, the search for a universal, coherent model of causation has intensified as homosexual behavior has come increasingly under the scrutiny of scientific authorities over the course of the past one hundred fifty years.

This intensification corresponded to a shift in how homosexuality was conceptualized during the nineteenth century, as it was transformed from being simply a criminal behavior to which all people might succumb to the habitual predilection of a small subpopulation whose collective identity came to be defined by a disposition to the criminal behavior in which they engaged. The initial function of etiologies of homosexuality was largely explanatory and prescriptive of medical and legal policy for the treatment of these "disordered" persons.

Some subsequent etiologies have been prophylactic, seeking to prevent the incidence of homosexuality or to arrest the course of its development in individual persons. These persons are usually male; the etiology of female homosexuality has been examined far less frequently and, when treated at all, is usually imagined as analogous to models developed for men.

Etiologies have become increasingly scientized, moving from their roots in early sexological writings through psychoanalysis and psychiatry to specializations such as endocrinology, neurology, and genetics. After a century and a half of research and conjecture, there are many partial explanations for the incidence of homosexuality and still no real consensus among the theorists who have formulated them. Different theories have been mobilized by different individuals and groups, often for directly opposed ideological ends, and may have done as much violence to the political cause of gay and lesbian rights as they have buoyed it.

Pre-modern Etiologies of Homosexual Behavior

Theories explaining homosexual behavior among humans have been circulating in European texts for many centuries, dating at least as far back as Plato's *Symposium* (5th century B. C. E.). In this Socratic dialogue on love and erotic attraction, Aristophanes imagines humans as having been once paired, joined back-to-back at the spine, a state in which they lived in perfect contentment. A whim of the gods split these strange, doubled creatures each into two, condemning them forevermore to seek out the person with whom they ought to have been conjoined.

Those who had been joined with someone of the opposite sex sought out opposite-sex partners; those joined with someone of the same sex, same-sex partners. In this fanciful formulation Plato (speaking through the personage of Aristophanes) manages to account for both erotic inclination and sexual object-choice in one fell swoop.



Dean Hamer (above) and his colleagues maintain that sexual orientation is attributable to genetic influences. Publicity photograph provided by Outright Speakers and Talent Bureau. Courtesy Outright Speakers and Talent Bureau.

Peter of Abano, a fourteenth-century French physician, described a condition in which male seminal vesicles were "obstructed" in such a way that men with this condition were made "effeminate" and could derive sexual pleasure only through stimulation of the anus; he nonetheless refused to characterize men with this condition as "sodomites," whose perversion he saw as willful.

Bernardino of Siena, a fifteenth-century polemicist, was not as generous in his estimation of the sodomitical vice so prevalent in Florence. In his sermons he offered up reasons why boys might become disposed to sodomy, many of which stemmed from negligent or overly indulgent parenting. Boys were believed to learn sodomy from their fathers, who were also practitioners; mothers might turn a blind eye to this grave sin, since gifts from male suitors brought money into the household. Bernardino warned against dressing up boys too prettily or letting them show too much skin in public, for fear of their being accosted and raped in the street by adult male sodomites.

In these three examples from pre-modern and early modern Europe, widely divergent in time and place, we nonetheless see some elements that recur in the allegedly more scientific etiologies of homosexuality of later centuries: the alignment of gender identity and sexual object-choice; the hodgepodge of somatic and behavioral factors accounting for a disposition to same-sex eroticism; the particular susceptibility of male youth to same-sex eroticism; and the decisive role played by parents in either facilitating or stemming their children's acquisition of socially undesirable behavior.

While attempting to derive directly modern etiologies of homosexuality from this matrix would be anachronistic, it seems significant that the preoccupations of more recent theorists of same-sex erotic inclination involve some of these same elements in varying constellations.

