

On the Etiology of Homosexuality: Theological Considerations

Steven Tutino

A Thesis
in
The Department
of
Theological Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts
(Theological Studies) at Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

December 2022

© Steven Tutino, 2022

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Steven Tutino

Entitled: "On the Etiology of Homosexuality: Theological Considerations"

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

_____ Chair
Dr. Eric Bellavance

_____ Examiner
Dr. Lucian Turcescu

_____ Examiner
Dr. Marie-France Dion

_____ Thesis Supervisor(s)
Dr. Christine Jamieson

_____ Thesis Supervisor(s)

Approved by _____
Dr. Marie-France Dion Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

Pascale Sicotte Dean of Faculty

Abstract

On the Etiology of Homosexuality: Theological Considerations

Steven Tutino

This thesis provides a historical and holistic overview of the etiology of homosexuality from the nineteenth century with the emergence of the scientific study of sex and the birth of sexual modernism up until the present. Today, the scientific literature leans heavily toward a biological explanation, while still taking into consideration environmental and cultural factors. Furthermore, this thesis offers a multi-variant definition of homosexuality primarily based on Camille Paglia's definition of homosexuality as an adaptation. This thesis also aligns itself with the work of Ritch Savin-Williams who puts forth a fluid, continuum-based model of sexuality as opposed to Michael Bailey's categorical model. Furthermore, I explore how Canadian philosopher and theologian Bernard Lonergan's notions of openness, conversion and authenticity shed light on the continual need for self-questioning and self-knowledge; scientific data suggests that sexual orientation is not immutable and can change, but authenticity in turn requires that the human person be open, attentive and receptive to such current and future possibilities. Lastly, my manuscript's intended purpose is to offer a fair and realistic understanding of homosexuality that involves taking note of the advantages and shortcomings of homosexuality. Crucial questions raised by my research include: What is the etiology of homosexuality? What is the cultural, philosophical and theological significance of homosexuality? What role do critical thinking and self-knowledge play in sexual ethics? Is it sensible to speak of the human person in terms of a binary of 'straight/gay' when much of the scientific literature points to a fluid continuum of sexual desire?

Acknowledgments and Dedication

To my mother and my sister, thank you for being there for me. Family truly is everything.

To my father, who passed away in 2014, I wish I would be acknowledging you under different circumstances, but alas, life doesn't always turn out the way we want it to. I have spent many hours reflecting on our nuanced relationship which has made me the person I am today. The self-knowledge I have gained as a result, has contributed enormously to my conceptualization and understanding of this subject matter as it is presented here.

To my maternal grandmother, Giovanna DiMaria, the strongest feminist I have ever come across. Thank you for your words of wisdom, encouragement and support. You have always motivated and pushed me to pursue my dreams and have given me so much strength and love. Your ethic of hard work, endurance and resiliency continues to be of inspiration to me.

To my fellow graduate students, thank you for being a part of this journey. Being in theology, I've learned that it really is about the journey, and I couldn't be prouder to have had each and every one of you on this amazing ride. Lastly, thank you for accepting me for who I am in all my flaws and insecurities.

To the faculty in Theological Studies, the experience, knowledge and understanding I have gained in the area of theology has been tremendous and extraordinary. Thank you for gracing me with your exceptional knowledge and expertise and thank you for giving me a voice in class. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to progress and develop the potential that is inherent within every human being.

To Sara Terreault, lecturer in the Department of Theological Studies, mentor and friend. It was your Creative Self course that resulted in me adding Theology as a second major to my undergraduate degree. Creative Self was the first Theology course I ever took, and it truly changed my outlook on myself as a creator and on what it means to be human. It was all of the wonderfully rich courses I took with you which led me to pursue a Master of Arts in Theological Studies. Thank you for the countless hours of conversation and e-mail correspondence to which I will be forever gratefully indebted. Thank you for always taking the time to meet with me during office hours, despite your heavy and at-times burdensome workload. Those many courses I took with you make up some of the greatest days of my academic life. I would not be the same person I am today if it were not for your classes and countless hours of constructive and proactive conversation. Thank you for the memories.

Finally, to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Christine Jamieson, thank you for believing in me and in my work. Thank you for accepting to work with me on a subject matter which is deeply personal and close to me. Thank you for your patience in what was, at times, a torturous and difficult process of writer's block, as well as periods of contemplation and introspection which involved the scrutiny of my deepest assumptions. And thank you for the fruitful and deeply rich discussions during the early stages of this thesis, which in turn gave me the courage to even write on such a topic.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| The Role of Self-Knowledge in Sexual Ethics..... | 3 |
| Overview..... | 8 |
| Chapter 1: Homosexuality in the Nineteenth Century | |
| Introduction..... | 11 |
| The Scientific Study of Sexuality..... | 12 |
| Etiological Theories of Homosexuality..... | 13 |
| Sexual Modernism: Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll..... | 16 |
| Sexuality and the Birth of the Modern Individual..... | 19 |
| Conclusion..... | 23 |
| Chapter 2: The Intermediate Sex | |
| Introduction..... | 25 |
| Magnus Hirschfeld..... | 27 |
| Edward Carpenter..... | 29 |
| John Addington Symonds..... | 31 |
| Havelock Ellis..... | 34 |
| Methodology and Bernard Lonergan..... | 36 |
| Conclusion..... | 39 |
| Chapter 3: Homosexuality in the Twentieth Century and Beyond | |
| Introduction..... | 41 |
| Freud and Homosexuality..... | 42 |
| Homosexual Anxiety: Irving Bieber..... | 47 |
| André Guindon and Camille Paglia..... | 51 |
| Homosexuality Today..... | 64 |
| Conclusion..... | 67 |
| Conclusion | 70 |
| Bibliography | 73 |

Introduction

“Sexuality is fully liberated when it speaks our truth integrally.”
André Guindon, *The Sexual Language*

“Genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity.”
Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*

This thesis offers a holistic, multi-variant definition of homosexuality¹ as an adaptation and variation. By holistic, I am referring to how the term spirituality has been defined in modern culture, as “a fully integrated approach to life.”² The premise of this thesis is that sexuality and specifically, homosexuality, carry deep spiritual and theological meaning, and that our sexuality is fundamentally tied to our spirituality, what Ronald Rolheiser defines as what we do with our desire.³ Furthermore, I explore how Canadian philosopher/theologian Bernard Lonergan’s notion of conversion,⁴ authenticity and self-transcendence are applicable to a comprehensive, interdisciplinary study of homosexuality that integrates the fields of biology, psychology, anthropology, sociology, history, theology, spirituality and ethics.⁵ This interdisciplinary,

¹ While much of the scholarly literature on homosexuality, from a theological and spiritual context, deals with issues ranging from church policy on gay marriage to how to reconcile one’s religious faith to one’s sexuality, this thesis departs from those concerns, even though they are important and naturally have their place within scholarly discourse.

Another important preliminary note to make is that this thesis deals exclusively with male homosexuality, insofar as the data of my own experience as a human subject has informed and continues to inform, corroborate and revise my understanding of this broad area of human study. As will be demonstrated, human subjectivity is the basis for the creation of knowledge.

² Philip Sheldrake, *Spirituality: A Brief History*, 2nd ed. (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 3.

³ Ronald Rolheiser, *The Holy Longing: The Search for a Christian Spirituality* (New York, Image, 2014), 7.

⁴ Conversion, as it has typically been understood as shifting from a homosexual orientation to a heterosexual orientation, is to be distinguished from how it is theorized and employed by Bernard Lonergan and the way in which that notion is applied in this thesis. This thesis employs Lonergan’s notion of conversion as an expansion of one’s horizons in the context of acquiring self-knowledge, as well as the subsequent effects this has on human living. In *Method in Theology*, Lonergan defines conversion as intellectual, moral and religious, but for the purposes of this introduction, a basic standard definition will do. Lonergan defines conversion as “existential, intensely personal, utterly intimate ... Conversion, as lived, affects all of a man’s conscious and intentional operations. It directs his gaze, pervades his imagination, releases the symbols that penetrate to the depths of his psyche. It enriches his understanding, guides his judgments, reinforces his decisions.” See Bernard Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, ed. Robert M. Doran and John D. Didosky (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 126. All future references to Lonergan’s *Method in Theology* will be abbreviated as *MT*.

In the context of this thesis, asking relevant questions about the etiology of one’s own homosexuality and/or the etiology of homosexuality more generally can be a pre-requisite for self-knowledge, which can in turn facilitate an expansion of horizons in and through conversion. Conversion is applicable to all human beings and is necessary for progress and development.

⁵ Phillip L. Hammack presents a similar methodological approach in the “new paradigm for research on human sexual orientation,” which he outlines and specifies in his paper “The Life Course

integrative approach aims to correct what Phillip Hammack has correctly diagnosed as problematic within research on sexual orientation, namely, that such research “continues to be intellectually fragmented along disciplinary lines, primarily due to divergent epistemological, methodological, and metatheoretical perspectives.”⁶

My manuscript’s intended purpose is to offer a fair and realistic understanding of homosexuality that is free from the biases of political correctness.⁷ Moreover, this involves taking note of the advantages and shortcomings of homosexuality, while seeking “to reconcile divisions among biological, social science, and humanistic paradigms.”⁸ Crucial questions raised by my research include: What is the etiology of homosexuality? What is the cultural, philosophical and theological significance of homosexuality? What are the advantages and shortcomings of homosexuality? What role do critical thinking and self-knowledge play in

Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm.” To my great enthusiasm, Hammack also seeks to offer an “interdisciplinary, integrative perspective ... which synthesizes diverse intellectual perspectives from fields such as biology, psychology, anthropology, sociology, history, and gender studies.” The main difference between my approach and that of Hammack’s is that the research paradigm I present also integrates data from spirituality, theology and sexual ethics in favour of a broader, fuller vision of the human person and human sexual orientation. See Phillip L. Hammack, “The Life Course Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm,” *Human Development* 48, no. 5 (2005): 267-68, <https://doi.org/10.1159/000086872>.

⁶ Hammack, “The Life Course Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm,” 267.

⁷ As cultural philosopher Camille Paglia points out, one is instantly labelled ‘homophobic’ in today’s politically charged climate for merely asking questions on the etiology of homosexuality. On *The Dennis Prager Show*, Paglia states that “Every single gay person I know has some sort of drama going on, back in childhood. Something was happening that we’re not allowed to ask about anymore ... you are not allowed to ask any questions about the childhood of gay people anymore. It’s called ‘homophobic.’ The entire psychology establishment has shut itself down politically ... and also, Freud was kicked out of early feminism in the late 60’s and early 70’s. So, all the sophistication of analysis that I knew in my college years when I went to The State University of New York – there were a group of radical young Jewish students from the New York area – they were so psychologically sophisticated in being able to analyze the family background. It’s all gone, that entire discourse is gone. Everything is political now.” “Lesbian Feminist Camille Paglia: ‘Sexual Orientation is Fluid and Can Change’,” *Voice of the Voiceless*, accessed March 2, 2021, <https://www.voiceofthevoiceless.info/lesbian-feminist-camille-paglia-sexual-orientation-is-fluid-and-can-change>.

On the other hand, research into the etiology of homosexuality continues to be conducted and findings continue to be written about and published within the sciences. See J. Michael Bailey et al., “Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science,” *Psychological Science in the Public Interest: A Journal of the American Psychological Society* 17, no.2 (2016): 45-101, doi: 10.1177/1529100616637616. Ritch C. Savin-Williams, “Sexual Orientation: Categories or Continuum? Commentary on Bailey et al. (2016),” *Psychological Science in the Public Interest: A Journal of the American Psychological Society* 17, no. 2 (2016): 37-44, doi: 10.1177/1529100616637618. Eleanor Whiteway and Denis R. Alexander, “Understanding the Causes of Same-Sex Attraction,” *Science and Christian Belief* 27, no.1 (2015): 17-40, https://www.scienceandchristianbelief.org/serve_pdf_free.php?filename=SCB+27-1+Whiteway+Alexander.pdf.

⁸ Hammack, “The Life Course Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm,” 267.

sexual ethics? Is it sensical to speak of the human person in terms of a binary of ‘straight/gay’ when much of the scientific literature points to a fluid continuum of sexual desire?

The Role of Self-Knowledge in Sexual Ethics

There is a misconception that asking questions about the etiology of homosexuality is somehow ‘homophobic’, as has been claimed by activists and other well-intended and well-meaning individuals across the political spectrum.⁹ Aside from presenting an integrative and holistic approach to understanding the etiology of homosexuality, this thesis also places a great deal of emphasis on the role of self-knowledge in critical reflection on a topic which has become so heavily politicized. As the cultural philosopher Camille Paglia states:

One might expect gay men, by virtue of their dissident perspective, to have greater psychological insight than straight men, but psychology is long gone from discussion of sex in academe and the media. Everything is ruled by the strangling octopus of politics. No one can ask questions about the etiology of exclusive homosexuality, because to do so is to be instantly labeled homophobic. Hence gay men and lesbians are now blocked from embarking on the road to self-knowledge: “Know thyself” was the maxim (adopted by Socrates) that was inscribed on the Temple of Apollo at Delphi.¹⁰

It can be fair to say that in the current political climate, the unexamined life, over and above a self-reflective life has taken center-stage. In today’s culture, it is deemed homophobic to even ponder the notion of self-examination or what in spiritual terms is known as discernment. With this comes the loss of what it means to think critically but also what it means to thrive and flourish and explore “the deepest self and ultimate purpose of life.”¹¹ One of the goals then, of this thesis, as J. Michael Bailey, Paul L. Vasey and others have put it, is “to criticize and improve common but incorrect reasoning in the domain.”¹² One incorrect reasoning this thesis attempts to de-mystify and correct is that any scientific basis for the etiology of homosexuality is not necessarily a negative thing, nor is it necessarily a good thing; objective science aims to present the data of its findings regardless of the political leanings of scientists and biologists. As R.J.E. Thompson writes, “There are biological realities” to the etiology of homosexuality ... “The constructionists however, do not participate in such challenge, they simply refuse to engage with the evidence or try to discredit it in non-scientific ways. The constructionist agenda is, in fact,

⁹ David M. Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love* (New York: Routledge, 1989): 49-51; “The search for a ‘scientific’ aetiology of sexual orientation is itself a homophobic project ... Just as scientific inquiries into biological and neurological differences between males and females are starting to fall into disrepute, so, too, will the effort to discover a genetic or hormonal basis for sexual preference eventually come to nothing, not so much for lack of scientific progress (which has never stopped research if other motives for it remained) as for lack of social credibility.”

¹⁰ Alex Kazemi, “Uncensored: Camille Paglia on Rihanna, Identity Politics, and Sexuality,” *V Magazine*, March 27, 2017, <https://vmagazine.com/article/uncensored-camille-paglia-rihanna-identity-politics-sexuality/>.

¹¹ Sheldrake, *Spirituality: A Brief History*, 5.

¹² J. Michael Bailey et al., “Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science,” *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 17, no.2 (2016): par. 2, doi: 10.1177/1529100616637616.

not just unscientific but anti-scientific.”¹³ Likewise, much of the consensus on causation factors for homosexuality seems to lean much more heavily toward a biological explanation, particularly amongst left-wing liberal ideologies. The well-meaning argumentative logic here is that by uncovering sufficient evidence for the inviolability of sexual orientation (‘born this way’ and ‘not a choice’), discrimination and hostility towards LGBTQ peoples will therefore cease as well. This thesis makes the case that either/or mentalities tend to be limiting and restrictive; it is typically not a question of either/or, but of both which results in a fuller, more complex and complete picture of human reality: “Scientifically, sexual orientation is an important, fundamental trait that has been understudied because it is politically controversial. This is a mistake. In fact, the more politically controversial a topic, the more it is in the public interest to illuminate it in a revealing and unbiased manner.”¹⁴ Moreover, much of the scientific literature on homosexuality today leans heavily towards a dynamic and multi-variant explanation, whereby a purely biological, or a purely social constructivist stance, no longer hold sway. This thesis in turn, upholds what Hammack refers to as “a moderate stance between essentialism and constructivism,”¹⁵ all the while making the fundamental argument that research into the etiology of homosexuality would not be complete without taking into account the spiritual and theological dimensions of the human person.

The ‘ethics of homosexuality’ outlined in this thesis articulates what it means to be sexually authentic and authentically human as homosexual. While homosexuality is not an equal alternative to heterosexuality, homosexuality and homosexual unions may still produce what André Guindon refers to as “sexual fecundity,” the fruits of love and incarnational tenderness in their own loving and creative ways. As will be elaborated throughout, this will be dependent upon the manner in which both ‘creativity’ and by extension the biblical imperative “Be fruitful and multiply”¹⁶ (‘fruitfulness’) – are interpreted and applied. While this thesis ultimately defends and even praises homosexuality as a kind of ‘rebel love,’ it also stands by and supports one of Guindon’s central claims, being that while “homosexual union is not constructive of man-woman humanity and, *consequently*, does not fructify in this specific order,” (thereby always remaining “within the canon of non-fully mature sexuality”), homosexuals may nevertheless, “express, at their own level, the loving unitive aspects of sexuality and certain dimensions of its fecundity.”¹⁷ The argument in favor of the fluidity of sexual orientation finds theological grounding in the fact that the union and complementary difference of man and woman runs at the core of humanity: “This unlikeness, this dissimilarity, this divergence runs through humanity itself and calls each person to a dialogue he cannot refuse with impunity.”¹⁸ The fundamental tragedy of homosexuality, according to Guindon, is that it fails to assume the loving, complimentary difference of the other: “only in such union do male and female assume all the forms of their

¹³ R.J.E. Thompson, “Greek taistia and tibV,” in *Ratio et res ipsa: Classical essays presented by former pupils to James Diggle on his retirement*, ed. Paul Millett, S.P. Oakley and R.J.E. Thompson (Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 84-5.

¹⁴ J. Michael Bailey et al., “Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science,” par. 8.

¹⁵ Hammack, “The Life Course Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm,” 268.

¹⁶ Gen 1: 22-23.

¹⁷ Andre Guindon, “Homosexuality,” in *The Sexual Language: An Essay in Moral Theology* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977), 368.

¹⁸ Guindon, 337.

humanity and thus become integrally themselves. Neither femininity nor masculinity are self-sufficient realities.”¹⁹ As will be demonstrated with Paglia however, it is precisely this “self-sufficient reality” (masculinity) which male homosexuality ultimately exalts, reveres, and idolizes as an eternal value in itself. Both Guindon and Paglia supplement one another, even though both take different methodological approaches. Paglia defends and celebrates homosexuality precisely because, as a form of *dissident* sexuality, it is a challenge to the norm of heterosexuality. For Paglia, dissidence, as a symbol of freedom, is necessary within a culture and is the basis from which great strides are made in civilization and the arts. Male homosexuality is the attempt at making a complete break with the feminine, what Guindon clearly states as the “fundamental tragedy” of homosexuality. The main question for sexual ethics then becomes how to reconcile this “fundamental tragedy” of homosexuality with how to be fully integral and fully human as homosexual: “One day, though, he will need to assume his sexuality and live it out.”²⁰ While I ultimately defend homosexuality from the perspective of Paglia’s libertarian feminist philosophy, for the sake of ethical scholarship, critical thinking and ethical deliberation require that we consider different sides of any argument on any given object of study, both positive and negative, and be willing to be intellectually convinced one way over the other regardless of any personal stance and views we may hold.

The importance of self-knowing in the spiritual journey entails being attentive to our experiences in a critically reflective manner.²¹ As David B. Perrin writes, “the goal is to *strive* to overcome the tendency to be strangers to ourselves ... self-knowledge helps people take a certain responsibility for their lives and the lives of others by consciously guiding personal actions and decision-making now and for the future.”²² Liberating ourselves sexually involves a continual process of arriving at fuller knowledge and awareness of ourselves in both our strengths and our flaws, in our biases, prejudices, misunderstandings and so forth. Only then can we truly, judiciously yet wholeheartedly, accept ourselves for who we are. It involves being at times painfully honest about our homosexuality, in terms of which areas in our sexual lives we may be deficient or lacking, such as relationality and openness to the “other,” being in this case, the opposite sex. So, while I support and even celebrate homosexuality, this thesis also makes a case for the essential role of self-knowledge in sexual ethics and human understanding, specifically, research into and study on the etiology of homosexuality as necessary for further understanding ourselves as human beings. In *Ethics and Self-Knowledge*, Peter Lucas writes that,

For Nietzsche, a drive to self-knowledge is a distinctively human characteristic. Honesty remains a cardinal virtue (perhaps the cardinal virtue) for Nietzsche ... A life that does not revolve around an uncompromising thirst for self-knowledge is, in his view, barely recognizable as a human life at all. At the same time however, Nietzsche recognizes that the distinctively human quest for self-knowledge is a never-ending one, since humanity itself is, properly understood, a continual project of self-overcoming. At the same time as

¹⁹ Guindon, 338.