Sexology, Criminology, and Modern Homosexual Identity

What is strikingly different about the modern era is that the articulation of homosexuality--an emergent concept in late nineteenth-century European medical and juridical discourse--occasioned a revolution in the way same-sex sexual behavior was understood by linking that behavior inextricably to social identity, hastening cultural changes in the organization of sexuality already underway in urban areas of Europe and North America. However, this novel formulation "homosexuality" generated a new etiological question--what makes a person homosexual?--and the search for a satisfactory answer was initiated.

Significantly, some of the initial answers to this question came from ostensibly "homosexual" people. Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, a German jurist and agitator for the abolition of sodomy laws, published a series of pamphlets in the 1860s and 1870s that were later collected as *The Riddle of Man-manly Love*. In this lengthy and detailed work, Ulrichs puts forth a theory of an irrefutable, innate, congenital disposition to what was just beginning to be called homosexuality.

Ulrichs calls his protagonists "Urnings"; these are male persons who possess a female soul. They are in search of "Dionings"--male persons with male souls; only from these persons are Urnings able to derive sexual fulfillment. Ulrichs's theory harkens back to the Platonic explanation outlined above with its dualism of body and soul and the compulsion of disjointed, complementary halves to seek out and to unite with one another; sexual object-choice remains differentiated at the level of the soul, if not at that of the body.

Ulrichs's theory also engenders the stereotype (made visible by the effeminate men who frequented public places for sex with other men in nineteenth-century Europe) of homosexuals exemplifying behavior contrary to their apparent biological sex. Ulrichs and his successors made the radical claim that this was because Urnings and men were not members of the same sex.

Ulrichs's intertwining of gender identity and sexual object choice, and particularly the designation of practitioners of homosexual behavior as belonging to a separate sex, has close parallels in the etiologies of

homosexual behavior current in many non-European societies, notably among certain native North American populations.

Magnus Hirschfeld took Ulrichs's theories to what, for this Berlin physician, was the next logical step: not only were male homosexuals constitutionally feminine (and female homosexuals masculine) at the level of the soul or psyche, the stigmata of this inner gender identity were made manifest on their bodies.

Homosexuals of both sexes, in Hirschfeld's clinical experience, displayed signs of hermaphroditism of both primary (genitalia) and secondary (breasts, hips, body and facial hair, Adam's apple, tenor of voice) sexual characteristics. Such a complex of physical and psychic characteristics came to be known in the voluminous studies produced by Hirschfeld and his contemporaries as "sexual inversion."

While Ulrichs did speculate as to the possibility of embryological causation, neither he nor Hirschfeld advanced convincing theories; the deviations were purported to engender a corresponding deviant sexual object-choice, and that was the limit to the explanatory powers of these theorists' writings. For their purposes, no further explanation was necessary, and indeed might have proven deleterious to their cause.

Certainly, their opponents' explanations of homosexual behavior were likewise undetailed. In their quest for legal reform, Ulrichs, Hirschfeld, and others contended with specialists in the emerging field of criminology who argued that homosexual behavior could be tied to a social identity only insofar as it could be tied to criminality. To criminologists, criminals as a group were a distinct class of persons, typically of the lowest echelons of society, who had either never achieved the same level of social sophistication as their betters or who had lost it through a process known as degeneration.

The degenerative theory of crime was a largely tautological one--crime is committed by degenerates who become degenerates by committing crimes--but one which nonetheless had widespread appeal to many nineteenth-century Europeans.

Homosexuality, like other forms of sexual licentiousness, was characterized as atavistic, representative of an earlier and lower stage of human development; since middle-class European society was seen as the pinnacle of a global historical advancement, the symbolic linkages between criminality, the European laboring classes, and the subjugated inhabitants of Europe's colonial empires were easily made.

Criminality (and thus homosexuality) was worse than simple "primitivism," as it was a willful, cultivated pattern of behavior. Indeed, some sexologists saw homosexuality as the capstone on a series of sexual perversions that ratcheted ever upwards; once the thrill of the others had passed, otherwise "normal" men could find sexual satisfaction only in violating boys.