²⁰ Guindon, 366.

²¹ David M. Perrin, *Studying Christian Spirituality* (New York: Routledge, 2007): 131.

²² Perrin, 131.

being driven to know ourselves we are (or should be) in the process of re-inventing what it means to be human.²³

Therefore, the study on the etiology of homosexuality is framed within a larger discussion around the necessity of self-knowledge in, though, of course, not limited to, sexual ethics. This involves, as will be elaborated on, tracing back one's developmental steps and examining one's own family dynamic as a way of continually expanding one's horizon of past and in turn, present and future. By applying insights from both Paglia and Lonergan to the framing of 'gay identity' in philosophical and theological terms, we come to see that tracing one's developmental steps gives one perspective, an expanded view of oneself through a continuous line of history; it offers clarity and insight into the persons we have become today and makes us aware that we are the products of a particular time and place in history, the products of specific family dynamics and historical forces of progress and decline. Illuminating the past helps shed light on the present; it situates the questioner within a specific historical context and can further lead to greater self-affirmation, self-acceptance and peacefulness. Presenting evidence in support of a "continuum-based perspective regarding the nature of sexual orientation,"²⁴ for males further supports an understanding of the human person that transcends the limitations and constraints of sexual categories and furthermore, identity politics.

Asking questions about ourselves and who we are suggests that we are not static and fixed, but rather dynamic and on the move, insofar as we seek answers to questions about ourselves and our world. This process, for Bernard Lonergan, is a product of the unrestricted desire to know: "the dynamic structure of human knowing intends being. That intention is unrestricted, for there is nothing that we cannot at least question."²⁵ Seen from this perspective, asking questions on the etiology of homosexuality is far from 'homophobic,' but is rather a product of our desire to know ourselves and further expand our horizons. Situating herself within the context of Lonergan's shift from faculty psychology to intentionality analysis in his appropriation of Husserlian phenomenology, Michele Saracino stresses the "protean subjectivity" of Lonergan's existential subject, "with its emphasis on the open, changing, evolving, and developing orientation of the human person."²⁶ She goes on to state that if we "intend a question, we both grapple with the question and are opened up by it ... Protean and malleable, the human being is not some *x* or essence, but rather a dynamic and developing subject."²⁷ The possibility of human knowing, as Lonergan writes, lies in an "unrestricted intention that intends the transcendent, and a process of self-transcendence that reaches it," which further constitutes the "intrinsic objectivity of human cognitional activity."²⁸ This is a

²³ Peter Lucas, "Self-Knowledge and Power," in *Ethics and Self-Knowledge: Respect for Self-Interpreting Agent* (Preston: Springer, 2011), 171.

²⁴ Savin-Williams, "Sexual Orientation: Categories or Continuum? Commentary on Bailey et al. (2016)," par. 1

²⁵ Bernard Lonergan, "Cognitional Structure," in *Collection: The Collected Works of Lonergan* vol. 3, ed. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (New York: Herder and Herder, 1988), 210.

²⁶ Michele Saracino, "Introduction," in *On Being Human: A Conversation with Lonergan and Levinas* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2003), 22.

²⁷ Saracino, "The Open Posture of Lonergan's Subject," in *On Being Human: A Conversation with Lonergan and Levinas* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2003), 63-64.

²⁸ Lonergan, "Cognitional Structure," 210.

basic universal pattern for Lonergan, who initiated a paradigm shift in theology by making the human person the basis and framework for ethical deliberation.

All forms of human achievement, even the most seemingly objective, such as the sciences, begin from the basic human desire to know, what Lonergan calls “the *eros* of the human spirit”²⁹ The curiosity and wonder Lonergan describes in turn led me on a quest for self-knowledge and self-understanding as homosexual in terms of whether I have been limiting my options and possibilities for self-actualization by boxing myself into a somehow indisputable “gay” identity. I recall a friend who once told me that while he found a particular woman to be attractive, he could never pursue the possibility of a relationship with her because he self-identified as “gay” and that would therefore run counter to his own self-conception. There is a certain sense, therefore, in which homosexuals tend to “choose precisely their homosexuality as the parameter of their identity”³⁰ in a manner which reflects the idolatrous attitude, and “which acts not as a new light but as a blinder, keeping one from growing, from acquiring new awareness, from facing human realities. It makes one close his eyes to reality instead of discerning the real issues.”³¹ Rather than being preoccupied with one’s identity, self-knowledge makes us look outside of ourselves toward questions of meaning and value, which in turn strengthens our relationship not only with ourselves but with others as well.³² As Perrin writes, “greater self-knowledge more easily opens people up to the potential of transformation and conversion in life ... the capacity for transcendence is a fundamental quality of the self and a unique characteristic of human beings – it grounds knowledge and freedom.”³³ Subjectivity is key toward real knowledge production and transcendence, insofar as it fosters the critical thinking necessary for arriving at true judgments of value. The study of any particular object can lead to a transformation in the subject insofar as they come to better understand themselves as subjects. The research and writing process required that I look deeper into myself, questioning my own deepest assumptions about sexuality and identity, and while it necessitated that I confront numerous biases and misunderstandings, it nevertheless fostered within me a capacity

²⁹ Lonergan, *MT* 389. By “*eros* of the human spirit,” Lonergan is referring to “what we have called the transcendental notions and precepts, on the openness they imply to ever wider information, ever fuller understanding, an ever better grasp of the truth, an ever firmer commitment to values and to the elimination of bias in all its forms.” As will be further elaborated upon, the transcendental precepts Lonergan refers to involve being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable and being responsible. These are essential to acquiring self-knowledge and further expanding our understanding of ourselves as human beings. The desire to obtain a clearer understanding of ourselves as sexual beings does not imply that our behaviours are somehow ‘sinful’ or ‘immoral,’ it simply means that we also obtain the clarity necessary to look beyond our own preoccupations and obsessions with ourselves and our own identities.

Our capacity for self-transcendence and the fulfilment of our human capacities stems directly from our faithfulness to these basic human precepts, all of which stem directly from the *eros* native to the human spirit. The *eros* of the human spirit is essentially the starting point of the spiritual life, the life of discernment, of acquiring self-knowledge, as Rolheiser points out in his analysis of John of the Cross’ *Dark Night of the Soul*, and in particular, the following line from the poem: “One dark night, fired by love’s urgent longings.” Rolheiser, *The Holy Longing*, 7.

³⁰ Guindon, “Homosexuality,” 339.

³¹ Guindon, 340-41.

³² Perrin, *Studying Christian Spirituality*, 132.

³³ Perrin, 131, 133.

to look deeply at myself and the world beyond the narrow lens of categories we at times impose on ourselves as a way of obtaining a false sense of security and fixed truth.³⁴

Overview

Part 1 contains an overview of the scientific literature on the etiology of homosexuality starting in the nineteenth century³⁵ with the emergence of the birth of sexual modernism and the modern individual. This chapter surveys the various competing schools of thought that aimed to provide a medical and scientific explanation for the etiology of homosexuality, most notably whether homosexuality was caused by environment or by internal physiological processes and disturbances. Sexual modernism did not develop in a vacuum however; it was a gradual process that took place as a result of a shift in attitudes towards the individual that emerged out of the Enlightenment and the challenges to social and religious authorities that ensued as a result. One of the main points made in this chapter is the shift from a religious framework for understanding sexual deviance, to a secularized, scientific view which locates the source of such deviance within the physical constitution of the body. Key figures such as Richard Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll are credited as pioneers of sexual modernism in that they denounced the traditional moral condemnation of deviance as sin and crime; the inclusion of numerous case histories and first-hand autobiographical accounts in their respective texts points to a paradigm shift for how the late nineteenth century in particular began to think differently about sexuality and sexual deviance.

Chapter 2 examines the contributions of four key figures who were at the forefront of scientific research on homosexuality at the fin-de-siècle and into the turn of the twentieth century: Magnus Hirschfeld, Havelock Ellis, Edward Carpenter and John Addington Symonds. These pioneering figures challenged the medicalization of homosexuality as illness, pathology or disorder while exalting what they perceived to be the unique gifts, special virtues and spirituality of homosexuals. There is a recurrent emphasis throughout the chapter on the innateness of homosexuality as an intrinsic and natural part of the human person. Whether it be through Hirschfeld's notion of "sexual intermediacy" or Ellis' theory of "congenital inversion," the argument from nature meant that homosexuality was just as normal as heterosexuality, that the individual could not help being the way he was and that homosexuals were born to their particular sexual orientation. Indeed, there is a quest on the part of Hirschfeld, Ellis, Carpenter and others to *normalize* homosexuality by essentializing its rootedness in the very fabric of who

³⁴ Knowledge about one's homosexual orientation can reveal meaningful aspects about one's life, such as a possible fraternal significance behind one's relations with other men, what it is about men which draws one toward them, as well as questions surrounding one's inability for openness and relationality to those of the opposite sex and whether there is a mixture of both freedom and determinism involved.

³⁵ I acknowledge that the nineteenth century as a starting point can be limiting and restrictive since there is a wide scope of history to uncover and unpack before this. However, given the scope of this thesis, a departure point from the nineteenth century is sound enough when considering that it is only starting in the nineteenth century that we get the classifications of sexual categories and a scientific boom into the study of homosexuality as a uniquely distinct category of human experience. The scientific method of classifying areas of human experience meant that particular areas of human sexuality were more scrutinized and analyzed by the burgeoning psychiatric communities at that time.

the person was. Of significant import in this chapter however, is the notion of the “intermediate sex,” or “third sex” by Carpenter, which draws heavily on the notion of the “Urning” propounded by the nineteenth century writer and sexologist Karl Heinrich Ulrichs to describe a female soul in a male body. The “intermediate sex” is by extension, predicated precisely on the creation of a separate category beyond male/female; writers like Symonds and Carpenter were interested in creating a metaphorical and literal space for difference and the homosexual was therefore seen as a kind of forger of modern identity who encapsulated the promises and hopes, as well as fears and anxieties around the turn of the century.

Chapter 3 contains a survey of some of the major etiological theories of homosexuality that emerged throughout the twentieth century up until the present. We begin this chapter by way of an encounter with Freud’s pioneering work into the fields of sexology and psychology. Freud initiated a paradigm shift in the study of psychology and homosexuality in particular through his theories of the unconscious and the Oedipus complex, as well as his claim that all human beings are inherently born bisexual and therefore capable of homosexual experience. Up until that point, the wide array of etiological theories had been quite limited and restrictive, philosophically abstract and too speculative as well as purely hypothetical at times, as seen with the arguments from nature put forth by Hirschfeld and Symonds, or theories of hermaphroditism and the intermediate sex by Ulrichs and Carpenter. With Freud we now get a much more sophisticated and empirically-based methodology for explaining the causes of homosexuality from the point of view of analysis of childhood and the developmental steps that occur throughout childhood into puberty and adolescence. Homosexuality, according to Freud, was the result of biology working in relation to culture and environment, particularly the family environment and the child’s relation and conflict resolutions with both parents. The chapter also covers how Freud’s theories were ultimately distorted and misappropriated in the service of political ends, developments in behavioral therapies and sociological theories that occurred after the Second World War as well as the resurgence of research into more biologically-driven etiological theories throughout the Seventies and Eighties. These developments, conflicts and resolutions finally culminate in the main ideas of two seminal thinkers on homosexuality that emerge in the latter half of the century: Andre Guindon and Camille Paglia. While Paglia defends homosexuality as a dissident form of sexuality, which is how, she argues, it must be looked at, she ultimately expresses a similar line of agreement with what Guindon argues is the tragedy of homosexuality: the inability to assume the loving complimentary difference of the other and that neither masculinity nor femininity are self-sufficient realities. There is a dignity and sacredness to male-female humanity that homosexuality will always be lacking in. Paglia questions the long-term ramifications of such self-sufficient realities on both men and women, and instead calls for universal bisexuality as a way of expanding our horizons, while also recognizing that bisexuality is more difficult for men than it is for women. She also calls on men and women to continue loving the same sex, while at the same time resolving their ambiguities with the opposite sex. This requires the “real human confrontation of each other’s differences, an experience of mutual learning and growing over and above ‘dissolution’ of the very problem in a dissoluteness which drowns all human differences.”³⁶ The implications of both Guindon and Paglia’s writings fall back on the complimentary difference of man-woman humanity, and that, more distinctively in Paglia, homosexuality is *necessary* precisely as a challenge to said norm. A conversation between Paglia

³⁶ Guindon, “Homosexuality,” 349.

and Guindon is further enriched by the thought of Bernard Lonergan and his theological epistemology and anthropology, as well as his writings on method particularly for the purposes of organizing the data presented throughout this study and for illuminating the role of self-knowledge in how we relate to ourselves and our world. Having established the scientific, socio-cultural and environmental data from a wide array of medical and scholarly data, this thesis aims at an interpretation of the data through a theological and spiritual lens, making the claim that a fuller vision of the human being is only possible by integrating data from science and the Humanities.

The final portion of the chapter certainly provides an overview of some of the most pertinent scientific literature on the etiology of homosexuality today, while making the broader claim that in order to understand homosexuality more fully, we need to expand our horizons and look at data from other disciplines such as ethics and theology and philosophy and the arts, all of which points to a revised methodological framework. A much more dynamic and comprehensive understanding of homosexuality arises from an integration of the aesthetic, spiritual and theological dimensions of human living. A holistic understanding of homosexuality however, asks deeper questions about the human person and the search for meaning and value in life. Guindon addresses this problem in the following terms:

But precisely the human problem of homosexuality is not one which may be dealt with adequately with tested empirical evidence because to be a man and a woman and both man and woman together is not a reality which can be totally disclosed by use of empirical methods. We are dealing here with ultimate values that imply other approaches to reality, those with which sociologists and psychologists are precisely not equipped. We must enter into the realm of the theological, the philosophical, the poetic, and the ethical.³⁷

The role of discernment and self-knowledge in sexual ethics play a central role in the human person's progress and development brought on by an expansion of horizons, in turn facilitating a life of fulfillment and radical self-acceptance.

³⁷ Guindon, "Homosexuality," 335.

Chapter 1: Homosexuality in the Nineteenth Century

Introduction

The background literature on homosexuality is immense. Given the scope and space of this thesis, I will be limiting myself to an overall general picture of the more popular and well-received theories accounting for the existence and reality of male homosexuality in the nineteenth century. This is due to the fact that “*the scientific study of sex began just after the middle of the nineteenth century, as an anti-Victorian movement began in the European upper classes.*”³⁸ To take note of is the shift from a religious worldview in which homosexuality was shrouded in the language of “sin,” resulting from “a violation of God’s intention for humankind,”³⁹ to a scientific, secularized view that attempted to “probe beneath the surface of a highly organized, repressive society to find the impulsive, primitive bedrock of life ... it was time for investigation, reform and a new idealism.”⁴⁰ The notion of “homosexual” as a distinctly unique category⁴¹ and marker of identity is therefore strictly a modern one that emerged out of the Enlightenment and Industrial Age. This chapter in particular traces the development of that scientific study of the etiology of homosexuality in the nineteenth century as essential to how sexuality is understood today.

³⁸ Arno Karlen, “The Scientific Overture,” in *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1971), 181-198.

³⁹ Richard B. Hays, “Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell’s Exegesis of Romans 1,” *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 14, no. 1 (1986): 184, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40015030>.

⁴⁰ Karlen, 181.

⁴¹ In 1869, the Hungarian doctor Karl-Maria Benkert coined the terms heterosexual from the Greek *héteros*, and homosexual from the Greek *homos*, meaning same. In covering nineteenth century etiological theories accounting for the existence of same-sex desire before the term ‘homosexual’ was coined, this paper employs the term ‘homosexual’ retrospectively while acknowledging that the term and the meanings we’ve come to attach to the term would not have been recognized. Thus, the term ‘homosexual,’ as it is freely employed and applied retrospectively throughout this paper, also stands in for terms such as ‘sexual invert’ and ‘urning,’ which would have been employed at the time to refer to homosexuality.

According to the theory of sexual inversion, homosexuality was a pathology which resulted from abnormal embryonic development, or in simpler terms, changes to the individual’s brain while still in the womb. There was therefore a medical/scientific basis for understanding homosexuality as inborn rather than acquired empirically (through experience), although theories of the latter also abounded. A ‘sexual invert’ was a term used to describe someone who demonstrated gender non-conforming behaviour, particularly behaviour conforming to the opposite sex. As Jacqueline Holler writes, “this idea that homosexuality was an inborn deviation from normal gender development was widely embraced.” For a more comprehensive overview and brief history the ways in which sexuality was pathologized to such an extent especially throughout the nineteenth century, see Jacqueline Holler, *Pathologizing Sexuality and Gender: A Brief History*,” *Visions Journal*, 6, no. 2 (2009): 7-9, <https://www.heretohelp.bc.ca/pathologizing-sexuality-and-gender>.

The Scientific Study of Sexuality

Developments in psychiatry and sexology in the nineteenth century are crucial to an understanding of the ways in which notions of sexuality and homosexuality as a uniquely distinct marker of identity were constructed. In “The Scientific Overture,” Arno Karlen offers a broad overview of the scientific and psychological study of sex and sexuality which largely took place in the middle of the nineteenth century. As Karlen points out, eighteenth-century studies of sex were limited in that they were primarily based on theories of “physical constitution.”⁴² Mental and physiological disorders such as homosexuality were no longer caused by witchcraft or humors, but rather “from injury or disease of the central nervous system.”⁴³ Such disorders and perversions were the result of biological and hereditary failure, “circulatory changes in the brain,” as well as “neuropathy”⁴⁴ – weakness of the nervous system caused by excesses in vice such as masturbation for instance. Furthermore, in 1835, the English psychologist Pritchard classified homosexuality as a form of “moral insanity” and “morbid perversion,”⁴⁵ an irresistible impulse categorized alongside murder, rape and arson. Thus, there really was no understanding of homosexuality within the larger context of the human person’s personality and family background because the tools and concepts to do so had not yet been discovered and formulated; therefore, the tools we now take for granted were just not available at the time. Some of the limitations in understanding had to do with the biases of the religious and socio-political structures that informed the research being conducted and the theories being published. As Karen writes, “until Freud’s work became widely known, very few people sought the causes of sexual problems in the emotional and social environments. The concept of personality, as we use it, did not exist yet.”⁴⁶ In short, the psychological notions of instinct, adaptation, variation, association and the unconscious were either unknown or just starting to be developed.⁴⁷

No overview of the scientific study of sexuality during the nineteenth century can be complete without a brief consideration of the larger forces which gradually gave way to a shift in how the world and human beings came to be viewed. In particular, the religious framework for understanding homosexuality and other types of sinful behavior was slowly replaced by emerging medical-scientific discourses⁴⁸ which tended to place emphasis on the mind and body as sources of illness, corruption and degeneracy. The source of such moral, physical and mental disease was no longer attributed to “original sin”⁴⁹ but rather to the actual physical constitution

⁴² Karlen, 181.

⁴³ Karlen, 184

⁴⁴ Karlen, 184.

⁴⁵ Karlen, 185.

⁴⁶ Karlen, 185.

⁴⁷ Karlen, 181.

⁴⁸ “In the 18th and 19th centuries an overtly theological framework no longer dominated the discourse about same-sex attraction. Instead, secular arguments and interpretations became increasingly common. Probably the most important secular domain for discussions of homosexuality was in medicine, including psychology.” See Brent Pickett, “Homosexuality,” in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Stanford, Spring 2021, Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality/.

⁴⁹ Interestingly enough, as Gabriel Daly maintains, ‘original sin’ refers to a “mixture of genetics and pathology – Adam’s sin ‘contracted by generation.’” See Gabriel Daly, “Theology 18: The Problem of Original Sin,” *The Furrow* 24, no. 1 (1973): 21, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27679676>. This “mixture of

of the body. The fallen corruption of humanity (including the physical body) and proclivity to sin that were attributed to the “original sin” of Adam and Eve, took new shape and form in the ways in which the body, as a source of injury, disease and hereditary/biological failure,⁵⁰ could now be used to explain the proclivity toward homosexual acts. Furthermore, nineteenth-century post-Enlightenment Europe was disillusioned with answers and solutions provided by religion, and therefore turned to the rapidly growing discoveries of science. Indeed, as Karlen writes, “Science had replaced religion as a justification of traditional mores.”⁵¹ This shift from a religious to a scientific framework for a discussion of the body as a source for understanding the cause of homosexuality speaks to anxieties surrounding the unruliness of the body at the time. Perversions of all kinds such as homosexuality could now be explained via internal disorders of the body. The weakening of religious power throughout Europe may have implied that human beings could more freely follow their own individual desires and volitions, a risk the new and emergent medical and scientific establishments caught on to and attempted to contain. The new and emergent disciplines of psychiatry and sexology were now suddenly the new purveyors of the body.

Etiological Theories of Homosexuality

A wide variety of theories on the etiology of homosexuality began to appear in conjunction with the advent of psychiatry as a rapidly growing discipline and field of scientific inquiry. Two distinct camps began to emerge as a result: on the one hand, those who fell in line with Darwin’s biological, hereditary model of evolution and disease and those who made the case for homosexuality as an acquired taste, or the result of excess masturbation for example. Either way, the consensus was that the homosexual or “sodomite,” was criminal and insane, physically, morally and psychologically bankrupt. Some of the early eighteenth and nineteenth century theories covered fall into the following schools: in-born constitutional, Environmental, Adaptational and Behaviorist. While some of the theories fall neatly into one or another school of thought, there is often much fluidity and interconnection among these various schools. One famous example is Richard Krafft-Ebing’s decision to deter from his “degeneracy” argument and side with the victorious oddity wing that emerged during the late nineteenth century.⁵²

The two most quoted writers on the subject of homosexuality just after the mid-nineteenth century were the leading medical-legal experts of Germany and France, the doctors Johann Ludwig Casper and August Ambroise Tardieu. Casper in particular put forth the

genetics and pathology” Daly refers to would then be carried over into dominant nineteenth century scientific theories accounting for the etiology of homosexuality, subtracting, of course, any religious references to Adam or God and so forth. The medico-scientific argument accounting for the reality of ‘original sin’ or the sinfulness of humanity came under more scrutiny as nineteenth century scientific theories were developing, especially in light of Darwin’s evolutionary theory which was heavily appropriated by criminologists and criminal anthropologists who attempted to establish a causal link between homosexuality and criminality. But in the context of ‘original sin,’ the etiology of homosexuality was explained in terms of the evil inclination to sin – in this case, to engage in same-sex sexual activity. Homosexuality then, was no doubt seen as one of the by-products of Adam’s sin and the fallenness of humanity.

⁵⁰ Karlen, 184.

⁵¹ Karlen, 184.

⁵² Karlen, 195.

distinction between “innate” and “acquired” homosexuality.⁵³ According to Casper, the vast majority of homosexuality is *congenital*, that is, biologically constituted and innate, while a smaller portion is *acquired* through “oversatiety with natural pleasures.”⁵⁴ In 1857, Tardieu portrayed homosexuals as “degraded monsters, not only morally but physically different from other men.”⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ Indeed, it was common at the time to identify homosexuals and other deviants through the classification of different physical traits, such as, in the case of sodomy, “papillary growths of the anus,” “syphilitic chancres,” and “obliteration of the radial folds around the anus.”⁵⁷ The difference though, between Casper and Tardieu, is that while Tardieu’s views were typical of his times, Casper “took an innovative view of homosexuality,” by being “one of the first scientists to stress that some homosexuals felt true love for each other”⁵⁸ just as equally as their heterosexual counterparts.⁵⁹

The first major work exclusively about homosexuality was written by a lawyer and writer by the name of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs. Ulrichs claimed that during an early stage of fetal development, the genital tissue of the human embryo is neither male nor female. In the case of the male homosexual, the genitals become male, “but the same differentiation failed to take place in the part of the brain that determines sex drive. The result is ... a female soul in a male body.”⁶⁰ There is a disjoint or incongruity in the homosexual between his given sex (that of a man) and his erotic desires (those of a woman).⁶¹ Ivory states that “this split between external features and internal emotions is the very foundation of Ulrichs’ etiology.”⁶² For Ulrichs then, because same-sex desire is a natural phenomenon which has always existed, the homosexual “is neither criminal nor insane. He is the product of abnormal embryonic development.”⁶³ This latter argument in particular is a break with the tradition of associating inversion with criminality throughout the nineteenth century. Thus, Ulrichs presents a case for innate homosexuality, for the homosexual being ‘born this way.’ The Swiss apologist for homosexuality, Heinrich Hösli, also made the case for a female soul in a male body in his 1836 study *Eros*, noting what Ivory refers to as the “invert’s inconsistency” whereby the invert’s “inner self (feelings, desires, drives) is not in harmony with his outer self (his biological sex). This last quality relies on the supposition that male inverts display feminine traits – that they are not wholly masculine, but

⁵³ Karlen, 185.

⁵⁴ Karlen, 186.

⁵⁵ Karlen, 186.

⁵⁶ Ambroise Tardieu, *Etude Medico-légale sur les Attentats aux Moeurs* (Paris: J.B Bailliere, 1857).

⁵⁷ Karlen, 186.

⁵⁸ Karlen 186.

⁵⁹ Yvonne Ivory, however, paints a more nuanced picture of Casper’s views on homosexuality, in which he noted that “for Casper, the invert is always a criminal and always deserving of punishment ... he [Casper] should be seen as an important actor at the junction of legal and medical discourses who, in taking on the task of representing each of these discourses to the other, concretizes and perpetuates the notion of juridical criminality.” See Yvonne Ivory, “The Urning and His Own: Individualism and the Fin-de-Siècle Invert,” *German Studies Review* 26, no. 2 (2003): 335, <https://doi-org.lib-ezproxy.concordia.ca/10.2307/1433329>.

⁶⁰ Karlen, 186.

⁶¹ Ivory, “The Urning and His Own: Individualism and the Fin-de-Siècle Invert,” 342.

⁶² Ivory, 343.

⁶³ Karlen, 186.

rather exhibit signs of compromised masculinity in manner, dress, or habits.”⁶⁴ Hösli’s model of sexuality is therefore based on an incongruity between an external/physical and internal/mental continuum, much more hybrid and sophisticated than the prevailing theories of degeneration/hereditary failure at the time. But perhaps the most daring and bold argument throughout his work is that “(external) sex organs do not necessarily predict what an individual’s (internal) sexual desires will be.”⁶⁵ This moves Hösli’s argument beyond the realm of the physical and the biological, noting that human beings are far more complex and cannot simply be reduced to their biology. Moreover, in arguing that “there are internal processes that also determine the sex life of the individual” such as “mental and spiritual factors,”⁶⁶ Hösli not only foreshadowed Freud and psychoanalysis, but also offered an alternative to the theories of physical constitution which were prevalent at the time and which resulted in an inordinate amount of prejudice and stigmatization against homosexuals. The notable difference however, between Hösli and Ulrichs, is that while Hösli’s “man-loving man” shows no external signs of femaleness/effeminacy other than playing the passive partner in sodomy,⁶⁷ Ulrichs’ ‘Urning’ is a kind of ‘half-man’ whose inner female sexual desires manifest themselves externally in the form of appearance, mannerisms and tastes. Either way, the discrepancy between his appearance and feelings makes the homosexual a kind of alien being, never fully at home or at peace within himself.

Homosexuality, at this time, came to be seen as a type of deviant sexuality, what the distinguished professor of psychiatry, Dr. Carl Westphal termed, “contrary sexual feeling,” a kind of “moral insanity due to congenital reversal of sexual feeling.”⁶⁸ The view of homosexuality as deviant sexual behavior and contrary to the fundamental hierarchy of man-woman humanity had already taken center stage at this point. The French doctors Jean-Martin Charcot and Valentine Magnan however, also hinted at brain differences between the sexes as a causal factor in the development of homosexuality in a paper entitled “Inversion of the Genital Sense.” They argued that “constitutional nervous weakness due to hereditary degeneration”⁶⁹ was the primary cause of psychosexual problems such as homosexuality. A stream of arguments for hereditary inferiority (victims of degenerated genes) would continue to emerge during this time from the likes of the psychiatrist Dr. Paul Moreau and the Swiss scientist August Forel.⁷⁰ The famous Russian sexologist Benjamin Tarnowski⁷¹ crystallized the distinction between acquired and innate homosexuals when he decided that innate homosexuality came from damage

⁶⁴ Ivory, “The Urning and His Own: Individualism and the Fin-de-Siècle Invert,” 334.

⁶⁵ Ivory, 342.

⁶⁶ Ivory, 342.

⁶⁷ Because Hösli viewed homosexuality as “a celebration of maleness,” his denial that love of men had anything to do with femaleness may have had to do with the fact that he felt all previous etiological models presented a picture of the homosexual whose masculinity had been compromised. He therefore wanted to protect the notion of the homosexual as not being any less of a man than his heterosexual counterpart. Hösli, here again, was ahead of his time in that he believed, to a certain extent, that being a homosexual did not somehow imply a compromised masculinity or the ‘Quasi-Mann’ of Ulrichs. If anything, Hösli’s man-loving man embodies the ideals of masculinity, namely, beauty, creativity and love; and far from displaying “a deviant sexual morphology,” he is in fact the “ideal man, physically.” See Ivory, 343.

⁶⁸ Karlen, 187.

⁶⁹ Karlen, 188.

⁷⁰ August Forel, *The Sexual Question*, trans. C.F. Marshall (New York: Rebman, 1908).

⁷¹ Benjamin Tarnowski, *Pederasty in Europe* (California: Brandon House, 1967).

to their parent's genes resulting from hysteria, epilepsy, alcoholism, soil, climate and altitude. Acquired homosexuality was more of a lifestyle choice according to Tarnowski, resulting from vice and sexual excess, among others such as the reading of 'dirty' books and luxurious living. Always a constant factor however, was Casper's distinction of homosexuality either as *congenital* or as an *acquired* taste, dating back to 1852 and 1863. Two Chicago psychiatrists, Kiernan and Lydston, argued that it could be that the homosexual lies between the male and female brain, again echoing back to the argument put forward by Ulrichs about male-female differentiation that takes place *in utero*. The equation of this in France would be the theory of "psychic hermaphroditism" put forth by Julien Chevalier.⁷² The term "psychic hermaphroditism" refers to the practice of bisexuality, to those "who had differentiated normally in their bodies but remained bisexual in their nervous systems."⁷³ Moreover, the bisexuality of the human embryo was commonplace among the thinking of theoreticians during this time, and was often seen as a counter-argument for hereditary inferiority due to degenerated genes. This was particularly notable in Italian circles for instance, where Cesare Lambroso's criminal anthropology⁷⁴ gained notoriety for its emphasis placed on research into the study of skulls, blood chemistry and sex organs of all types of deviants and moral degenerates. Sexuality, and in particular, deviant sexuality was intrinsically linked to criminality: "whereas psychiatrists had first believed that mental and nervous disorders were the *result* of 'unnatural' behaviors, psychiatrists now took a different view, suggesting that such disturbances were actually the *cause* of sexual deviance."⁷⁵ In other words, for Lambroso and others, the homosexual was a sexual invert who failed to evolve socially into a fully civilized human being.

Sexual Modernism: Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll

The late nineteenth century is noted for a scientific boom in the study of sexuality. As Karlen writes, "Deviation was no longer a subject for gossip and anecdote ... It was a ghastly, haunting deformity for science to study."⁷⁶ Karlen singles out Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis – A Medico-Forensic Study* as the pinnacle of nineteenth century studies of sexology and sexual deviations.⁷⁷ What stands out in Karlen's summary of *Psychopathia Sexualis* is the process of "mental feminization in men and masculinization in women as a result

⁷² Julien Chevalier, *Une Maladie de la Personnalité: L'Inversion Sexuelle* (Paris: G. Nason, 1893).

⁷³ Karlen, 192.

⁷⁴ As Ivory notes, "Cesare Lambroso characterizes sexual inversion as a crime with its roots in heredity." Medical and sexological accounts often linked inversion (homosexuality) with criminality; the invert, it was thought, had a natural inclination towards criminality. Furthermore, inversion was also seen as a symptom of degeneration. See Ivory, "The Urning and His Own: Individualism and the Fin-de-Siècle Invert," 337. For the primary source, see Cesare Lambroso, *Criminal Man*, trans. Mary Gibson and Nicole Hahn Rafter (North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2006).

⁷⁵ Harry Oosterhuis. "Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll." *Medical History* 56. 2: 133-155. 2012.

⁷⁶ Karlen, "The Scientific Overture," 193.

⁷⁷ For a comprehensive study of Krafft-Ebing's legacy, see Hubert Kennedy, "Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: First Theorist of Homosexuality," in *Science and Homosexuality* ed. Vernon Rosario (New York: Routledge, 1997): 26-45, as well as Harry Oosterhuis, *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

of a lack of proper differentiation at the time of fetal bisexuality.”⁷⁸ A prominent psychiatrist in Central Europe, as well as a leading forensic and humanitarian expert, Krafft-Ebing was also a professor at the universities of Graz (1872-89) and Vienna (1889-1902).⁷⁹ The first edition of the bestselling *Psychopathia Sexualis* which first appeared in 1886, subsequently went through at least thirty-five British and American editions between 1892 and 1899.⁸⁰ It was written primarily for lawyers and doctors considering sexual crimes in court, again harkening back to the intrinsic connection at the time between sexual deviance and criminality.⁸¹ In an article entitled “Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll,” Harry Oosterhuis argues that “the modern notion of sexuality took shape at the end of the nineteenth century, especially in the works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll.”⁸² During the 1890’s, Moll was part of the medical elite in Berlin as a neurologist, psychotherapist, forensic expert, as well as a pioneering expert in the treatment of sexual perversions.⁸³ With the publications of the now classic *Die Conträre Sexualempfindung* (*The Contrary Sexual Feeling*) in 1891 and both parts of *Untersuchungen über die Libido sexualis* (*Research into the Libido Sexualis*) in 1897-98, Moll succeeded Krafft-Ebing “as one of the leading medical authorities in sexology.”⁸⁴ Indeed, Moll picked up Krafft-Ebing’s work and made it more systematic by articulating Krafft-Ebing’s pioneering insights in methodical form: “Whereas Krafft-Ebing’s explanatory reflections were mainly comments on his case histories, in Moll’s work the case histories rather illustrated his theoretical outline.”⁸⁵ Through his “empirical collection of clinical observations,” Krafft-Ebing did present “a systematic classification of deviant sexualities,” but Moll provided a more broad and expansive, “explanatory framework of sexuality in general, whereby his discussion of perversion served as supportive elucidation.”⁸⁶ Both Moll and Krafft-Ebing were pioneers in the sense that not only did they argue against “traditional moral-religious and legal denunciations of sexual deviance as sin and crime,” but they also “satisfied curiosity about sexuality and made sexual variance imaginable.”⁸⁷

While both seem to complement and supplement one another, Krafft-Ebing and Moll eventually moved in opposite directions with respect to their conceptualizations of homosexuality. Krafft-Ebing’s initial views characterized homosexuality in terms of immorality and pathology, while later in life admitting that this position was one-sided and that there was also truth to the fact that many of his homosexual correspondents were asking for sympathy and

⁷⁸ Karlen, 192. The result being what Krafft-Ebing refers to as the ‘Urning,’ “as one who experiences a disjoint between internal desires and external traits.” In this regard then, although Krafft-Ebing’s “work was central to the era’s re-evaluation of same-sex desire, the popularity of his work made the theory of an inner/outer split [as seen earlier in Ulrich, Hössli and Westphal] in the invert’s sense of self more widespread than ever.” See Ivory, “The Urning and His Own: Individualism and the Fin-de-Siècle Invert,” 344.

⁷⁹ Oosterhuis, “Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll.” para. 4.

⁸⁰ Oosterhuis, para. 4, 6.

⁸¹ Oosterhuis, para. 4.

⁸² Oosterhuis, Abstract.

⁸³ Oosterhuis, para. 5.

⁸⁴ Oosterhuis, para. 6.

⁸⁵ Oosterhuis, para. 6.

⁸⁶ Oosterhuis, para. 6.

⁸⁷ Oosterhuis, para. 7.

compassion.⁸⁸ Krafft-Ebbing would eventually deter from his “degeneracy” argument and side with the victorious oddity wing which stressed that homosexuality was not a disease but rather a “congenital anomaly compatible with psychic health.”⁸⁹ Moll on the other hand, shifted from an open-minded, pragmatic view to a more conservative and nationalistic one when he noted that the Scientific Humanitarian Committee led by Hirschfeld had mixed up scientific sexology with a leftist political agenda.⁹⁰ Moll in turn, “had distinguished himself with a detached and well-balanced approach to homosexuality, turned more regressive in his attitude to homosexuals.”⁹¹ Thus, while Krafft-Ebbing and Moll shared many similar views on sexuality, in that they “criticized the criminalization of sexual deviance,”⁹² both began from different foundational premises and ended up espousing completely differing understandings of sexuality later on in their respective lives. It is important to note though, that despite their differences, both initiated a paradigm shift in terms of how sexuality came to be understood as no longer a symptom of a fundamental disorder, but rather “to a consideration of perversion as an integral part of a more general, autonomous and continuous sexual instinct.”⁹³

The psychiatric theories of Krafft-Ebbing and Moll embodied a host of ambiguities and contradictions which became markers of nineteenth century views on sexuality. On the one hand, while both “surrounded sexual deviance with an aura of pathology,” typical of nineteenth-century stereotypical thinking on gender and sexuality more generally, “their publications were open to divergent meanings.”⁹⁴ Because both argued against “traditional moral–religious and legal denunciations of sexual deviance as sin and crime, individuals approached them to find understanding, acceptance and support.”⁹⁵ Both can also be considered pioneers in the sense that they made “sexual variance imaginable,”⁹⁶ and they were among the first to include many autobiographical accounts, letters, and intimate confessions into their case histories. Therefore, despite their methodological differences, both gave a voice to many who had been categorized as pathologically deviant and “revealed to readers that such sexual experiences were not unique.”⁹⁷ As Oosterhuis makes clear, “the psychiatric understanding of perversions moved between scientific labelling and control on the one hand, and the realization of self-awareness and self-expression on the other.”⁹⁸ The irony is that their extensive case histories, predicated precisely on the dominant nineteenth century psychiatric view of “perversion as illness,”⁹⁹ in turn actually fostered and facilitated the dissemination and eventual legitimacy of a wide diversity of sexual desires to the wider medical and psychiatric communities, as well as the public more broadly. As Oosterhuis maintains,

⁸⁸ Oosterhuis, para. 6.

⁸⁹ Karlen, “The Scientific Overture,” 195.

⁹⁰ Oosterhuis, “Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll.” para. 6.

⁹¹ Oosterhuis, para. 7.

⁹² Oosterhuis, para. 7.

⁹³ Oosterhuis, Abstract.

⁹⁴ Oosterhuis, para. 8.

⁹⁵ Oosterhuis, para. 8.

⁹⁶ Oosterhuis, para. 8.

⁹⁷ Oosterhuis, para. 8.

⁹⁸ Oosterhuis, para. 9.

⁹⁹ Oosterhuis, para. 11.