By the turn of the twentieth century, however, most sexologists had managed to reconcile two seemingly incompatible etiologic models of homosexual behavior: the congenital model, advanced by Ulrichs, Hirschfeld, and others; and the degenerative or "cultivated perversion" model, preferred by criminologists. These were believed to be two fundamentally different, mutually exclusive kinds of homosexuality.

So long as they did not attempt to dishonor others, sexologists argued, congenital homosexuals could not be held criminally liable for their actions, given their peculiar constitutions; "cultivated pederasts," on the other hand, had no such excuse and should be subject to the full rigor of legal prosecution.

Sexologists believed they possessed the necessary expertise to tell which kind of homosexual was which, and made their careers doing so as witnesses in high-profile cases.

Freud: An Ambivalent View of Homosexuality

In part one of his *Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* (1905), Sigmund Freud reviews the earlier

literature on same-sex sexual attraction and finds it wanting. From his readings in this literature, including the works of Ulrichs and Hirschfeld, Freud could identify no consistently meaningful link between human biology or morphology and sexual behavior or identity. Both the degenerative and congenital models of explanation were insufficient; for Freud, therefore, so-called "sexual inversion" must reside in early childhood socialization.

Like his predecessors, however, Freud argued that while inversion might be *deviant* it could not be described as *pathological*; in the tradition of sexological writing, he drew on case studies of highly functional persons of good social standing as well as citing the example of Greek antiquity, a society taken by his contemporaries to represent some of the greatest achievements of European civilization that was nonetheless characterized by widespread male homosexuality.

This view was epitomized by his famous and frequently cited 1935 letter to an American mother who had written to Freud regarding her concerns about her homosexual son: "Many highly respected individuals of ancient and modern times have been homosexuals, several of the greatest among them (Plato, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, etc.) It is a great injustice to persecute homosexuality as a crime and cruelty too."

Freud's etiology of homosexuality has been tremendously influential and continues to drive speculations about the phenomenon among both scientists and laypersons. All humans, he argued, are born with the capacity for both homosexual and heterosexual expression. Childhood development can be understood as a gradual process by which the individual comes to understand himself or herself as a gendered being, and by which his or her libido, or sex drive, comes to be fixed upon particular objects.

Childhood trauma or faulty sexual socialization could lead to what Freud termed the "Oedipus complex." Named for the figure in Sophocles's tragic drama who unwittingly murders his father and marries his mother, the Oedipus complex in men was characterized by an incomplete break with the mother and hence an insufficient identification with the role of the father. Homosexuals were thus men who identified with their mothers and desired to be sexually satisfied by a father-figure. Successful sexual socialization, on the other hand, was indicated by men who were able to surmount this developmental hurdle and identify with their fathers.

Freud boldly claimed that such a developmental trajectory was universal, having its origins in a single episode in prehistory when early human males engaged in parricide in order to have access to women. Their collective guilt over the murder of the father compelled the men to develop a system for the exchange of women, which was allegedly the foundational moment of human civilization.

This theory resonated strongly with late-nineteenth century anthropologists' explorations of social organization in "primitive" (that is, non-European) societies. A belief in so-called "primitive promiscuity," understood to be a developmental stage in culture where heterosexual congress was unregulated by taboos on incest or proscriptions for marriage--akin to the individual libido prior to its fixation--drove much of this research, notably among Aboriginal populations in Australia.

While Freud, in *Totem and Taboo* (1918), cited this work as the basis for his theory of the Oedipus complex, a later generation of anthropological research (notably the works of Bronislaw Malinowski and Margaret Mead) demonstrated that assumptions of its universal nature were largely unfounded, and that models of social organization and sexual socialization were highly culturally specific.