It was against this background that Krafft-Ebing's and Moll's work, in several ways, can be viewed as a central moment in the constitution of the modern sexual experience and that it anticipated twentieth-century attitudes toward sexuality, which are not without ambiguities ... It was a much more fundamental transformation of the definition and explanation of sexuality and of its meaning in human life."¹⁰⁰

Sexuality and the Birth of the Modern Individual

The modern sexual experience and twentieth-century attitudes towards sex did not develop in a vacuum however. The shift from a traditional understanding of sexuality embedded in sin and crime, "a fixed natural order and moral order,"¹⁰¹ to one that saw sexuality "as a distinct impulse with its particular internal physical and psychological mechanism"¹⁰² was a gradual process that emerged as a result of a variety of "longer-term social and cultural developments" which only then "transformed the experience of sexuality in society."¹⁰³ The nineteenth century would witness the birth of sexual modernism as a result of a shift in attitudes towards the individual that emerged out of the Enlightenment and the challenges to social and religious authorities that ensued as a result. As a result of the Industrial Revolution, more people fled the countryside at a rapid pace in search for work in factories, which eventually gave way to the emergence of the middle-class bourgeoisie. The shift from the extended family to the newly formed nuclear family had tremendously disastrous consequences on theology and the church. It is imperative therefore, that sexuality, as it gradually came to be understood in the twentieth century, did not simply emerge from psychiatry and sexology so much as from shifts in attitudes toward gender and sexuality that arose out of "the historical development of individualization and social democratization,"¹⁰⁴ namely, the Enlightenment and the Industrial Age. The very notion of sexual identity would therefore not have been possible without "a self-conscious, reflexive bourgeois society in which there was a dialectic between humanitarian reform and emancipation on the one hand, and efforts to enforce social adaptation and integration on the other."¹⁰⁵ The context for understanding this overall shift in perspective has to do with what Michael Himes refers to as "historical consciousness"¹⁰⁶ as a distinctively unique feature of the Enlightenment. "Historical consciousness" refers to the awareness that we are all situated in history and that history and historical awareness impact the way we make and create meaning and knowledge, as well as how we perceive the world and ourselves in relation to others. The awareness of our situatedness in history created a crisis for theology and ethics, namely, the crisis of relativism, the notion "that knowledge, truth and morality exist in relation to

¹⁰⁰ Oosterhuis, para. 11.

¹⁰¹ Oosterhuis, para. 42.

¹⁰² Oosterhuis, para. 43.

¹⁰³ Oosterhuis, para. 44.

¹⁰⁴ Oosterhuis, para. 43.

¹⁰⁵ Oosterhuis, para. 43.

¹⁰⁶ Michael J. Himes. "The Human Person in Contemporary Theology: From Human Nature to Authentic Subjectivity," in *Introduction to Christian Ethics: A Reader*, ed. Ronald Hamel and Kenneth Himes (New York: Paulist Press, 1989): 49-62.

culture, society, or historical context, and are not absolute.”¹⁰⁷ As Himes indicates, “within this historically minded and so pluralist context there is no such thing as one theology,”¹⁰⁸ nor is there such a thing as one perspective within ethics. Bernard Lonergan identifies this shift in culture from a classicist worldview to an historical consciousness, or what he terms the empirical notion of culture.¹⁰⁹ In the classicist worldview, “culture was normative,” ... “there was but one culture that was both universal and permanent,” in which “theology is conceived as a permanent achievement.”¹¹⁰ In the historical (modern) or empirical conception of culture however, the world is dynamic and evolving; according to Lonergan, “theology is known to be an ongoing process.”¹¹¹ It was only then that sexuality, as a distinct category of human experience, “became associated with profound and complex human emotions and anxieties”¹¹² as a result of precisely this shift from a classicist worldview to a historical and modern worldview that emphasized the complexity of the individual’s inner life and the question of the meaning of life in an increasingly scientific and technologically advanced world. As Sheldrake notes, the quest for meaning and purpose that emerged from the gradual turn toward personal interiority “is in many ways a response to the decline of traditional religious or social authorities, particularly in Western cultures.”¹¹³ Thus, it is not difficult to see the link between contemporary spirituality’s emphasis on “an understanding of human identity and of personal development,”¹¹⁴ with the emergence of homosexuality as a concrete and defined sexual identity tied to contemporary, even pop-culture notions of ‘finding oneself,’ and ‘coming-out of the closet.’

It is in this context of a classicist worldview that a traditional sexual order is situated and one in which notable psychiatrists like Krafft-Ebing and Moll were navigating. As Oosterhuis points out, the traditional sexual order operated within a “collectively and hierarchically structured society ... as a function of social and moral behavior, sexuality had no distinct existence but was instrumentally integrated in marriage, reproduction, kinship, fixed gender roles, social status and economic concerns.”¹¹⁵ From a theological and ethical viewpoint, morality was therefore concerned not with the context around ‘good’ and ‘bad’ acts, but rather with the nature of such acts as either contributing and upholding the socio-moral, economic order, or obstructing the natural order as God intended it. There was an emphasis on duty and obligation to reproduce, maintain and uphold the established order. Because sexual morality was dominated by a “reproductive imperative,” acts such as adultery, sodomy, bestiality and masturbation were seen as immoral,¹¹⁶ and were pathologized and seen as contributing to the corruption and moral degeneracy of the nation. In other words, the ‘sick’ body, that which

¹⁰⁷ *The Oxford Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, 2nd ed. (Oxford University Press, 2006), s.v. “Relativism,” <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780198609810.001.0001/acref-9780198609810-e-5956?rskey=w01kMR&result=5941>.

¹⁰⁸ Himes, “The Human Person in Contemporary Theology,” 49.

¹⁰⁹ Lonergan, *MT*, 3.

¹¹⁰ Lonergan, 3.

¹¹¹ Lonergan, 3.

¹¹² Oosterhuis, “Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll.” para. 43.

¹¹³ Sheldrake, *Spirituality: A Brief History*, 3.

¹¹⁴ Sheldrake, 3.

¹¹⁵ Oosterhuis, “Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll.” para. 42.

¹¹⁶ Oosterhuis, para. 42.

willingly participated in such transgressive acts, became symptomatic of the illnesses of a 'sick' nation and a 'sick' body politic.

The turn towards self-consciousness and self-reflection, as well as questions of identity and individual authenticity resulted in the birth of the very notion of sexual identity. Paglia defines sexual identity as "our consciousness of and commentary upon our own sexuality, mediated through social conventions and norms."¹¹⁷ She goes on to write, "sexual identity in this sense is a product of the creation of the modern individual through and after Rousseau and Romanticism."¹¹⁸ Before Romanticism, people "did not deeply reflect on and agonize over their sexuality or psychology," and it would only be until the late nineteenth century that the polar opposition between heterosexuality and homosexuality would emerge into medical discourse.¹¹⁹ Paglia attributes this to "the changing and diminishing family structure under nineteenth and twentieth century industrial capitalism, which has been extraordinarily beneficial in permitting both men and women for the first time in history to choose unmarried, self-supporting, and self-fulfilling lives."¹²⁰ The downside of this is the very fragmentation and disintegration of the extended family into the constricting nuclear family. The turn toward interiority and feeling which took place in the Romantic era during the eighteenth century, suddenly turned into an all-pervasive malaise and discontent, that despite progress and technological advancements, the human person was ultimately, at the end of the day, alone. John Durham Peters encapsulates this sentiment when he writes, "Communications is a registry of modern longings."¹²¹ Peters tracks the emergence of solipsism and telepathy as particularly unique phenomena which arose out of the isolation and loneliness people began to feel in modernity. This is ultimately, for Peters, the fundamental drama of modernity: the struggle to communicate in an increasingly fragmented world of hyper-individualism.

All of this is necessary context to keep in mind when considering the emergence of homosexuality as a distinct category apart from heterosexuality, which would pave the way for what we now see as gay identity in our postmodern era. Ivory makes the interesting argument that the increasing pressure exerted by these ever-newly emerging medical models of inversion

¹¹⁷ Camille Paglia, "Junk Bonds and Corporate Raiders," in *Sex, Art, and American Culture*," (New York: Vintage Books, 1992): 143.

¹¹⁸ Paglia, 144.

¹¹⁹ Paglia, 145.

¹²⁰ Paglia, 145-46.

¹²¹ John Durham Peters, "Introduction: The Problem of Communication," in *Speaking into the Air*, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1999), 1-31.

A quote from the nineteenth-century French author Guy de Maupassant truly captures this deep sense of malaise. In his short story "Solitude," the narrator's companion notes "Whatever we may do or attempt, despite the embrace and transports of love, the hunger of the lips, we are always alone. I have dragged you out into the night in the vain hope of a moment's escape from the horrible solitude which overpowers me. But what is the use! I speak and you answer me, and still, each of us is alone; side by side but alone."

The poetry of T.S. Eliot, in particular *The Waste Land*, is equally reminiscent of the loneliness and malaise brought upon by the advent of modernity, a rather dark and bleak picture in which, despite progress and advancements in the way people live and communicate, the modern individual suddenly finds themselves alone in their own thoughts, isolated and solipsistic.

actually precipitated, reinforced and strengthened the individualism and turn toward alternative identities in the late nineteenth century. He writes,

as increased pressure was exerted on the nineteenth-century man-loving man to identify with new legal and medical models of inversion, the notion of individualist agency and self-culture became more appealing – and even more necessary – for the affirmation of alternative identities ... specific individualist ideologies – ideologies in which the cultivation of the self is granted primary importance – served as defenses against a number of accusations to be found in nineteenth – and early – twentieth – century sexology.¹²²

The results of the nineteenth century would be a greater turn toward markers of identity, in which the individual would define himself less in relation to God or the cosmos or nature, but to a mere fragment of his identity such as his sexuality. One could argue that this has taken the form of identity politics, or the fragmented individual in today's culture. However, Ivory's text serves as a useful reminder that the turn toward individualism and the adoption of "an identity based on sexuality" *at the time* was necessary and valuable; for the first time in history, "it allowed the invert to include same-sex desire in projects of self-cultivation."¹²³

The departure from nineteenth-century sexual orthodoxy paved the way for the development of sexual modernism. In reaction to the traditional institutional contexts of human sexuality, the modernists, "held that sexual experience was neither a threat to moral character nor a drain on vital energies. On the contrary, they considered it an entirely worthwhile, though often problematic, human activity, whose proper management was essential to individual and social well-being."¹²⁴ According to Oosterhuis, sexual modernism is defined by five key features. These are 1) Sexuality as an Inevitable Natural Force 2) Sexual desires as differentiated and classified 3) a shift from a procreative view of sexuality to one that also incorporates pleasure and relationality 4) a psychological understanding of sexuality and 5) Sexual identity: the link between sexuality and personal identity.¹²⁵ Another important factor to take notice of during the nineteenth century is the contrast between the environmental and inborn schools. The environmental school (Binet, Näcke, Bloch and Schrenk-Notzing) had lost to the constitutional school (Krafft-Ebbing, Charles Féré, Albert Moll). By then, another controversy raged between the view of whether homosexuality was a kind of "biological failure or just another nonpathological oddity like left handedness or color-blindness."¹²⁶ By the end of the nineteenth century, the major consensus stressed the inherent bisexual potentiality within all human beings, that homosexuality is more of an anomaly rather than a pathology and that those who were homosexuals should therefore not be punished, and lastly, that the attempt to "cure" the homosexual ought to be disregarded.

¹²² Ivory, 334.

¹²³ Ivory, 346.

¹²⁴ Paul A. Robinson, "Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory," *Salmagundi*, no. 21 (1973): 27-62, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40547346>.

¹²⁵ Oosterhuis, "Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll." para. 12.

¹²⁶ Karlen, "The Scientific Overture," 195.

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have seen how various developments throughout the nineteenth century are essential context for understanding the emergence of homosexuality and the 'homosexual' as a uniquely distinct category in modern culture. Before the advent of secularism and the birth of modern science, there was no such thing as a homosexual identity or orientation. There was same-sex sexual activity, which was treated as "sin" or crimes against the established order of God. One of the main points made in this chapter is the shift from a religious framework for understanding sexual deviance, to a secularized, scientific view which locates the source of such deviance within the physical constitution of the body: hereditary and biological failure, circulatory changes in the brain, injury to the nervous system, excess masturbation and so forth. As demonstrated by Yvonne Ivory however, the increasing pressure exerted by these ever-new medical models of inversion actually precipitated and reinforced the emergence of individualism we have come to also associate with the emergence of modernity, along with the turn toward alternative identities in the nineteenth century.

The nineteenth century witnessed the emergence of various competing schools of scientific thought. This chapter covered a wide range of theories, from the distinction between "innate" (congenital) and "acquired" homosexuality put forth by Ludwig Casper,¹²⁷ to the product of "abnormal embryonic development"¹²⁸ (female soul in a male body) by Karl Ulrichs, to the result of "constitutional nervous weakness due to hereditary degeneration,"¹²⁹ by Charcot and Magnan, to "victims of degenerated genes"¹³⁰ by August Forel and lastly, to the inherent bisexuality of the human embryo resulting in "psychic hermaphroditism ... attributing homosexuality to a failure to pass beyond a primitive ancestral condition of bisexuality."¹³¹ One of the most prevalent theories of the time was that of the "invert's inconsistency" between his biological sex and his internal feelings and drives, which were thought to correspond to those of the female. This view was held by Heinrich Hössli, who made the rather bold and daring argument that biological sex does not determine sexual desires. Lastly, the popular debate between whether homosexuality was acquired or inborn, whether homosexuality was an anomaly (such as left-handedness or color-blindness for example) or pathology also particularly characterized the nineteenth century's scientific thinking on homosexuality.

The nineteenth century would witness the birth of sexual modernism as a result of a shift in attitudes towards the individual that emerged out of the Enlightenment and the challenges to social and religious authorities that ensued as a result. Two key figures are tied to the birth of sexual modernism: Richard Krafft-Ebbing and Albert Moll. Both figures are regarded as pioneers in the field of sexology in that they denounced the traditional moral condemnation of deviance as sin and crime, while making "sexual variance imaginable"¹³² through the inclusion of numerous case histories and first-hand autobiographical accounts in their respective texts.

¹²⁷ Karlen, 185.

¹²⁸ Karlen, 186.

¹²⁹ Karlen, 188.

¹³⁰ Karlen, 188.

¹³¹ Karlen, 188-9.

¹³² Oosterhuis, "Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll," para. 8.

Krafft-Ebing's decision in the final year of his life to deter from his degeneracy argument (homosexuality as pathology and disease) in favor of the anomaly/oddity argument helped garner sympathy from the public. By the turn of the century, the major scientific view was that "homosexuality was congenital, caused by hereditary damage that appeared as neuropathy, and was exacerbated by masturbation. Probably the embryonic bisexual stage had never been surmounted ... There was a good chance that homosexuality, though, was not pathological; in any case, it should not be punished. Since it was congenital, it was incurable."¹³³ Even with the birth of psychiatry and advances in science, it would not be until the advent of psychoanalysis towards the turn of the century that a more integrated and nuanced view of the human person as an individual starts to present itself, one which would take into account family history and the child's relationship to their parents and surrounding environment.

¹³³ Karlen, "The Scientific Overture," 196.

Chapter 2: The Intermediate Sex

Introduction

In the previous chapter, we traced the development of the scientific study of sex in the nineteenth century as it emerged in direct response to Victorian sexual orthodoxy. We saw the emergence of various competing and complimentary schools of scientific thought which attempted, in their own respective ways, to uncover and explain the etiology of homosexuality in direct relation to physical constitution. We also saw the increasing divide between those who argued that homosexuality was inborn and those who maintained that it was acquired through experience. By the turn of the twentieth century, there was a larger consensus that because homosexuality was most likely congenital (inborn and therefore incurable), those who engaged in same-sex activity should not be criminalized and punished. This chapter is a continuation of the first in that it surveys the emergence of psychosocial causation models that attempted to explain the etiology of homosexuality as a direct result of the doctrinal conflicts that emerged throughout the nineteenth century. Although there was some degree of consensus reached by the fin de siècle, the growing field of psychoanalysis put into question previously held assumptions and doctrinal ‘truths.’

Developments in understanding the complexity of being human meant that the increasingly outdated theories in the nineteenth century no longer held sway. At the same time however, the theories covered in this chapter are a direct outgrowth of previous discoveries and achievements, so that rather than there being a break with the past, there is instead continuation and ongoing development, what Bernard Lonergan calls “sublation” in Karl Rahner’s sense of the term: “what sublates goes beyond what is sublated, introduces something new and distinct, puts everything on a new basis, yet so far from interfering with the sublated or destroying it, on the contrary needs it, includes it, preserves all its proper functioning and properties, and carries them forward to a fuller realization within a richer context.”¹³⁴ Lonergan’s theological method, in particular, his understanding of dialectic, clarifies the doctrinal conflicts between the various competing schools of thought in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Although Lonergan is writing in the context of theology, his writings on method are actually applicable to any discipline,¹³⁵ which demonstrates the universal applicability of the tasks and operations theologians perform. But in the context of the present study, Lonergan’s method highlights and puts into perspective the dynamic forces and operations that took place as new questions emerged in light of ever-new data, as new investigations were undertaken in light of revised hypotheses, as conflicts were settled and resolved only to re-emerge in newer form decades later by a new generation of practitioners. As Lonergan writes,

the results of investigations are cumulative and progressive ... The wheel of method not only turns but also rolls along. The field of observed data keeps broadening. New discoveries are added to old. New hypotheses and theories express not only the new

¹³⁴ Lonergan, *MT*, 227.

¹³⁵ In the Introduction to *Method in Theology*, Lonergan writes, “The method I indicate is, I think, relevant to more than Roman Catholic theologians. But I must leave it to members of other communities to decide upon the extent to which they may employ the present method. See Lonergan, 4.

insights but also all that was valid in the old, to give method its cumulative character and to engender the conviction that, however remote may still be the goal of the complete explanation of all phenomena, at least we now are nearer to it than we were.¹³⁶

Therefore, the theorists covered in this chapter are not doing away with the past, so much as building upon the insights and discoveries from the past in order to further inform and develop their own insights. It is this dialectical view of history, elucidated in Lonergan, which informs research of historical data and subsequent interpretation of such data in the formation of new hypotheses and subsequent theoretical formulations.

There are three key figures who were at the forefront of scientific research on homosexuality at the turn of the twentieth century: Magnus Hirschfeld, Havelock Ellis and Edward Carpenter. All three are pioneering figures who challenged the medicalization of homosexuality as illness, pathology or disorder while exalting what they perceived to be the unique gifts, special virtues and spirituality of homosexuals. They can be considered “apologists” in Karlen’s use of the term¹³⁷ because their research was intimately tied with their desires for political and social reform. According to David E. Greenberg, these writers constituted the “earliest wave of the homosexual emancipation movement,”¹³⁸ against the backdrop of a subject which had been heavily pathologized the century prior. For Jeffery Weeks, these scholars are responsible for “a much more clearly defined sense of a homosexual identity”¹³⁹ predicated on protecting the notion of human agency and social equality regardless of sexual orientation. Notwithstanding, the liberal politics all three writers identified with no doubt influenced the direction their research took them in, along with the conclusions they arrived at. Lastly, this chapter expounds on the notion of “Intermediate Sex,” as described by Ellis and Carpenter, as well as John Addington Symonds, a nineteenth century poet and literary critic. As Jonathan Coleman writes, the “Intermediate Sex” entails a “a possible third sex that transcended male/female bodies and masculine/feminine gender roles,” based on “homosexual performance.”¹⁴⁰ Moreover, all three writers “questioned long-held pernicious assumptions of homosexual behavior,” and “had a significant impact on how the homosexual became characterized, discussed and identified.”¹⁴¹ Like Krafft-Ebing and Moll had done decades prior, this new generation of scholars also made sexual variance imaginable by breaking through the code of Victorian propriety and sexual morality.

¹³⁶ Lonergan, 9.

¹³⁷ Arno Karlen, “The Apologists,” in *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1971), 213-227.

¹³⁸ David Greenberg, *The Construction of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 4.

¹³⁹ Jeffery Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800* (London: Longman, 1981), 111.

¹⁴⁰ Jonathan E. Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” Master’s Thesis, (University of Kentucky, 2010), 2-3
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/gradschool_theses/628.

¹⁴¹ Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” 1.

Magnus Hirschfeld

Magnus Hirschfeld was a Berlin doctor and sexologist who is considered a “pioneering researcher and writer on homosexuality and variant sexual behavior.”¹⁴² He founded the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee and World League for Sexual Reform and “fought against the criminalization and pathologization of homosexuality,”¹⁴³ namely, the anti-homosexual Section 175 of the German penal code. As a pioneer for sexual freedom, he advocated for tolerance of numerous forms of sexual deviancy not limited to homosexuality: the “liberalization of contraception, the right to legal and safe abortions, the enhancement of sexual pleasure, combating alcoholism, and the promotion of healthy births sought to enhance the individual’s sexual freedom and choices.”¹⁴⁴ In fact, Ralf Dose traces the origins of the gay liberation movement to Hirschfeld, maintaining that Hirschfeld’s quest for scientific truth was intimately tied to his search for justice.¹⁴⁵ Through his doctrine of “sexual intermediacy,” Dose claims, Hirschfeld sought to find a place in nature and society for homosexuals which would be free from discrimination and criminal persecution. For the purposes and scope of the present study, the doctrine of “sexual intermediacy”¹⁴⁶ in particular, serves to elucidate Hirschfeld’s

¹⁴² Elena Mancini, *Magnus Hirschfeld and the Quest for Sexual Freedom* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), ix.

¹⁴³ Mancini, ix. Mancini’s comprehensive study situates Hirschfeld within the socio-political realities of his day, arguing that the fullness of Hirschfeld’s theories can best be understood within the context of his broader humanistic values and liberal political activity. Mancini’s work therefore establishes the connections between the scientist/scholar and politician, while also claiming that previous studies on Hirschfeld “fail to see the deeper implications of his scientific efforts, the tradition from which they emerged and ... the ethical perspective which informed both his scientific enterprise and his political activism.” See ‘Mancini, xvi.

¹⁴⁴ Mancini, *Magnus Hirschfeld and the Quest for Sexual Freedom*, xiii.

¹⁴⁵ Ralf Dose, *Magnus Hirschfeld: The Origins of the Gay Liberation Movement*, trans. Edward H. Willis (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2014), 8.

While my research for this thesis focuses almost exclusively on the etiology of homosexuality, much has been written about Hirschfeld’s legacy as a pioneer for LGBTQ rights. For more on Hirschfeld’s impact as a forerunner of the gay liberation movement, see Ralf Dose, *Magnus Hirschfeld: The Origins of the Gay Liberation Movement*, trans. Edward H. Willis (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2014), as well as *Not Straight from Germany: Sexual Politics and Sexual Citizenship since Magnus Hirschfeld*, ed. Michael Thomas Taylor, Rainer Herrn and Annette Timm (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017). For more on the historical context in which Hirschfeld was formulating his research methods and ideas, as well as the overall impact he had on sexual liberation during his own lifetime, see Laurie Marhoefer, *Sex and the Weimar Republic: German Homosexual Emancipation and the Rise of the Nazis* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015).

¹⁴⁶ J. Edgar Bauer points out that nineteenth century Germany’s conceptualization of a “third sex” was initially meant as an “addition” or “supplement” to the male-female sexual binary. Secondly, the “third sex” was seen as a unique phenomenon, “a collective category” that integrated male and female in one, thus surpassing or transcending the mutual exclusion of male and female within the traditional binary scheme of two separate and distinct genders. But it was also seen as “a collective category that included all previously rejected and ignored sexual alternatives.” However, as Bauer further points out, the paradox is that while the creation and postulation of the category was “designed to closure the possibilities of what is conceivable as ‘sex,’” the reality was that the very category itself “reflected the insight that no final category can do justice to the inexhaustible variability of human sexuality.”

etiology of homosexuality. Indeed, the “intermediate sex” or “third sex” was Hirschfeld’s attempt to counter and transcend the boundaries and limitations of what he and many of his contemporaries saw as a rigid and confining heteronormative dual gender-based model which had seemingly done nothing but demonize and pathologize homosexuality up until that point.

In terms of the etiology of homosexuality, Hirschfeld heavily emphasized the “innateness”¹⁴⁷ and by extension, incurability of homosexuality. He conducted the first large, statistical study of homosexuality and sex behavior,¹⁴⁸ the results of which were published in his book *The Uranian* (1903) and *Berlin’s Third Sex* (1904). His masterwork however, is considered to be *Homosexuality in Men and Women* (1914), in which he argues that “homosexuality was congenital and nonpathological, probably due to the interplay of hormones and the nervous system.”¹⁴⁹ In legitimizing difference across many spectrums beyond the male-female heteronormative ideal, Hirschfeld stresses the “richly varied nature of human desire”¹⁵⁰ and sexual preference as both common and universally applicable to all human beings. A phenomenon such as homosexuality should be tolerated, according to Hirschfeld, not only due to its innate nature, but precisely because it aligns perfectly with his claim regarding the “commonness and universally human character of the variability of desire.”¹⁵¹ By arguing for the universality of differences in sexual preference, Hirschfeld was able to defend his concluding arguments in favor of tolerance toward homosexuals. As Karlen points out, “His importance was as a pioneer in research methods and reform. He fought hard, and to much effect, for the idea that homosexuality (innate, incurable and nonpathological) should be tolerated.”¹⁵²

The logical implications and conclusions of Hirschfeld’s argument of universality lie in his secondary argument from nature. According to Elena Mancini, “Hirschfeld’s logic is easily grasped: individuals are not to blame, nature is. He argued that because the sex drive was under nature’s command, it could neither be influenced nor generated artificially; it had no choice but to express the character that nature had given it.”¹⁵³ It would seem then, that human agency and freedom play a minor if not insignificant role in Hirschfeld’s theory, at least when it comes to the etiology of sexuality.¹⁵⁴ Hirschfeld’s argument can be said to be both somewhat predictable and

It is also important to note that the notion of “sexual intermediacy” or the “third sex” can be traced further back to the writings of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, the nineteenth century apologist for homosexuality who coined the term “Urning” (derived from the goddess Aphrodite Urania as female psyche/soul trapped in a male body) for homosexuals. In Ulrichs’ own words, “we constitute a third sex.” See J. Edgar Bauer, “Magnus Hirschfeld’s Doctrine of Sexual Intermediaries and the Transgender Politics of (No-)Identity,” in *Past and Present of Radical Sexual Politics*, ed. Gert Hekma (Amsterdam: Mosse Foundation, 2004), 41-55.

¹⁴⁷ Mancini, xiii.

¹⁴⁸ Karlen, “The Apologists,” 213.

¹⁴⁹ Karlen, 213.

¹⁵⁰ Mancini, *Magnus Hirschfeld and the Quest for Sexual Freedom*, xiv.

¹⁵¹ Mancini, xiv.

¹⁵² Karlen, “The Apologists,” 213.

¹⁵³ Mancini, *Magnus Hirschfeld and the Quest for Sexual Freedom*, 53.

¹⁵⁴ As Mancini astutely makes clear, “the inborn nature of homosexuality was a fundamental and immutable aspect of Hirschfeld’s concept of homosexuality. Although Hirschfeld continued to augment his theoretical and clinical knowledge of homosexuality, and modify his theories and therapies accordingly, the inborn nature of homosexuality was a mainstay of his theories.” See Mancini, 72.

politically convenient in terms of his liberal bias, and it certainly corresponds to many of the arguments put forth today by gay activism with regards to the fixed and indisputable nature of sexual orientation. But at the time in which Hirschfeld was operating, it was no doubt a counter-reaction against “the fiercely ingrained stereotypes and common banalities that were believed about homosexuality, such as it being contagious or a learned behavior.”¹⁵⁵ In a way then, it may sound like Hirschfeld had to compromise the freedom and self-determination of the individual for the purposes of his argument, or else his theories may not have garnered the same amount of sympathy and positive reception. On the other hand, Hirschfeld’s argument also legitimizes sexual deviancy by claiming that homosexuality comes from nature, not culture or society; because something is natural and innate to one’s unique self, it should not be criminalized and persecuted. Indeed, Hirschfeld not only argued in favor of tolerance towards homosexuality, but also argued in favor of its “naturalness”¹⁵⁶ in direct response to the opposing medical models which pathologized any sexual deviancy since at least the late eighteenth century with the birth of sexology and the scientific study of sex. This argument put him in direct contrast with those such as Tissot, Pritchard and Casper, who, as we saw in the previous chapter, emphasized sexual excess, perversion and the vice of masturbation, as leading causal factors for homosexuality, along with others such as Sir Richard Burton who concluded that homosexuality resulted from geographic and climatic conditions.¹⁵⁷ With Hirschfeld, now the pendulum swung in the other direction, as his efforts for reform, along with his increasingly vast literary output, changed the perception of homosexuality in Germany at least for some time until the Nazis came into power in 1933 and sacked and destroyed his Institute of Sex Research.

Edward Carpenter

Karlen’s chapter “The Apologists,” is particularly useful for the insights it provides into Havelock Ellis’ *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (1900). The writings of this now classic seven-volume work were influenced by the views of John Addington Symonds and Edward Carpenter, the latter of whom maintained that homosexuality is innovative and that homosexuals contain a “bisexual mixture of traits,” which grants them “intuition and complexity far beyond heterosexuals.”¹⁵⁸ Typical of the period, Carpenter believed that sexual inversion was not acquired, but rather congenital, and uses the term “The Intermediate Sex,”¹⁵⁹ to prove “the special spirituality of the urning temperament.”¹⁶⁰ This view corresponded to one of the main sexual doctrines of the early twentieth century, “the notion that sexual differentiation was a matter of degree – that each sex possessed the recessive characteristics of the opposite sex.”¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁵ Mancini, 53.

¹⁵⁶ Mancini, 53.

¹⁵⁷ Karlen, “The Apologists,” 215.

¹⁵⁸ Karlen, 220.

¹⁵⁹ “The Intermediate Sex” is also the title of Carpenter’s essay on the subject. See Edward Carpenter, “The Intermediate Sex,” in *Homosexuality: A Cross-Cultural Approach*, ed, Donald Webster Cory (New York: The Julian Press, 1956): 139-206. Carpenter’s essay is part of a larger study entitled *The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women*, (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1908), The Edward Carpenter Archive, <http://www.edwardcarpenter.net/ecinttit.htm>.

¹⁶⁰ Karlen, 220.

¹⁶¹ Robinson, “Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory,” 33.

Indeed, there was a growing consensus among such modernists that bisexuality and hermaphroditism could eventually, through future advances in scientific research, explain the phenomenon of homosexuality.

Carpenter's "Intermediate Sex" is basically Ulrich's "Urning." Carpenter establishes continuity with one of the main arguments put forth in the nineteenth century regarding the matter of degree to which male and female occupied the homosexual. He writes,

To Men or Women thus affected with an innate homosexual bias, Ulrichs gave the name of Urning ... In the case of [Urnings, homogenic love] is, as said, so deeply rooted and twined with the mental and emotional life that the person concerned has difficulty in imagining himself affected otherwise than he is; and to him at least the homogenic love appears healthy and natural, and indeed necessary to the concretion of his individuality.¹⁶²

There is a discrepancy in the homosexual between their biological gender and their mental and emotional lives, hence the popular notion that the homosexual is comprised of a female soul in a male body. Moreover, Carpenter sought to highlight the "essential difference" of those born with "an inherent inclination towards persons of their own gender."¹⁶³ The argument from "essential difference" meant that homosexuality was just as normal as heterosexuality; indeed, there is a quest on the part of Hirschfeld, Ellis, Carpenter and others to *normalize* homosexuality by essentializing its rootedness in the very fabric of who the person was. As Coleman makes clear, "congenital homosexuals were being true to their inherent sexuality," whereas those whose desires were acquired out of curiosity, monetary desire, criminality or other forms of degeneracy were "responsible for damaging the reputation"¹⁶⁴ of 'true' homosexuals, as well as hindering the cause for tolerance and reform. The logical implications of such an argument were that "those with an inherent, intrinsic predisposition to homosexuality deserved sympathy and freedom of sexual expression."¹⁶⁵ This was to preserve the spiritual nobility of homosexuality (rooted in "Greek love"), something which had democratic and transformative implications for Carpenter and Symonds, as well as for poets such as Walt Whitman who sang the praises of fraternity and male comradeship.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² Edward Carpenter, *Homogenic Love and its Place in Free Society* (Manchester: The Labour Press, 1984), 18, quoted in Coleman, "'Surely it Deserves a Name:' Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds," 32.

¹⁶³ Coleman, 32, 31.

¹⁶⁴ Coleman, 39. Carpenter makes a clear distinction between "true" congenital homosexuals and those who partake in homosexual acts for a variety of reactionary, external reasons: "Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the distinction between these born lovers of their own sex, and that class of persons with whom they are so often confused, who out of mere carnal curiosity or extravagance of desire, or from the dearth of opportunities for a more normal satisfaction (as in schools, barracks, etc.) adopt some homosexual practices. In the case of these latter the attraction towards their own sex is merely superficial and temptational, so to speak, and is generally felt by those concerned to be in some degree morbid." See Edward Carpenter, *Homogenic Love and its Place in Free Society*, 139, quoted in Coleman, 38.

¹⁶⁵ Coleman, 32.

¹⁶⁶ As Coleman points out, the writings of Walt Whitman were central to Carpenter and Symonds' construction of and definition of the "true" homosexual – that is, he for whom same-sex desire

John Addington Symonds

Both Ellis and Symonds would often share and exchange ideas, even co-authoring *Sexual Inversion*, which formed a significant part of Ellis' *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* in 1897, not least of which because it was the first English medical textbook on homosexuality. As a result of his literary background, Symonds idealized Greek homosexuality and "romanticized the spiritual nobility of homosexual comradeship."¹⁶⁷ The "true" homosexual, as opposed to "a denigrated homosexuality based upon perceived depravity among the working class,"¹⁶⁸ is for Symonds, the ideal man, "a new form of individual that practiced a new form of love,"¹⁶⁹ and whose sexuality would be celebrated rather than pathologized. Symonds, like Hirschfeld, argues that homosexuality is innate and nonpathological, "a recurring impulse of humanity ... in the majority of cases compatible with an otherwise normal and healthy temperament."¹⁷⁰ This would, in a sense, explain the impetus for the creation of a new sexual category known as the "intermediate sex" or "third sex" among Ellis, Symonds and Carpenter. As Coleman writes, the

is essential, innate and constitutional; the "true" homosexual is conscious and aware of his own sexuality in relation to his own individuality. This is a purely modern understanding of sexuality, and so, in that case, the writings of Carpenter and Symonds, among others, are an emblematic product of modernism and are thus highly representative of the fin-de-siècle. We have evidence of Whitman's influence based on Carpenter's published lecture *Some Friends of Walt Whitman*, in which Carpenter spoke of Whitman's "love-nature" as "grand and noble," predicated on "comradeship," terms which Whitman often employed to evoke the socio-cultural, as well as spiritual and psychological significance of homosexuality. Edward Carpenter, *Some Friends of Walt Whitman: A Study in Sex-Psychology* (London: J.E. Francis, 1924), 3, quoted in Coleman, 35.

¹⁶⁷ Karlen, "The Apologists," 216.

¹⁶⁸ Coleman, "'Surely it Deserves a Name: Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds," 40.

¹⁶⁹ Coleman, 41. In a letter addressed to Carpenter, we obtain a glimpse of Symonds' utopian vision: "My hope has always been that eventually a new chivalry, i.e., a second elevated form of human love, will emerge and take its place for the service of mankind by the side of that other which was wrought out in the Middle Ages. It will be complementary, by no means prejudicial to the elder and more commonly acceptable. It will engage a different type of individual in different spheres of energy." From this extract alone, we can surmise that for Symonds, social acceptance and even social appraisal of homosexuality does not come at the expense or denigration of the heterosexual norm – male-female humanity, but rather that both heterosexuality and homosexuality can co-exist harmoniously within a culture. John Addington Symonds' letter to Edward Carpenter, 29 December 1892, in *Nineteenth-Century Writings on Homosexuality: A Sourcebook*, ed. Chris White (London: Routledge, 1999), 94, quoted in Coleman, 41.

¹⁷⁰ John Addington Symonds, "A Problem in Modern Ethics," in *Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach*, ed. Donald Webster Cory (New York: The Julian Press, 1956), 37. In direct response to Krafft-Ebing's theory of homosexuality, Symonds responds, "what seems unwarranted by facts is the suggestion that inherited neuropathy is an indispensable condition and the fundamental cause of homosexual instincts ... The problem is too delicate, too complicated, also too natural and simple, to be solved by hereditary disease and self-abuse. When we shift the ground of argument from acquired to inborn sexual inversion, its puzzling character will become still more apparent. We shall hardly be able to resist the conclusion that theories of disease are incompetent to explain the phenomenon in modern Europe ... facts tend to show that it is a recurring impulse of humanity, natural to some people, adopted by others, and in the majority of cases compatible with an otherwise normal and healthy temperament." See Symonds, 36-7.

“third sex” is “characterized by the individual’s attraction to persons with similar sexed bodies. This ‘intermediate sex’ would be a new creature, natural yet abnormal, defined primarily by sexual practice.”¹⁷¹ The “intermediate sex” embodies and encapsulates the fears and anxieties, as well changing attitudes toward gender and sexuality at the fin-de-siècle. As will be demonstrated, it is a central concept which remains foundational in any comprehensive overview of the etiology of homosexuality during this time period. There was no doubt a feeling of optimism and renewal, as well as great expectations, around the turn of the century, and so, the “intermediate sex” was a way for writers like Symonds and Carpenter to project and displace their own fears and anxieties, as well visions and hopes, onto the future.

As previously mentioned however, neither Hirschfeld, Carpenter, Symonds or Ellis were the first to introduce the “intermediate sex,” as the concept can be traced back to the writings of Ulrichs, whom Carpenter acknowledges as “the first, in modern times, to recognize the existence of what might be called an Intermediate Sex.”¹⁷² It was Symonds however, who drew out the full implications of specifically Ulrich’s Urning and incorporated its characteristics into his conceptualization of the “third sex,” or what Carpenter refers to as the “intermediate sex.” The “natural” and “abnormal” in Symonds’ ideal man derives from Ulrichs’ own male binary: the Dioning and the Urning.¹⁷³ Symonds describes the Dioning as the “normal man” or “men proper” as opposed to the Urning, the “abnormal man.”¹⁷⁴ But Ulrichs’ Urning consists of a seemingly infinite number of subcategories each predicated upon sexual proclivities, inclinations and sexual performance – all based on the premise of accommodating the infinitely vast array of sexual desires and behaviors that were being accounted for in their respective case studies. According to Symonds, Ulrichs’ Urning, “Man, Woman, and Urning – the third being either a male or female in whom we observe a real and inborn, not an acquired or a spurious inversion of appetite – are consequently regarded by him [Ulrichs] as the three main divisions of humanity viewed from the point of sex.”¹⁷⁵ The conceptualization of a third category was therefore meant to give legitimacy to the epistemological differences and realities of those who did not fit into heteronormative gender roles: “In encompassing aspects of both genders, the homosexual could be neither sex; the homosexual was relegated to a third, intermediate sex.”¹⁷⁶ Because late nineteenth century psychiatry and sexology had no place for the existence of homosexuality other than to relegate it to the realm of illness, disease and pathology, writers like Symonds and Carpenter were essential in attempting to find a metaphorical and literal space for difference, at times couched in spiritual and poetic terms.

¹⁷¹ Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” 41.

¹⁷² Edward Carpenter, *Love’s Coming of Age* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1986), 123-24.

¹⁷³ Symonds quotes Ulrichs in this regard: “Up to a certain stage of embryonic existence all living mammals are hermaphroditic. A certain number of them advance to the condition of what I call man (Dioning), others to what I call woman (Dioningin), a third class become what I call *Urning* (including Urningin).” See Symonds, “A Problem in Modern Ethics,” 65.

¹⁷⁴ Symonds, 63.

¹⁷⁵ Symonds, 65.

¹⁷⁶ Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” 50.

The nineteenth century scientific study of sexuality heavily emphasized physiology, and Ulrichs' arguments were no different in some respects. But Symonds also makes the case that theories of illness and disease, which had been prevalent at the time, were inadequate to explain such a wide phenomenon like homosexuality.¹⁷⁷ Symonds absorbs the entire nineteenth-century tradition of sexology and quite boldly questions the logic and premises behind the theories of Tardieu, Burton, Lambroso and others, who claimed, for example, that masturbation caused homosexuality or that homosexuality was the result of hereditary neuropathy or criminality. Instead, for Symonds, the issue of etiology was much more nuanced and complex; like Hirschfeld, Symonds argued that Nature is to 'blame,' not the individual. He writes, "Nature does not complete her work regularly and in every instance. Having succeeded in differentiating a male with full-formed sex organs from the undecided fetus, she does not always effect the proper differentiation of that portion of the psychical in which resides the sexual appetite. There remains a female soul in a male body."¹⁷⁸ Thus, because the Urning resulted from physiology rather than from culture or environment, he was a "natural anomaly" whose attraction and desire for persons of the same sex was an "intrinsic drive" which could not be cured.¹⁷⁹ Symonds locates this "intrinsic drive" as part of the mental and emotional life of the person, all of which reside in the psyche or soul,¹⁸⁰ whereas the body is merely the physical vessel or container of that soul with its own biological functions. In clearly distinguishing sexual organs from sexual appetite so that one's biological sex does not necessarily determine the gender one is attracted to, Ulrichs, and by extension Symonds, integrate sexuality into the totality of the human person's mental and emotional life, thus transcending the material constraints of the body. Because sexual desire has its roots in the soul – the mental and emotional life of the person that is beyond empirical observation – sexuality, they claim, cannot be compartmentalized and relegated to the realm of mere materiality. It is instead a significant dimension of who we are as spiritual beings that deserves as much attention as other aspects of the soul. Thus, in using the language of "soul" to explain a biological and therefore scientific process, Symonds' conceptualization of sexuality, based on Ulrichs' model, is actually predicated upon a hybrid intersection of materiality and spirituality – body and soul – while still maintaining that "the way in which these factors of the person are combined in human beings differs extremely."¹⁸¹

Although Ulrichs was a product of his time in some respects, he also broke with the reigning physiological theories of congenital inversion of his day by regarding the problem of inversion *psychologically*.¹⁸² It constituted a pivotal moment in the constitution of sexual modernism, as well as a broadening of the parameters for studies in the etiology of homosexuality that still reverberate with us today. Lastly, in order to understand sexuality more fully as commensurate with a broader vision of human life, Ulrichs, and by extension Symonds, argue that we need to look beyond theories of physiological constitution since we are also

¹⁷⁷ Karlen, "The Apologists," 217.