Many scholars have argued that Freud's relatively tolerant view of male homosexuality, as well as his etiological conception of it, were shaped by his own proximity to his mother as well as his emotionally intimate friendship with Wilhelm Fliess as a young man.

Nonetheless, Freud's understanding of how homosexual feelings were engendered did partly follow that of

the degeneration theorists insofar as he imagined the roots of homosexuality to lie in arrested childhood sexual development in individuals, viewed as an analog to the development of entire societies along a trajectory from "primitive" to "modern." Since the object of the libido was conditioned by early socialization, homosexuality was inevitably described as a circumvention of normal, heterosexual development that might possibly be avoided by a more complete, normative socialization--or corrected through the medium of analysis.

Witness Freud's pronouncements to the concerned mother, from later in the same letter quoted above: "By asking me if I can help, you mean, I suppose, if I can abolish homosexuality and make normal heterosexuality take its place. The answer is, in a general way, we cannot promise to achieve it. In a certain number of cases we succeed in developing the blighted germs of heterosexual tendencies which are present in every homosexual, in the majority of cases it is no more possible. It is a question of the quality and the age of the individual. The result of treatment cannot be predicted."

Pathology and Therapy in the Mid-Twentieth Century

Even though Freud was skeptical about the potential for homosexuals to adopt heterosexuality through therapeutic intervention, his speculations left the door open to the interpretation that because homosexuality was *abnormal* it was perforce *pathological* and required corrective measures.

While this perception had its roots in Europe in earlier decades (E. M. Forster's posthumously published novel *Maurice*, completed in 1914, presents a dramatic example of reparative therapy from turn-of-the-century Britain), it became the view most commonly held by Freud's adherents, particularly those in the United States, in the decades following his death in 1939.

Significantly, this period was also witness to some of the most systematic and progressive social research that had yet been conducted on homosexuality. These studies utilized homosexual volunteers, and their results indicated that homosexuality was socially ubiquitous, not constitutionally determined, and not incompatible with mental health and successful socialization.

The researches of the Kinsey Institute and that of social psychologist Evelyn Hooker, however, were not focused on the vexed question of etiology and were not interested in changing individual behavior. This work was left to psychiatrists in the institutions where many "social deviants" were coming to be housed, as well as to psychoanalysts in private practice.

It was the conviction of these professionals that homosexuality was a mental illness that could be both averted by better socialization and cured by appropriate therapeutic interventions. This view was codified in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) of the American Psychiatric Association, a professional publication that set the standard of care for mental health practitioners.

As a result of the dominant psychiatric view of the mid-twentieth century, mothers were blamed for "coddling" their sons, for allowing their daughters to engage in stereotypically masculine pursuits, as well as for permitting opposite-sex socialization between young children, which, ironically, was believed to encourage the development of homosexuality. "Cures" for this ailment, meanwhile, came in a number of guises, running the gamut from the "talking cures" of psychoanalysis to behavioral conditioning by way of hypnosis, medication, aversion therapy, and electric shock treatment.

One particularly invasive form of "therapy" was founded on the supposition that male homosexuals suffered from either a lack or a surfeit of male hormones. A belief in the constitutional effeminacy of male homosexuals led Nazi doctor Carl Vaernet to implant animal testicles in the bodies of homosexual inmates in the Buchenwald concentration camp, as well as selecting certain other gay prisoners for castration and subsequent "hormonal rebirth." In the unsanitary conditions that prevailed in the camp, many men did not survive Vaernet's surgical attentions.

In the postwar United States, conversely, male "sexual psychopaths" were believed to be characterized by an intense sexualized aggression responsible for outrages against children of both sexes, for which castration or even frontal lobotomy and hence behavioral mollification were perceived by some to be the answer.

Not only were such researches unethical in the extreme, typically neither soliciting subjects' consent nor displaying any concern for their continued well-being, they were also ill-conceived scientifically, lacking in the rigorous application of scientific principles and producing results that were inconclusive at best. By the early 1970s, countless persons had died or sustained grave permanent physical and mental injury as a result of this work, and the scientific community was no closer to understanding the precise nature or origins of homosexuality than it had been thirty years before.