¹⁷⁸ Coleman, "'Surely it Deserves a Name:' Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,"

¹⁷⁹ Coleman, 51-2.

¹⁸⁰ For Ulrichs, the soul "eludes the observation of the senses," and includes "his passions, inclinations, sensibilities, emotional characteristics, sexual desires," and is the "element of instinct and emotion and desire." See Symonds, "A Problem in Modern Ethics," 66.

¹⁸¹ Symonds, 66.

¹⁸² Symonds, 63.

psychological, and by extension, spiritual beings. By uplifting sexuality beyond the realm of the ‘animal’ into the realm of the psychological and by extension, spiritual, or the ‘soul,’ Ulrichs’ theories played a key role in emancipating homosexuality from the reigning physiological pathology theories of his day.

Havelock Ellis

Some of the questions Havelock Ellis explores in his *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* include: Is homosexuality inborn or acquired? Physical or psychic? Is it, as Edward Carpenter and Magnus Hirschfield argue, an intermediate sex? Or is it pathological? Paul Robinson argues that although Freud is regarded as a monolithic figure of sexual modernism, another important figure at the forefront of the movement who has not gotten the recognition he deserves is Havelock Ellis. In reacting against Victorianism, the modernists such as Ellis “sought to broaden the range of legitimate sexual behavior – to investigate and to apologize for those apparently deviant forms of sexuality that the Victorians, with their exclusive commitment to adult, genital, heterosexual intercourse, had been reluctant even to recognize.”¹⁸³ Thus, in many ways, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* is an apology for homosexuality,¹⁸⁴ as well as a critique of nineteenth century sexual doctrine. It also, in the tradition of Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll, helped bring homosexuality to the forefront of public discourse by having more people openly discussing it without fear of being reprimanded. Furthermore, the numerous case studies within *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* sought to legitimize the image of the homosexual as capable of leading a healthy, successful and normal life just like his heterosexual counterpart.

Ellis’ greatest contribution to sexual modernism is arguably his theory of “congenital inversion,” which essentially stressed that the individual could not help being the way he was and that homosexuals were born to their particular sexual orientation. As a student of history, Ellis was no doubt advancing and modernizing the arguments previously put forth earlier in the century, which essentially stated that homosexuality was inborn, though not pathological as others were claiming. Ellis, who borrowed from Symonds and Carpenter, believed “it most likely that homosexuality was an inborn constitutional abnormality – quite nonpathological.”¹⁸⁵ For Ellis, deviance is “harmless, unblameworthy, perhaps even especially valuable.”¹⁸⁶ While homosexuality is not naturally the same as heterosexuality, all dissident behavior and speech ought to be protected under the eyes of the law: “the real message of the boom is that all sexual acts, particularly the more unusual, and, to many people, unattractive ones, are alike before God and should be alike before man.”¹⁸⁷ Moreover, Karlen summarizes Ellis’ position by stating that “although many deviants showed mental disorders and neuropathy, homosexuality was not itself a disease; it was a congenital anomaly compatible with psychic health.”¹⁸⁸ Indeed, one of Ellis’ main intentions was to cast doubt on the prevailing notion at the time that homosexuality and any type of inversion, for that matter, was “unnatural,” “a vice ... willfully indulged either out of

¹⁸³ Robinson, “Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory,” 28.

¹⁸⁴ Robinson, 29.

¹⁸⁵ Karlen, “The Apologists,” 221.

¹⁸⁶ Karlen, 221.

¹⁸⁷ Karlen, 221.

¹⁸⁸ Karlen, “The Scientific Overview,” 195.

boredom or out of sheer perversity,” such as excess masturbation.¹⁸⁹ Ellis also broke with Victorian sexual ideology by “liquidating distinctions” and sexual categories and sub-categories which were characteristic of nineteenth century sexology, in favor of understanding sexual deviations as “manifestations of a single psychological process, which he called erotic symbolism.”¹⁹⁰ Thus, we see how Ellis reformulated methods in sexology from his predecessors like Krafft-Ebing, by unifying and integrating the seemingly infinite amount of sexual categories into a more comprehensive viewpoint of the human person – a bringing together of all the various interdependent parts into a single agglomeration of parts.

Some of Ellis’ main arguments placed him firmly at odds with Freud, who argued that homosexuality was acquired as the result of the boy’s unresolved Oedipus complex, even though Freud himself theorized that all human beings are born inherently bisexual. Furthermore, what also placed Ellis at odds with Freudian theory was Freud’s belief that through psychoanalysis, the homosexual could be “cured,” even though Freud himself eventually deterred from this initial argument. Ellis, rather, believed that because homosexuality was not a disease, homosexuality was not curable and that most homosexuals did not even want to be “cured.” This contention was also in direct response to Krafft-Ebing, who tended to characterize homosexuality around the language of sickness, pathology and degeneration,¹⁹¹ even though he himself, as was mentioned in the previous chapter, wavered from his degeneracy/pathology argument in favor of the congenital anomaly argument near the end of his life. Through his own analysis of case studies, Ellis saw “anomaly” and “variation,” not pathology or degeneracy. Indeed, Ellis turned the dominant degeneracy argument of his day by “associating inversion with artistic and intellectual excellence.”¹⁹² Furthermore, Ellis stresses “the homosexual’s artistic and moral superiority ... capable of greater spiritual and artistic heights.”¹⁹³ This view is clearly aligned with that of Carpenter, who in “The Intermediate Sex,” stresses “the special spirituality,” “feminine traits,” and “bisexual temperament of homosexuals.”¹⁹⁴ For instance, throughout *Sexual Inversion*, Ellis describes homosexuals “of exceptional ability,” with “artistic aptitudes.”¹⁹⁵ Thus, for Ellis, “far from being degenerates, homosexuals turned out to be responsible for some of civilization’s finest achievements.”¹⁹⁶ Ellis advocated and sought to establish terminology that was based on a “continuum of sexual behavior” rather than sexual normality, in which case homosexuality was “a mere modification of a constitutional organization and a childhood inclination shared by all.”¹⁹⁷ This view is similar to the writings of Paglia close to a century later, who argues that homosexuality is inextricably intertwined with art and that anything which contributes to civilization ought to be fostered and preserved.

¹⁸⁹ Robinson, 31.

¹⁹⁰ Robinson, 49.

¹⁹¹ Robinson, 32.

¹⁹² Robinson, 32.

¹⁹³ Karlen, “The Apologists,” 222.

¹⁹⁴ Karlen, 220.

¹⁹⁵ Robinson, “Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory,” 33.

¹⁹⁶ Robinson, 33.

¹⁹⁷ Robinson, 34.

Methodology and Bernard Lonergan

Since a large part of this thesis is concerned with history and with providing a comprehensive historical overview of the etiology of homosexuality and how it has been conceived and understood throughout different periods of history since the nineteenth century, Lonergan's insights into history as that which "aims at expressing knowledge of history,"¹⁹⁸ is useful for elucidating the patterns and methods that are operative throughout each identifiable period in this present study. Lonergan first and foremost distinguishes the historian from the exegete, by stating that while the exegete's task is to "determine what was meant," ... "the historian envisages a quite different object. He is not content to understand what people meant. He wants to grasp what was going forward in particular groups at particular places and times."¹⁹⁹ Moreover, this requires interpretation on the part of the historian, whose knowing is "not just experiencing, but a compound of experiencing, understanding and judging."²⁰⁰ History therefore, for Lonergan, is not simply about "gathering and testing all available evidence"²⁰¹ like in chemistry or biology, but actually involves the full subjectivity of the human person, seeing as they too are products of history, biased and thus prone to error and misjudgment.

For Lonergan, history is "existential history,"²⁰² insofar as the historian is not simply engaged in the recounting of dates and decrees, but also in the interpretation of such data that "involves a number of interlocking discoveries that bring to light the significant issues and operative factors"²⁰³ that are ultimately constituted by the authenticity of the subject performing the operations of experiencing, understanding, judging and deciding. In the study and interpretation of history, the subject therefore ultimately comes to understand themselves as existential subject. Hence why the study of history, for Lonergan, should be *heuristic*, "for it brings to light the relevant data," all the while being *ecstatic*, "for it leads the inquirer out of his original perspectives and into the perspectives proper to his object."²⁰⁴ The study of history, for Lonergan, does not merely involve identifying the biases and errors of specific persons in history, but it also involves discovering such biases and errors within oneself as part of a larger dynamic of progress, decline and redemption.

It is to Lonergan's great credit that he placed the human subject at the center of his epistemological anthropology, for without the subjective dimension of the human person, objective historical knowledge simply would not be attainable. As Thomas J. McPartland writes,

¹⁹⁸ Lonergan, *MT*, 164.

¹⁹⁹ Lonergan, 168.

²⁰⁰ Lonergan, 169.

²⁰¹ Lonergan, 168.

²⁰² "I am simply attempting to portray the significance of the past in the present, and thereby to communicate what is meant by saying that man is a historical being. But being historical is the history that is written about. It may be named, if considered interiorly, an existential history – the living tradition which formed us and thereby brought us to the point where we began forming ourselves." See Lonergan, *MT*, 170.

²⁰³ Lonergan, 168.

²⁰⁴ Lonergan, 176.

The foundation of Lonergan's philosophy of history then, is not the activity of an abstract being or substance or of a transcendental ego; it is not some strange region of the globe to be apprehended by an esoteric metaphysics of knowledge; it is rather the concrete performance of concrete historical persons to be known by personal self-reflection; that is, it is one's own performance as an actor in the drama of history to be known by an exercise of self-scrutiny.²⁰⁵

Lonergan's philosophy of history is useful for the present study as it guides one toward ascertaining the trends, patterns and modes of development within a particular age. History, for Lonergan, is an ongoing process that involves revision that builds on previously established foundations without necessarily invalidating or substituting said foundations. New data places previous data and interpretations of such data in a new perspective, while shedding light on the interconnecting series of events in the context of a higher viewpoint. In that sense, the study of history should be *constructive*, "for the data that are selected are knotted together by the vast and intricate web of interconnecting links that cumulatively came to light as one's understanding progressed."²⁰⁶ Because we are historical subjects, any effective interpretation of history requires an encounter with the past, which can potentially affect a transformation for the subject in the present. Properly understanding an object of study requires that one, in a sense, 'becomes' that object and takes up the values and ideals and concerns associated with that particular object of study. One's basic horizon is then fundamentally altered, revised and transformed by way of encounter with numerous other horizons from the past.

The question then, is how is Lonergan's philosophy of history relevant to the present study? For one, it elucidates and sheds light on the procedures and operations performed by the psychologists and sexologists covered in each respective chapter. If we take the present chapter as an informative example, Lonergan's method reveals that the writers covered in this chapter grounded their insights on experience of the data, which also comprised of their own respective homosexual tendencies and/or identities. Against the backdrop of mid-nineteenth century etiological theories of homosexuality which stressed physiology in conjunction with pathology and disease, the above-mentioned writers arrived at different insights and conclusions which challenged previously held assumptions, via their own respective experiencing, understanding, judging and deciding. As McPartland writes,

If knowledge of self is conditioned by historical tradition, nevertheless the condition is not a total one ... If the person cannot completely leave behind the historical situation, nevertheless, the person can transcend tradition by exposing mistaken beliefs, grasping their assumptions, and tracing the historical origins and implications. If the person cannot exist without society, nevertheless society cannot exist without the creative insight and actions of persons. The person, then, as a transcending being, is the source of creativity in history and the source of critique.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ Thomas J. McPartland, "Lonergan's Philosophy of History: Ontological, Epistemological, and Speculative," *Revista Portuguesa De Filosofia* 63, no. 4 (2007): 965-66.

²⁰⁶ Lonergan, *MT*, 176-77.

²⁰⁷ Thomas J. McPartland, "Lonergan's Philosophy of History: Ontological, Epistemological, and Speculative," 970-71.

Indeed, the writers covered in this chapter exposed, what they saw, as an entire tradition filled with mistaken beliefs, biases, misunderstandings and prejudices about homosexuality. In being arguably some of the earliest proponents who argued in favor of normalizing and decriminalizing homosexuality, writers such as Hirschfeld, Carpenter, Ellis and Symonds were “the source of creativity and the source of critique” that McPartland describes in his analysis of the role of interpretation in Lonergan’s dialectical view of history.

Magnus Hirschfeld, Havelock Ellis, Edward Carpenter and John Addington Symonds are direct products of modernity in that, for them, the “true homosexual is one who he is aware of his sexuality as an individual.”²⁰⁸ This chapter has focused specifically on these four transitional figures who wavered and rebelled against the pathology/degeneracy arguments which had dominated nineteenth century sexology and psychiatry. Moreover, the fin-de-siècle represents a theoretical shift from the etiological theories which characterized the emergence of the scientific study of sexuality in the mid-nineteenth century. The arguments which writers such as Ellis and Hirschfeld put forward “symbolized a major shift in opinion among early twentieth-century sexual authorities.”²⁰⁹ In the case of Ellis for example, Robinson devotes his entire essay to discussing the “modernist tendencies” in his work, “the conceptual unity that informed his survey,” as well as “his intention to examine human sexuality in a systematic, theoretical fashion.”²¹⁰ Thus, they represent the divergent wing of fin-de-siècle etiological writings on homosexuality which essentially called for the creation of new paradigms for thinking about homosexuality and the etiology of sexuality more broadly construed. I have chosen to focus on these four writers in particular because a lot of their thinking and writing took place around the turn of the century, a key transitional moment for modernity. Their work ultimately embodies the tensions and anxieties associated with the transition into modernity, as well as the cultural, economic and technological advances which resulted and were a direct result of the birth of the modern individual. And so, just as Lonergan emphasizes that “a theology mediates between a cultural matrix and the significance and role of religion in that matrix,”²¹¹ the same can be said for the manner in which Hirschfeld, Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds conceived the study of homosexuality empirically as an ongoing process that mediates between the present culture and the significance of psychology and sexology within that culture. In other words, the economic, technological and socio-cultural developments which began to accelerate around the turn of the century were mirrored in the theoretical advances and shifts initiated by writers such as Ellis and Hirschfeld.

Ellis’ notable remark that “there can be no doubt that a peculiar amount of ignorance exists regarding the subject of sexual inversion,”²¹² speaks directly to the problem of bias and horizons in Lonergan’s understanding of history as ‘existential history.’ As McPartland writes, “basic horizon is essentially defined, bounded, limited, by the range of the pure question; it

²⁰⁸ Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” 39.

²⁰⁹ Robinson, “Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory,” 36.

²¹⁰ Robinson, 39.

²¹¹ Lonergan, *MT*, 3.

²¹² Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (Watford: University Press, 1897), v., quoted in Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” 61.

extends as far as does human questioning, questioning that regards both what is and what ought to be.”²¹³ And so, the historian’s research into and account of history is framed and limited by the questions they ask, but the range of questions asked is in turn limited by basic horizon, defined as the limits of one’s capacity for being attentive to *all* the relevant data, being intelligent in one’s interpretation of the data (involves asking all relevant questions which arise out of insight into the data), being reasonable in one’s judgment of which interpretation is most faithful to a fair and clear understanding of the data that abandons ideology in the quest for truth, and lastly, deciding on whether or not one will be responsible in acting in accordance with the interpretation deemed most true. The pure, unrestricted desire to know, therefore, drives our questioning, but the questions we ask in furtherance of the answers we seek are limited by the operative ranges of the persons we are, by the biases that impede our ability to be attentive and ask all the relevant questions; hence why, for Lonergan, we need to expand our horizons. This is precisely why history is an ongoing process, for “one cannot exclude the possibility that new sources of information will be uncovered and that they will affect subsequent understanding and judgment.”²¹⁴ There is synergy between subject and object: we evolve and grow and develop just as our interpretation and understanding of the data shifts, expands and develops, thus placing the understanding we thought to have permanently achieved in light of a new perspective.²¹⁵ Therefore, the pure desire to know, driven by the ‘eros’ of the human spirit, is central to Lonergan’s philosophy of history because it places the human subject as the foundation of ethics, both as historical subject and as one who writes and makes history. Because the bulk of this thesis comprises of a historical overview of the etiology of homosexuality, Lonergan’s writings on history, particularly the methods, practices and procedures deployed in the interpretation and writing of history, illuminate the practices and procedures deployed in this present study. In writing a historical overview, all the while drawing on methods and procedures to be deployed in the writing of such history, the present study is therefore just as much about the historical object of study as it is about the existential subject who is a product of such history, and whose own interpretation of such history is itself constitutive of that ongoing process of writing history.

Conclusion

The goal of this chapter has also been to highlight the significance of the “intermediate sex,” or “third sex.” The “intermediate sex” or “third sex” is emblematic of late nineteenth century’s increasing fascination with the categorization of the body via sexual performance and sexual acts.²¹⁶ It was believed by sexologists at the time that the nature of the human body could be understood via the study of sexual acts and the subsequent categorization of such acts as a marker of bodily identity. As Coleman writes, the writers mentioned in this chapter “proffered the existence of an individual that moved beyond the assumptions of a universal male/female body and the masculine/feminine gender. This individual was characterized by his/her homosexual behavior.”²¹⁷ The proliferation of such a concept is key within the study of the

²¹³ McPartland, “Lonergan's Philosophy of History: Ontological, Epistemological, and Speculative,” 976.

²¹⁴ Lonergan, *MT*, 179.

²¹⁵ Lonergan, 179.

²¹⁶ Coleman, “‘Surely it Deserves a Name:’ Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds,” 61.

²¹⁷ Coleman, 62.

etiology of homosexuality, as it represents a pendulum swing in the opposite direction of the physiology/pathology/criminality continuum associated with the nineteenth century emergence of the scientific study of sexuality. Writers such as Hirschfeld, Carpenter and Symonds were therefore invested in normalizing homosexuality via protecting and even idealizing and exulting the notion of the “true” homosexual, as opposed to its “degenerate” counterpart. Doing so required the creation of a separate category beyond male/female, which both Carpenter and Symonds trace back to the writings of Ulrichs and his concept of the “Urning” predicated on the belief that male and female co-existed within the homosexual in the form of a female soul in a male body. By regarding the problem of inversion *psychologically* rather than physiologically, Ulrichs transitions from body to psyche/mind as the source for understanding sexual orientation, thereby attaining “a greater measure of intelligibility in light of these radical horizon shifts.”²¹⁸ Lastly, such developments foreshadowed psychoanalysis and by extension, constituted a pivotal moment in the emergence and consolidation of sexual modernism, resulting in a broadening of the parameters for studies in the etiology of sexuality that still reverberate with us today.

²¹⁸ Thomas J. McPartland, “Lonergan’s Philosophy of History: Ontological, Epistemological, and Speculative,” 983.

Chapter 3: Homosexuality in the Twentieth Century

Introduction

In the previous chapter, we noted how the *fin-de-siècle* saw “a major transformation in sexual theory,”²¹⁹ particularly through the writings of Magnus Hirschfeld, Edward Carpenter, John Addington Symonds and Havelock Ellis. Sexual modernism, embodied in such figures, essentially challenged the scientific-medical models of mid-nineteenth century psychiatry and sexology, which itself represented a reaction against religious and theological orthodoxy, and instead pushed for the normalization and de-criminalization of homosexuality. Furthermore, we began to see the emergence of etiological models of homosexuality, which now stressed psychology rather than physiology as the source of sexual orientation. John Addington Symonds and Edward Carpenter, for example, trace their own thought to the theories of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, whose notion of the Urning as a female soul in a male body sought to provide an all-encompassing etiological theory predicated on biological and spiritual factors. Indeed, the emergence of sexual modernism around the *fin-de-siècle* continued to see an increased interest and preoccupation with androgyny and hermaphroditism; the notion of “the intermediate sex” or “third sex” – a creature that was anatomically male yet whose psyche/soul was female – was a direct by-product of this shift in sexual attitudes at the turn of the century.