Gay Liberation and the Repudiation of Causation

The radicalization of the political movement for gay and lesbian rights in the wake of the 1969 Stonewall rebellion precipitated a sea change in the way in which homosexuality was regarded by science, as well as an abrupt shift in the relationship of gay and lesbian people to the scientific establishment.

One of the first initiatives of the newly formed Gay Liberation Front (GLF) was the abolition of homosexuality as a pathological designation by medicine; in 1974, under mounting pressure from gay activists, the American Psychiatric Association elected to remove homosexuality from its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual.

Instead of looking to science for answers to the "problem" of their condition, as earlier generations of gay and lesbian activists had done, these newly radicalized gay men and lesbians categorically denounced scientific opinion as homophobic. The ideology of gay liberation insisted that homosexual identity and its unabashed expression were a normal, healthy part of human sexual diversity.

Gay men and lesbians who had sought therapy because of their sexual identity were urged to abandon it; as they were intrinsically healthy, perhaps healthier than the sexually repressed society around them, they did not require a cure, which meant therapy had nothing to offer.

The ideology of gay liberation did not seek an accounting of homosexuality's etiology from any source. Simply acknowledging one's gay identity, acting on that premise, and attempting to change hostile public opinion were sufficient. No one had ever bothered looking for the cause of heterosexuality, so why the pressing need to find a cause for homosexuality?

Although these gay and lesbian activists may have seen the question of etiology as in some ways antithetical to their aims, they nonetheless invoked a theory of causation when they insisted on characterizing gay identity as intrinsic to personhood and ultimately immutable.

While such nineteenth-century luminaries as Ulrichs and Hirschfeld were regarded as pioneering heroes in their assertion that homosexuality was congenital, gay political thinkers of the 1970s seldom questioned what implications these men's theories of homosexual identity might have for contemporary gay and lesbian identities, which were rapidly refashioning themselves along political lines.

For example, gay liberation and lesbian feminism both reviled any association of homosexuality with gender non-conformity (butch women and fey men were seen as not politically astute), thus attempting to combat an age-old stereotype that was nonetheless at the core of both Ulrichs's and Hirschfeld's theories.

Moreover, anti-gay activism in the United States (from the late 1970s onward) has routinely challenged the blithe assertions of gay activists that homosexuality was congenital. Anita Bryant's "Save Our Children"

campaign to overturn a gay civil rights ordinance in Miami drew very productively on an earlier generation's perception of homosexuals as "psychopaths" bent on recruiting innocents to populate their ranks by way of sexual molestation.

While a subsequent generation has modified this inflammatory rhetoric somewhat, in recent years the claim that a psychotherapy grounded in the practice of evangelical Christianity can "cure" homosexuality has posed a more insidious threat to gay and lesbian people's individual and group integrity.

In the face of political challenges such as these, as well as in the face of mounting evidence from gay and lesbian practitioners in the social sciences that homosexuality is a socially constructed phenomenon strongly demarcated by both historical and cultural domains, any direct investigation of the etiology of homosexuality on the part of gay people would be tantamount to collusion with the enemy.

If the claims of historians and sociologists were correct, and homosexuality was indeed a novel social identity, would this not add fuel (however unintentionally) to the Moral Majority's incendiary rhetoric that homosexuality was the product of a wantonly permissive modern society, a blight that might be extinguished with a return to the presumed piety and clean living of yesteryear?

The Return of Etiology: New Directions in Research

Inevitably, some gay and lesbian people saw a political value in investigating the etiology of homosexuality, insofar as conclusive evidence in favor of a congenital model would refute the outrageous claims made by their detractors.

Partly because the limitations of psychology and psychoanalysis for finding the answers to such questions had already become apparent, partly because the development of new scientific technologies was giving rise to new theories of human behavior as well as novel modes of exploration, research on the origins of homosexuality has in recent decades been concentrated in fields such as genetics and evolutionary biology.

The study of population genetics has exploded since the early 1980s, with the advent of technologies like the polymerase chain reaction, which helps scientists sequence the human genome. Some geneticists subscribe to a radical belief that all manifestations in the life of an organism are encoded chemically at the molecular level in deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), found in every cell of every living creature. It is perhaps unsurprising that an ideology with seemingly limitless explanatory power should be so widely embraced by persons both inside and outside the scientific community and applied to all manner of age-old etiologic questions.

Genetics has been used to account for predispositions to everything from cancer and schizophrenia to violent behavior and homosexuality. Dean Hamer and colleagues' 1993 study claiming molecular genetic evidence of the existence of a gene disposing men to homosexuality epitomizes this kind of research. Taken together with other studies, it has rapidly become the irrefutable evidence that many have sought to back up political claims about the "naturalness" and inoffensive quality of homosexuality: not willful, not aggressive, not contagious, just one anomaly among many.

Yet there are many lingering questions that these studies are unable to answer. First and foremost among these is: how can we account for the incidence of homosexual behavior in persons who do not claim a homosexual identity? Over the course of the past century, such behavior (among inmates of institutions such as military installations, prisons, boarding schools, and asylums) has typically been believed to be compelled by the circumstance of their location in sex-segregated environments.

One problem with studies such as Hamer's is that they assume a gay identity, whether acknowledged by the individual or not, antecedent to homosexual behavior. Researchers have only to look as far as the data published in Alfred Kinsey and associates' *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Sexual Behavior in*

the Human Female (1953) to see that the correspondence between behavior and identity is rarely one-to-one. Fully one-third of Kinsey's male respondents reported homosexual contact to orgasm at least once over the course of their lifetimes; a significantly smaller percentage of his male respondents identified as gay, however.

Would a hypothetical "gay gene" produce a disposition to behavior or identity? What factors would account for the difference between the two overlapping groups outlined in Kinsey's study? And would a disposition to either behavior or identity at the genetic level necessarily guarantee the manifestation of either at the phenotypic level (that is, able to be otherwise observed in the constitution of the organism)?

A movement toward the integration of biological and social science research approaches to understanding human behavior has grown up contemporary with (and heavily dependent on) the study of genetics. Sociobiology is one among various approaches that differ in the extent to which they perceive biological and environmental influences to be determinative of human behavior, but concur insofar as they believe that neither set of variables can be ignored.

In the sociobiological model, social behavior in all organisms is orchestrated primarily around maximizing the amount of genetic material that each individual is able to spread to others; in short, this means having as many offspring as possible. Social behavior is thus understood to be primarily a function of self-interest, of the persistence of one's own genetic material over generations. Perhaps paradoxically, sociobiology has explained a failure to produce offspring in terms of altruism.

In sociobiological theory, celibacy or homosexuality on the part of one organism permits its close relatives to have more offspring who will in turn have greater access to resources in the environment. That this supposition is generally true of life on earth is believed to be evidenced by the widespread incidence of homosexual behavior in non-human animals. Yet the idea of apparently unmotivated altruism does much damage to an otherwise coherent theory.

Is reproductive altruism a conscious or unconscious response? If reproduction is such a strong imperative, what could inspire an even stronger response against it?

One possible answer is that homosexuality is a response exhibited by males who are unsuccessful in their competition for access to women, a proposition that is vaguely redolent of Freud. Another is that homosexuality is characteristic of genetically deficient individuals who are programmed not to reproduce so as not to spread undesirable traits through the population. Neither is an explanation that will be palatable to many gay and lesbian people.

Both the genetic and sociobiological conclusions enumerated here are at best premature; at worst, they have been characterized by some as "bad science." As we learn more about the human genome and the extent of its influence on human behavior, the debate over the causation of homosexuality will doubtless continue, and its content will be changed.