In the present chapter, we shall trace the development of the etiology of homosexuality throughout the twentieth century, the major trends and patterns, as well as conflicts, disputes, tensions and resolutions, all culminating in the thought and writings of two seminal thinkers on the subject of homosexuality: André Guindon and Camille Paglia. As will be demonstrated, the advent of psychoanalysis and Freud’s pioneering work in the study of sexuality, initiated a paradigm shift which placed into doubt all of the previous etiological models that have been covered thus far. As the scientific study of sex developed throughout the nineteenth century, there was an increasing recognition and realization of the broad range and diversity of sexual desire and expression, in large part due to shifting attitudes toward sexual morality after the Enlightenment into the modern era, as well as the increasingly rapid dissemination of medical studies and texts, such as those by Krafft-Ebing and Moll, who have been credited for making sexual variance imaginable. This recognition and realization of sexual difference and sexual diversity resulted in attempts at understanding the origins of sexual orientation. But with Freud and psychoanalysis, a much more dynamic and potent understanding of the etiology of homosexuality emerges which does away with such concepts as the “third sex” and “psychic hermaphroditism.” Subsequent figures however, such as Irving Bieber and Edmund Bergler, misinterpreted and misappropriated Freud’s work in the service of their negative portrayals of homosexuality, particularly in the 1950’s when ideal notions of the nuclear family were reinforced in reaction to the turbulence and displacement caused by the Second World War. The reactionary conservatism of the 1950’s however, would equally be met by strong counter-reactions in the 1960’s, culminating in the civil rights movements, particularly and for the purposes of the present study, the gay liberation movement. Polarity on the subject became much more pronounced, which in turn gave way to a multitude of diverse research and writing on the etiology of homosexuality, especially with advances in psychology, sociology, anthropology and

²¹⁹ Paul A. Robinson, “Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory,” 27.

science. Furthermore, this chapter provides a summary and analysis of the writings of Andre Guindon and Camille Paglia, both of whom offer a range of balanced perspectives on homosexuality and its etiology. While Guindon approaches the subject from the lens of moral theology and ethics, Paglia offers a holistic analysis that integrates research on the subject from a multitude of disciplines ranging from biology to anthropology, literature and the arts. Paglia's writings on the subject are ultimately a culmination of the broad and diverse range of theories and models covered in this study thus far. Lastly, the application of Lonergan's method in this particular historical context sheds light on not only the operations and tasks performed by Freud, Bieber and others, but also the major trends and patterns of development, as well as conflicts, disputes, tensions and resolutions. This in turn allows us to characterize a particular historical period and that historical period's interrelation with other historical periods, as well as how method is central to understanding history from a particular vantage point.

Freud and Homosexuality

A comprehensive overview of the etiology of homosexuality would not be complete without attention given to Freud's pioneering work in the fields of sexology and psychology. Freud's contributions to the study of homosexuality initiated both a break from the past as well as continuity, paying homage to the works of his predecessors such as Krafft-Ebing, Moll and Hirschfeld, while rejecting concepts of degeneracy, the idea of innate homosexuality and psychic hermaphroditism,²²⁰ all of which dominated nineteenth century scientific views on homosexuality. As Karlen writes, "Freud's writings do not present a full, final theory of homosexuality, but they do sketch out a new picture of its origin and nature quite different from anything before it."²²¹ Sara Flanders et al. maintain that by locating homosexuality "within an ever-widening, but also changing and developing frame," Freud "has offered a rich and varied foundation for further thinking on the subject."²²² Their further claim that "as Freud's interests change and develop over a lifetime of revolutionary intellectual and clinical pursuits, the subject of homosexuality appears frequently in his writing, informing and reflexively being informed by different discoveries, different clinical problems," is all too reminiscent of Lonergan's epistemological anthropology which is partly predicated on the notion that encounter with ever-new and expanding data revises and modifies previously held assumptions and truths. Hence, the existential dimension in the attainment of knowledge, understanding and truth is ever-present in Lonergan as he also understood the dynamic interplay between subject and the text, and that just as how one's understanding of the text could be altered and revised according to new data and insights, so too could that new and acquired understanding initiate a drama of change within the subject themselves. The case for that is evident in Freud's research and output on the subject of homosexuality.

²²⁰ Florence Tamagne, "Awakening: Working to Construct a Homosexual Identity," in *A History of Homosexuality in Europe: Berlin, London, Paris, 1919-1939* (New York: Algora Publishing, 2006), 159-160.

²²¹ Arno Karlen, "The Age of Irony," in *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1971), 258-268.

²²² Sara Flanders et al., "On the Subject of Homosexuality: What Freud Said," *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 97 (2016): 933-950, doi: 10.1111/1745-8315.12520.

Before diving into an overview of Freud’s theory however, it is critical to understand the significance of method in Freud’s work. As Florence Tamagne notes, “first of all is the importance of method: all conclusions are drawn from interviews with patients; this process was already used by other doctors, but Freud systematized it and transformed it by the practice of analysis.”²²³ Any complex phenomena could be known, Freud believed, by uncovering the inner workings of the unconscious, that which is concealed from our own conscious minds, through the practice of psychoanalysis, which “brought about a major shift in the concepts, the approach, and the way of thinking about homosexuality; it created a shock by its method as well by its conclusions.”²²⁴ As we have already seen with Lonergan in particular, method is all-encompassing, a pre-requisite for arriving at true knowledge of a particular subject matter. While his thinking on the subject is centered around a particular theological context, we have also seen how the study of method is open and dynamic rather than static. This dynamism and flexibility inherent within method itself are noted by Lonergan early on in *Method in Theology*, where he states that a “contemporary method” would not be solely limited to theology, but would rather be applicable “in the context of modern science, modern scholarship, modern philosophy, of historicity, collective practicality and co-responsibility.”²²⁵ Outlining and elaborating upon “the various clusters of operations to be performed”²²⁶ by the multitude of diverse thinkers throughout this present study reveals a much more dynamic structure of cognitive, moral and existential import. As Patrick Brennan writes in his study of Lonergan’s cognitional method, “the final criterion of all our judging, deciding and doing is found not ‘out there,’ but within our rational self-consciousness ... It is our primordial desire to know, manifested in human intelligence as the pure question, that is our guide and measure.”²²⁷ The tasks and operations performed by notable figures such as Krafft-Ebing, Ulrichs and Ellis for example, have revealed the specific historical contexts in which they were operating and navigating, the theories and ideas set forth by predecessors and contemporaries that they were grappling and contending with, the specific historical patterns of development and conflict, progress and decline, transcendence and integration and meaning and value. Returning to Freud in particular, his own pioneering insights and method reveal a new and much more dynamic approach to exploring the nature of reality, one that is predicated on the scientific method of empirical observation on the one hand, and the study of the mind, or more specifically the unconscious, that which is “unobservable” and “inaccessible to consciousness,”²²⁸ on the other.

Up until now we have seen how the study of homosexuality as a category of sexual perversions evolved from one focused primarily around the law and criminal acts (sodomy was punishable by law for instance) to the constitution of a sexual identity defined by such acts or perversions²²⁹ as they were characterized by psychiatrists who became increasingly interested in the study of human sexuality from a medical vantage point. The shift from criminality to

²²³ Tamagne, “Awakening: Working to Construct a Homosexual Identity,” 160.

²²⁴ Tamagne, 159.

²²⁵ Lonergan, *MT*, 3.

²²⁶ Lonergan, 4.

²²⁷ Patrick McKinley Brennan, “Asking the Right Questions: Harnessing the Insights of Bernard Lonergan for the Rule of Law,” *Journal of Law and Religion* 21, no. 1 (2005): 3.

²²⁸ M. Guy Thompson, *The Truth about Freud’s Technique: The Encounter with the Real* (New York: New York University Press, 1994), 2.

²²⁹ Tamagne, “Awakening: Working to Construct a Homosexual Identity,” 153.

psychiatry meant that the homosexual was now a victim of such factors as heredity, climate or masturbation who required treatment under the guise of mental illness.²³⁰ This was a time when theories of degeneracy and models of disease dominated the scientific study of homosexuality,²³¹ and while many theorists and practitioners insisted on the inborn and “innate”²³² character of homosexuality, the etiological theories put forth during this period were generally limited to categorizations of different types of homosexuals based on symptoms²³³ and classification models, as well as often abstract philosophical premises and hypotheses left untested. Nonetheless, the result was a scientific boom in the medical study of homosexuality, centered around the attempt at understanding the complex nature of homosexuality in etiological terms rather than through religious and criminal terms. This shift was a product of the Enlightenment and the emergence of modernity in the late eighteenth century, where questions of the individual took center stage; the birth of the scientific method meant a rethinking of how knowledge and meaning could be attained in an increasingly industrialized and capitalistic world. Furthermore, the steady publication of medical studies and texts gave way to diverse camps and schools of thought, doctrinal conflicts were resolved and consolidated in foundations, while others were taken up by a new generation of scholars who were products of preceding generations but who also became more sympathetic to homosexuality, even exalting and idealizing the special gifts they saw as features of the homosexual. It is this tradition that Freud inherited; while limited and “narrow,”²³⁴ it nonetheless served as the foundation for the pioneering contributions he made to the study of psychology and human sexuality that still reverberate today.

Freud, along with many others, was unsatisfied with the answers that had been provided by previous scientific studies on the etiology of homosexuality. As Karren points out, for Freud, “the question of innate and acquired homosexuality, which had dominated thought on the subject for decades, was a waste of time. Theories about psychic hermaphroditism remained oversimplified guesses, unsupported by medical evidence. Homosexuality was probably produced by environment working on some unknown degree of constitutional propensity.”²³⁵ Homosexuality, according to Freud, was no longer an illness or pathology but rather “a variation of the sexual function.”²³⁶ whose etiology he attributed to a disruption of the child’s psychosexual development, all of which for the most part takes place within the recesses of the unconscious. Furthermore, one of the major shifts in thinking about homosexuality came from Freud’s claim that “the homosexual is neither a criminal nor a congenital mental patient, he is a neurotic,”²³⁷ which signals a clear break and departure from many of the scientific writings he inherited. Although Freud’s theories have arguably been discredited and disregarded, it is also important to recognize that in light of the “narrow”²³⁸ and limited tradition he inherited, Freud offers a much more dynamic, complex and nuanced picture of the etiology of homosexuality

²³⁰ Tamagne, 153.

²³¹ Tamagne, 154.

²³² Tamagne, 154.

²³³ Tamagne, 153.

²³⁴ Tamagne, 154.

²³⁵ Karlen, “The Age of Irony,” 264.

²³⁶ Sigmund Freud, “Letter to an American Mother,” *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 107 (1951): <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/pwh/freud1.asp>.

²³⁷ Tamagne, “Awakening: Working to Construct a Homosexual Identity,” 159, 160.

²³⁸ Tamagne, 154.

which attempts to trace the consolidation of a sexual identity back to childhood and the interaction of the child with their familial and external environment. Indeed, Flanders et al. note that “every form of adult human sexuality is the product of a complex evolution, developing over time, beginning in earliest infancy, in the first relation with the mother. The understanding of the potential for complexity in this wide frame is made richer, deeper, more certain over the years of study.”²³⁹ Our sexual identity is molded and shaped by unconscious forces beyond our rational control, and certainly, beyond the scope of what the nineteenth century psychiatrists and sexologists were attempting to verify, corroborate and substantiate in their own diagnostic models of pathology, illness and disease.

Freud was a sexual pioneer who helped liberate sexuality from the confines of Victorian sexual orthodoxy by claiming, for instance, that homosexuality can be traced back to “the constitutional bisexuality of all human beings,”²⁴⁰ and that homosexuality was neither illness or perversion but rather a *variation* of the heterosexual norm. For Freud, one is not born ‘homosexual’ just as one is not born ‘heterosexual.’ Freud defines homosexuality as a “variation of the sexual function produced by a certain arrest of sexual development.”²⁴¹ The “arrest of sexual development” is tied to the Oedipus complex, something which Freud thought was universally applicable to all children, hence why he also thought that “the route to adult heterosexuality is complex, full of hurdles ... enforced, sometimes brutally, by the demands of civilization, the pressure to reproduce essential to the continuity of society. Without social pressure, he confirms, there would be much more homosexuality.”²⁴² As will be demonstrated with Camille Paglia, who draws heavily on Freud in her own etiological theory, homosexuality is not only a variation of nature’s law, but also a form of rebellion against such pressure, even though the biological imperative to procreate, itself rooted in nature, heavily draws the two sexes together.

A core feature of Freud’s theory of homosexuality is the Oedipus complex. Typically, what occurs throughout the Oedipus complex is that the boy unconsciously desires his mother, while fearing castration from his father for his ‘perverted’ desires. However, the boy’s bisexual nature comes into play when beneath his fear and hatred of his father there is also “feminine urges for his father ... A boy’s first homosexual love is his father, as a countercurrent to his Oedipal desire for his mother.”²⁴³ This is concurrent with another of Freud’s claims that we “all have been homosexual in infancy and childhood,” and that “homosexuality lives on in the unconscious life of the adult.”²⁴⁴ Moreover, normal sexual development has it that the boy represses his desires for his mother, which eventually develops into a healthy desire for other women, all the while identifying with the father as his masculine role model. Hence, for Freud, the shadow of the mother looms over men’s attraction to and selection of a future female

²³⁹ Flanders et al., “On the Subject of Homosexuality: What Freud Said,” 933-34.

²⁴⁰ Sigmund Freud, *An Autobiographical Study* (London: Hogarth Press, 1935): 38.

²⁴¹ Freud, “Letter to an American Mother,” 787.

²⁴² Flanders et al., “On the Subject of Homosexuality: What Freud Said,” 949.

²⁴³ Karlen, “The Age of Irony,” 265.

²⁴⁴ Flanders et al., “On the Subject of Homosexuality: What Freud Said,” 949.

partner;²⁴⁵ in other words, men unconsciously select women who are a reflection of their own mothers. However, if the boy fails to resolve this conflict for any multitude of reasons, he risks identifying with his mother and never truly breaking free from a half-eroticized relationship which can ultimately block him from adult contacts with other women: “If a boy is constitutionally more feminine and passive than is normal, said Freud, and the Oedipal conflict is intense, he will retain this inverted Oedipal crush and become a homosexual,”²⁴⁶ with the implied connotation that adult contacts with other women would be akin to incest. Normal sexual development “ends with an identification with one parent, taking the other, usually the other sex, as an object,”²⁴⁷ yet by identifying with the mother, the boy in turn takes on his mother’s tastes and values and really internalizes her as a representation of the feminine as part of his own identity. In short, for Freud, the outcome of the Oedipus complex is ultimately dependent on the degree to which the *masculine* and *feminine* are dominant in the boy and the degree to which he identifies with one parent at the expense of the other parent.²⁴⁸

Another core feature of Freud’s theory of homosexuality is the concept of narcissism. For Freud, homosexuality and object choice are intimately related, which broadly encompass more broader questions of identity.²⁴⁹ The homosexual’s object choice is ultimately narcissistic in nature according to Freud, rooted primarily in “identification with the mother”²⁵⁰ as symbolic of the all-powerful feminine and maternal element. The homosexual in turn loves other men the way his mother loved him: “A too intense, overwhelming attachment is maintained and yet ameliorated by taking as an object a lover based on the self, while the subject identifies with the caring but overwhelming and powerful mother.”²⁵¹ The narcissistic object choice, moreover, is predicated on the manner by which the homosexual loves another the way he is loved as ultimately a reflection of himself. The boy, as Karen points out, ultimately “seeks in other boys an idealized image of himself, to love as he wants his mother or father to love him. In homosexual attraction and love-making, the narcissistic male projects himself into another male and gives to him the mother-love he wants for himself.”²⁵² As will be demonstrated with Guindon and his notion of the mirror-image in homosexual formation, the homosexual seeks out in other men what is lacking with himself in terms of a compromised masculinity, thereby always pursuing an elusive transcendent other in the form of a masculine ideal, that which he can never fully have.

²⁴⁵ Camille Paglia’s theory of the etiology of homosexuality draws extensively on Freudian thought and can be said to be almost entirely theoretically predicated on the foundations Freud set for future studies into the origins of homosexuality. Paglia echoes this insight in particular, on *The Charlie Rose Show* back in 1992, when she made the claim that “heterosexual men are closer to women as they are in essence mating with the shadow of their mothers. The shadow of their mothers is falling over their wives, but gay men are making the most complete break from their mothers, so to me, gay men are ultimately more masculine than straight men. It is one of my peculiar opinions, I have to admit.” For the full interview, see miedqy0, “Camille Paglia 1992 Interview,” *YouTube* video, 24:20, August 12, 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcvuqHZcICE&t=624s>.

²⁴⁶ Karlen, “The Age of Irony,” 265.

²⁴⁷ Flanders et al., “On the Subject of Homosexuality: What Freud Said,” 945, 946.

²⁴⁸ Flanders et al., 945.

²⁴⁹ Flanders et al., 938.

²⁵⁰ Flanders et al., 939.

²⁵¹ Flanders et al., 939.

²⁵² Karen, “The Age of Irony,” 265.

For Freud, a multi-varied analysis of homosexuality demonstrates that there are both biological and environmental forces at play, and the interaction between both forces ultimately determines the course which the child's sexual orientation will take. And yet Freud also saw variation and diversity and ambiguity; he understood that sexuality was a much more complex process that entailed a continuum of sexual difference and expression. Where Freud was particularly controversial and revolutionary was his contention that there exists a degree of homosexual potential within every human being and that more attention needed to be paid on the developmental factors that contributed to both heterosexuality and homosexuality. But as Freud's theories came to be widely disseminated throughout North America, his attitude and conclusions about homosexuality were ultimately distorted in the service of political and religious ends.

Heterosexual Anxiety: Irving Bieber

Before delving into Bieber's findings, it is important to first situate Bieber within the proper historical context within which he was operating. As Stephen Vider and David S. Byers write, "throughout the 1960's, psychiatrists Irving Bieber and Charles Socarides were regularly quoted in newspapers and magazines, arguing that homosexual desire was a form of psychosocial maladjustment, resulting from childhood."²⁵³ Although Bieber's argument demonstrates key parallels with Freudian thought, it is equally important to keep in mind that Freud's own thinking developed on this matter, and that by 1935, he himself admitted that homosexuality was not an illness and all attempts at treatment should be strongly discouraged.²⁵⁴ However, by the 1950's, Freud's "theories were widely misappropriated by conservative Americans and émigré psychiatrists vested in reaffirming the heterosexual, breadwinner-housemaker household in the wake of World War II."²⁵⁵ In turn, the popularization of behavioral therapies throughout the 1960's and 1970's resulted in new attempts at treating homosexuality as a neurotic disorder, in the form of "aversion" therapies, such as hormonal medication, electric shocks and even lobotomy. One such key figure was Dr. Wilhelm Stekel, who actually studied under Freud, but felt that Freud's method of treatment was limited in its range and scope. Although Stekel agreed with Freud that "everyone was bisexual and could be conditioned depending on one's own personal and psychological experiences," he ultimately went against Freud by terming homosexuality as an "illness," rather than a "congenital condition."²⁵⁶

The language of pathology from the nineteenth century never really left; it simply took new form and expression in a different historical context a century later. From that perspective then, "history moves in cycles"²⁵⁷ as Paglia maintains, in that ideas come and go and return with a force and vengeance in reaction to opposing viewpoints within a culture. For example, the civil rights movement of the 1960's was equally met with opposing reactionary views from

²⁵³ Stephen Vider and David S. Byers, "A Half-Century of Conflict Over Attempts to 'Cure' Gay People," *TIME*, February 12, 2015, <https://time.com/3705745/history-therapy-hadden/>.

²⁵⁴ Vider and Byers, para. 2.

²⁵⁵ Stephen Vider and David S. Byers, para. 2.

²⁵⁶ Jonathan Barrett, "Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy," *Psi Sigma Siren*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2014): 4-14, https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=psi_sigma_siren.