As the political situation of gay and lesbian people changes, certain kinds of etiologic explanations will necessarily be perceived as better serving the interests of this constituency than others; likewise, certain etiologies of homosexuality will play larger roles in shaping individual and group identity and politics than others.

Genetic models of causation have reawakened the specter of eugenics in the possibility of genetic engineering, inspiring the not-unjustified fear that homosexuality may one day be systematically eliminated from human populations. Like the other etiologies of homosexuality identified in this article, genetics has offered gay and lesbian people as much a threat to their existence as it has a vindication of it. If and when the definitive answer is known, it is equally likely to produce as much unease as relief.

Bibliography

- Abelove, Henry. "Freud, Male Homosexuality, and the Americans." *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. Henry Abelove, Michele Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin, eds. New York: Routledge, 1993. 381-93.
- Bagemihl, Bruce. *Biological Exuberance: Animal Homosexuality and Natural Diversity*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Bayer, Ronald. *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry*. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Bland, Lucy, and Laura Doan, eds. *Sexology Uncensored: The Documents of Sexual Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Burleigh, Michael, and Wolfgang Wippermann. *The Racial State: Germany 1933-1945*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Cadden, Joan. *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- D'Emilio, John. *Making Trouble: Essays on Gay History, Politics, and the University*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- _____. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Duberman, Martin. *Cures: A Gay Man's Odyssey*. New York: Dutton, 1991.
- Forster, E. M. *Maurice*. New York: Norton, 1971.
- Freedman, Estelle B. "'Uncontrolled desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960." *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*. Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons with Robert A. Padgug, eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989. 199-225.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*. A.A. Brill, ed. New York: Modern Library, 1995.
- Hekma, Gert. "'A female soul in a male body': Sexual Inversion as Gender Inversion in Nineteenth-century Sexology." *Third Sex, Third Gender: Beyond Sexual Dimorphism in Culture and History*. Gilbert Herdt, ed. New York: Zone Books, 1993. 213-40.
- Hirschfeld, Magnus. *The Homosexuality of Men and Women*. Michael A. Lombardi-Nash, trans. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 2000.
- Hooker, Evelyn. "Male Homosexuals and Their 'Worlds.'" *Sexual Inversion*. Judd Marmor, ed. New York: Basic Books, 1965. 83-107.
- _____. "The Homosexual Community." *Sexual Deviance*. John H. Gagnon and William Simon, eds. New York: Harper & Row, 1967. 167-84.
- Kinsey, Alfred C., et al. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- _____. *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Levy, Simon. *Queer Science: The Use and Abuse of Research into Homosexuality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT

Press, 1996.

Lewes, Kenneth. *The Psychoanalytic Theory of Male Homosexuality*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*. New York: Routledge, 1927.

Mead, Margaret. *Coming of Age in Samoa*. New York: Perennial, 1928.

Pick, Daniel. *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c. 1848-c. 1918*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Plant, Richard. *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War against Homosexuals*. New York: Henry Holt, 1986.

Plato. *The Symposium*. Christopher Gill, trans. New York: Penguin, 2003.

Rocke, Michael. *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Roscoe, Will. *The Zuni Man-Woman*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991.

Stocking, George W., Jr. "Lorimer Fison and the Search for Primitive Promiscuity." *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology 1888-1951*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995. 17-33.

Terry, Jennifer. *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine, and the Place of Homosexuality in Modern Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Ulrichs, Karl Heinrich. *The Riddle of "Man-manly" Love: The Pioneering Work on Male Homosexuality*. Michael A. Lombardi-Nash, trans. 2 vols. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1994.

About the Author

Matthew D. Johnson holds a Masters Degree in Anthropology and History from the University of Michigan. He is currently Cataloging Assistant in the Brooklyn Museum library.