²⁵⁷ Camille Paglia, "Introduction," in *Free Women, Free Men: Sex, Gender Feminism* (New York: Vintage Books, 2017), ix.

conservatives, in which pathology arguments were only reinforced. Even prior to the 1960's however, the 1950's saw the rise of a psychoanalytic campaign predicated on the belief that homosexuality can be cured as a "pathological disease."²⁵⁸ The campaign was primarily set off by the well-known psychiatrist Dr. Edmund Bergler, who in his widely popular 1957 book *Homosexual: Disease or Way of Life?* refers to homosexuality as a "neurotic distortion of the personality,"²⁵⁹ and to homosexuals as "sick people requiring medical help."²⁶⁰ Although he shared some of the same methodological principles as Freud in terms of "looking at the inner psyche and psychoanalyzing his patients' desires and childhoods,"²⁶¹ Bergler ultimately disagreed with Freud's conclusions regarding the incurability of homosexuals. Moreover, Bergler's methods instead revolved around reinforcing the guilt which he perceived all homosexuals carried with them for indulging in same-sex pleasures: "mobilization of this guilt, and placing it where it genetically belongs, provides the vehicle for therapeutic changes in psychiatric treatment."²⁶² Bergler's methods in turn became widespread and common practice among psychiatrists in the late 1950's,²⁶³ and would ultimately set the tone for the ways in which homosexuality would be studied and analyzed within psychiatric and medical discourse throughout the 1960's and 1970's. The Bergler case is therefore one of many examples which showcase the widespread misappropriation of Freud's thought during this time. As Barrett points out, "Bergler had used the psychological methods created by Freud in an attempt to 'fix' homosexuals, which Freud stated was not possible."²⁶⁴

By the 1950's, the notion of the 'nuclear family' came to have great appeal to Americans. This was in large part due to the social and economic fallout of World War II. During the 1920's however, American society had undergone a transformation in terms of gender roles and sexuality.²⁶⁵ As Taylor Gilkison writes, "women were thinking and acting much more independently, which in turn, caused massive uproar. They challenged the Victorian conception of sexuality and they challenged the traditional roles that both men and women had previously enjoyed"²⁶⁶ In short, the period after World War I was marked by a transgression against fixed gender roles in favor of sexual freedom and liberation in the context of the ongoing "transformation of American culture and the development of a completely different social structure."²⁶⁷ But after the fallout of the Second World War, there was a sense in which people simply wanted a return to normalcy and fixed social order. This resulted in the re-polarization of gender roles as well as a re-appraisal of conservative sexual values. Furthermore, homosexuality

²⁵⁸ Barrett, 7.

²⁵⁹ Edmund Bergler, *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life?* (New York: Hill and Wang Inc., 1957) 9.

²⁶⁰ Bergler, 25.

²⁶¹ Barrett, "Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy," 8.

²⁶² Edmund Bergler, *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life*, 27.

²⁶³ Barrett, "Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy," 8.

²⁶⁴ Barrett, 8.

²⁶⁵ Taylor Gilkison, "The Transformation of Gender and Sexuality in 1920's America: A Literary Interpretation," *Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects*, Paper 682 (2017): 1-65, https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses/682/.

²⁶⁶ Gilkison, 61

²⁶⁷ Gilkison, 64.

was seen as threatening that very nuclear structure, hence the growing research and information by psychiatrists and doctors “on the illness that homosexuality could cause; they feared that the family structure was at stake and needed to be analyzed and studied to see how homosexuality had developed in a family setting.”²⁶⁸ This is where Bieber comes into play, whose views on psychoanalysts’ ability to cure homosexuals became the norm and which dominated psychiatry for at least a decade.

A large portion of Arno Karlen’s chapter “Cure or Illusion”²⁶⁹ is devoted to an overview of Irving Bieber’s seminal 1962 statistical psychodynamic study entitled *Homosexuality*. In 1952 Bieber and other members of the Society of Medical Psychoanalysts formed a research committee to study male homosexuality. They acquired seventy colleagues to answer questionnaires about homosexual patients in comparison to heterosexual cases. After a decade of expanding and reshaping and re-administering the questionnaires, Bieber obtained data on 106 homosexuals and 100 comparisons. Karlen’s summary of Bieber’s work and conclusions place into clearer focus many of the causation factors for homosexuality which lean more toward a social causation model of sexuality. As Paglia notes, virtually all of the major schools of psychoanalysis that have ruled from the Thirties to the present have stressed “the socialization of identity. These movements were a turn away from the earlier medical orientation of psychoanalysis, as it was established by Freud, who emerged from European hard science of the late nineteenth century.”²⁷⁰ While the Fifties and the Sixties in particular were characterized by the socialization and behaviorist hypotheses,²⁷¹ the Seventies and Eighties saw “a worldwide resurgence of research into hormones, comparative anatomy, genetics, fetal development, and brain chemistry, and their relation to sex differences and even personality traits.”²⁷² Several insights Bieber arrived at through his research and analysis was the crucial significance of the family drama in playing a major role in determining sexual orientation. The people we are attracted to and fall in love with later in life are symptomatic of that initial ‘family romance.’ In the case of male homosexuality, Bieber noticed a recurring pattern between an overbearing, stifling mother and an emotionally distant father. In this case, the mother stuns the boy’s psychosocial growth by making him her confidant and acts out a romance she feels is lacking in her own marriage. The son is in turn imbued with anti-sexual attitudes, bound hopelessly between his mother’s seductiveness and rigid restrictions. According to Barrett, Bieber “concluded that homosexuals were conditioned from an early age because of the fear and disgust they felt towards the opposite sex and this could have been influenced from the behavior of the

²⁶⁸ Barrett, “Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy,” 9.

²⁶⁹ Arno Karlen. “Cure or Illusion,” in *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, (New York, W.W. Norton & Company, 1971), 572-606.

²⁷⁰ Paglia, “Junk bonds and Corporate Raiders,” 143.

²⁷¹ A well-known example would be the issue of left- vs. right-handedness. Well-meaning behaviorists in the 1940’s and 1950’s attempted to ‘convert’ left-handed children, which ultimately proved largely unsuccessful. The major consensus today is that left- vs. right-handedness is “an innate property of an individual determined by brain-wiring.” Likewise, social constructivists and behaviorists during this time, also stressed the socialization of homosexuality, and that the homosexual could be converted back to heterosexuality through social training and behavioural therapy.

²⁷² Paglia, “Junk Bonds and Corporate Raiders,” 153.

parents.”²⁷³ Bieber wanted homosexuality to be openly discussed, especially within a family setting; just as he felt that the parents’ behavior and family dynamic were somewhat to blame, he also felt that it was the parents’ responsibility to identify signs of “pre-homosexuality” in their children and immediately seek treatment before “the sexual pattern was firmly integrated into the child’s behavior.”²⁷⁴ Moreover, just like Bergler, Bieber saw tremendous value in Freud’s theories of “psychoanalyzing the family of the homosexual to understand how they think and act, but he disregarded Freud’s conclusions that continuing treatment on homosexuals would be unsuccessful.”²⁷⁵ It would be a common theme amongst Bergler and Bieber, as well as others within the psychological community, to utilize Freud’s theories rather inconsistently, appropriating only what they felt would help advance their own respective conclusions, while discarding Freud’s own.

Although Bieber’s “study helped bring candor to the discussion of homosexuality,”²⁷⁶ many of the psychiatric methods introduced in the 1930’s and 1940’s were still being applied to “cure” homosexuals,²⁷⁷ in large part due to the views of psychoanalysts like Bergler and Bieber. And even when, in 1973, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of psychiatric disorders, Bieber remained steadfast in his beliefs, stating “a homosexual is a person whose heterosexual function is crippled, like the legs of a polio victim.”²⁷⁸ Although Bieber’s views have now been discredited since the 1970’s, his insistence, like others who have preceded him, on “disruptions in family relationships”²⁷⁹ and the psychodynamics of the child’s relationship to mother and father harkens back to Paglia’s observations about the lack of sophistication of analysis in today’s highly politicized culture. Although Bieber’s conclusions no doubt propagated much of the harm and injustice directed at homosexuals during that time, his and others’ emphasis on family history and childhood experiences in the formation of sexual identity more generally are valid in light of a social developmental model of homosexual identity. Karlen here notes that “Bieber, like many psychiatrists before him, pointed out that when homosexuals are exposed to heterosexual stimuli, they often feel acute anxiety and immediately seek a homosexual partner – reliving their reaction to a mother who incited sexuality but threatened rejection if it were expressed.”²⁸⁰ This insight relates, for example, to Gilbert Hamilton’s claim that homosexuality is a defense against incest.²⁸¹ For Gilbert Hamilton, while homosexual tendencies are a normal component of human sexuality, they are

10. ²⁷³ Barrett, *Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy*,

²⁷⁴ Barrett, 10.

²⁷⁵ Barrett, 10.

²⁷⁶ Steven Lee Myers, “Irving Bieber, a Psychoanalyst Who Studied Homosexuality, Dies,” *The New York Times*, August 28, 1991, <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/08/28/nyregion/irving-bieber-80-a-psychoanalyst-who-studied-homosexuality-dies.html>.

11. ²⁷⁷ Barrett, “Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy,”

²⁷⁸ Myers, “Irving Bieber, a Psychoanalyst Who Studied Homosexuality, Dies,” para. 6.

²⁷⁹ Myers, para. 5.

²⁸⁰ Karlen, “Cure or Illusion,” 573.

²⁸¹ Gilbert Van Tassel Hamilton. “Defensive Homosexuality: Homosexuality as a Defense Against Incest,” in *Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach*, edited by Donald Webster Cory, (New York, The Julian Press Inc, 1956), 368.

“overdeveloped as a defense against incest toward the end of infancy by males who have been too erotically loved by their mothers or mother surrogates.”²⁸² It is important here to analyze the role that repressed heterosexual impulses play, according to Hamilton, in the emotional narcissism of the homosexual. Hamilton quotes Freud who in turn refers to Fenichel’s conclusion that “the male invert who is exclusively homosexual, unconsciously longs for heterosexual relations.”²⁸³ There was the belief that the heterosexual aspect of the homosexual was repressed, and therefore needed to be brought to the surface and properly integrated into normal psychosexual functioning. Furthermore, Bieber’s insights regarding the mother’s overprotectiveness and indulgence coincided with his discovery of the “deep, unremitting pathology on the father’s part.”²⁸⁴ Often the father was detached and lacked a strong paternal presence that would protect the child from destructive maternal influences. Other cases can be seen where instead of doing nothing while “their wives tied the boys to them in submission and guilt,” the detached fathers were “openly hostile, rejecting and minimizing.”²⁸⁵ In other words, the boy is crushed under the weight of the masculine influence, in turn provoking him to seek safety by siding with the mother, thereby leading to further identification with her.

André Guindon and Camille Paglia

This next section traces the development of both André Guindon and Camille Paglia’s theories on the etiology of homosexuality. Both Guindon and Paglia have made tremendously valuable contributions to the study of homosexuality that not only synthesizes the vast wealth of historical data at our disposal, but also integrates the fields of theology, ethics, literature, art and spirituality. The inclusion of both Paglia and Guindon represents the culmination of the various etiological theories covered throughout this study. In many respects then, sexual modernity culminates in both the emergence of Paglia and Guindon, both of whom absorbed and integrated the dynamic tradition of the scientific study of sex beginning in the nineteenth century. While Guindon’s methodological approach is grounded in his experiences as a Catholic theologian and professor of Christian Ethics writing in direct response to traditional doctrines of the Church on matters of sexuality, Paglia is writing from the perspective of a sexual dissident yet mainstream cultural philosopher and self-proclaimed anti-feminist feminist who renewed and re-invented the image of the intellectual celebrity in the tradition of Marshall McLuhan and Susan Sontag. Both were writing near the end of the twentieth century and represent, in many instances, dissident challenges to political and religious conservatism, as well as, in some instances, far-left liberalism. Just as Guindon’s task in *The Sexual Creators* is to offer “a unified vision of the human being,”²⁸⁶ so too does the goal of this chapter and project as a whole. Before the emergence of the scientific study of sex, homosexuality and sexuality as a whole for that matter,

²⁸² Hamilton, 368.

²⁸³ Hamilton, 367.

²⁸⁴ Karlen, 574.

²⁸⁵ Karlen, 574.

²⁸⁶ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Note on the Book by Fr. André Guindon, O.M.I. *The Sexual Creators: An Ethical Proposal for Concerned Christians*,” (University Press of America: Lanham-New York-London, 1992), https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19920131_book-guindon_en.html.

were treated as isolated instances rather than understood as dimensions of human identity in a much more multi-faceted way. Therefore, this “unified vision of the human being”²⁸⁷ which Guindon refers to really is the direct result of the emergence of sexual modernism in the nineteenth century, whereby sexuality came to be more integrated into a more nuanced and multi-faceted view of identity.

Turning from family background to childhood development, we have seen in the preceding chapter how for Irving Bieber, the sexual preoccupation of so many homosexuals was a result of the mother’s sexual provocations which in turn only led to more guilt on the part of the child and eventually, the adolescent. The boy in turn feels different, somewhat inadequate, like he never belongs, even though he longs for his male peers’ approval. For Guindon, the masculine comes to take on an elusive ephemeral quality, beautiful and dreamlike, hence the emphasis on beauty as a glorious and eternal ideal that echoes back all the way to Greek antiquity with the ‘cult of youth and beauty.’ Guindon’s ethical orientation postulates a more tragic dimension, since the boy never gets beyond the stage of identifying with his male peers, of looking in the mirror and seeing and testing and imagining if what he finds attractive in himself will also be attractive to women. As Guindon writes, “identification is easier and less anxiety-producing. Some, because of an unconscious fear, will linger longer than others within the small, secure world of their own sex.”²⁸⁸ Puberty is crucial because it is at this definitive stage that the boy is “confronted more than anyone else by the fearsome aspect of the mystery of the other sex. For the first time in his life, he is consciously perceiving the ‘difference’ and is summoned, as it were, to face it ... But the ‘other’ sex is so ‘unlike’ him”²⁸⁹ Homosexual development is therefore predicated on the manner in which this pubescent stage is resolved, yet the outcome of such events will also be determined by a conglomeration of other factors, ranging from biological/genetic influences to family influences as well as “the deliberate choice of repeating an initial pleasurable, yet purely fortuitous, homosexual contact.”²⁹⁰ Paglia also questions whether “homosexuality may not indeed be a pausing at the prepubescent stage when children anxiously band together by gender ... The difficulties in changing sexual orientation do not spring from its genetic innateness. Sexuality is highly fluid, and reversals are theoretically possible. However, habit is refractory, once the sensory pathways have been blazed and deepened by repetition.”²⁹¹ This has enormous implications on notions of difference, horizons and openness to the other. But going back to Guindon, depending on the trajectory the boy’s psychosexual development takes, he may result in lusting after his own mirror image, to what he perceives to be a fundamental lack of the masculine within himself. The boy in turn remains in a phase of auto-eroticism, never outgrowing the developmental phase of sexual maturity where he compares himself to other boys, judging, scrutinizing, evaluating. Eventually the boy, in contemplating the beauty of the other boy, assumes the role of the other sex, that of the female:

the teenager might ‘forget’ that the other one is only a *model* through which he is trying to discover himself in an effort of self-adjustment. In this state of ‘oblivion’ it is tempting to assume, unconsciously – and in contradiction to the underlying purposes, that of

²⁸⁷ Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, para. 3.

²⁸⁸ Guindon, “Homosexuality,” 305.

²⁸⁹ Guindon, 305.

²⁹⁰ Guindon, 307.

²⁹¹ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 77-78.

adjusting to the role of the other sex. Then one falls in love with the model he sets out to copy.”²⁹²

In other words, variations and deviations can occur throughout psychosexual development, which can in turn result in the development and consolidation of a homosexual identity. The problem Guindon identifies is that “the *difference* which makes men to be men and women to be women produces anxieties which serve a dynamic purpose in psychosexual development.” Even though he could never be what the other represents, he nevertheless falls in love with what he cannot be, chasing after a lost archetypal dream. Paglia further elaborates on this idea by noting how the boy “will always be hungry for and awed by the masculine, even if and when, through bodybuilding or the leather scene, he adopts its accoutrements.”²⁹³ For Guindon, this ultimately represents a kind of innocence that “consists in a childhood that is never outgrown. It acts not as a new light but as a blinder, keeping one from growing, from acquiring new awareness, from facing human realities. It makes one close his eyes to reality instead of discerning the real issues.”²⁹⁴ This can further be understood in terms of what Lonergan calls ‘dramatic bias,’ or a *scotosis*, a ‘blind spot,’ as that which “restricts the ability to understand ourselves.”²⁹⁵ Given that for Guindon, homosexuality will always be lacking in man-woman humanity, the original vision of humanity created in the image of God, understanding ourselves better in the context of homosexuality would involve realizing or recognizing how homosexuality falls short of that ideal, while still acknowledging the potential, as within any relationship, for creativity, fecundity, love and flourishing, but most importantly, as the key insight from *Dignitatis humanae* stresses, the inherent dignity of the human person made in the image of God.²⁹⁶

Paglia on the other hand, goes in a somewhat different direction. In critiquing Christian morality’s call for a renunciation of homosexual behavior, Paglia asks: “Why shouldn’t all avenues of pleasure remain open? But it is worthwhile for gays to retrace their developmental steps and, if possible, to investigate and resolve the burden of love-hate they still carry for the opposite-sex parent. Behavior may not change, but self-knowledge – Socrates’ motto – is a philosophic value in its own right.”²⁹⁷ It is a process that involves the scrutiny of our deepest assumptions and commonly held beliefs, a process of growth and transcendence that, for Lonergan, requires being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable and being responsible. In *Method in Theology*,²⁹⁸ Lonergan writes that “the simple fact of change itself makes it likely that new possibilities will have arisen ... So change begets further change, and the sustained observance of the transcendental precepts makes these cumulative changes an instance of progress.”²⁹⁹ In decline however, possibilities for new avenues and new shifts in understanding

²⁹² Guindon, “Homosexuality,” 303.

²⁹³ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 76.

²⁹⁴ Guindon, “Homosexuality,” 341.

²⁹⁵ Brian J. Braman, *Meaning and Authenticity: Bernard Lonergan and Charles Taylor on the Drama of Human Existence* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), 52.

²⁹⁶ Pope Paul VI, *Dignitatis Humanae*, December 7, 1965, https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html.

²⁹⁷ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 78.

²⁹⁸ Lonergan, *MT*, 28-54.

²⁹⁹ Lonergan, 52.

are continually suppressed and shut down. Again, sexual behavior may not and in most instances will not change, but self-awareness and self-knowledge can allay many anxieties and confusion one may have felt with regards to their sexual orientation, whatever form that may take. As Braman points out, “My horizon is the boundary of what I know and value. Anything outside of that boundary does not exist for me ... Those meanings and values that reside outside my caring do not exist for me; they are outside my horizon of concern.”³⁰⁰ Openness to the “other” is a prerequisite to moral growth, what Lonergan terms a conversion experience through an expansion of moral horizons, the ground for achieving authenticity in self-transcendence. According to Guindon, “when there is little to discover in the other, interaction finds little stimulus. Too much comfort is an obstacle to conversion and to human development.”³⁰¹ What could have been progress results in decline that comes from an inability or refusal to move past the narrow viewpoint of one’s horizon. As Braman further writes, “any positive materials that would give rise to unwanted insights that would call into question our ‘persona’ is prevented from arising within consciousness.”³⁰² Hence the significance of conversion in Lonergan’s writings. In the context of this present study, conversion is employed not in the narrow sense of moving or turning away from a gay identity to a straight identity as seen in certain segments of Christian fundamentalism and American conservatism. Rather, conversion in this context recognizes that some people are gay and some aren’t and that the good life is best understood in terms of authenticity in and through self-transcendence.³⁰³ Braman defines conversion as “a movement into a new horizon ... Conversion is a new understanding of one’s self ... It is only in terms of conversion that we are able to address whether we are indeed living truthfully, morally and religiously ... This change in how we concretely live out our life is ultimately a concern for the truth by which we live our lives; it is the truth involved in the choices we make in self-constitution.”³⁰⁴ Homosexuality then, is a mere fragment of the human person, as one is not solely defined by one’s sexuality and sexual identity, but rather by much larger questions of value and responsibility and human progress. Nonetheless, the implications of self-knowledge for both Guindon and Paglia and Lonergan for that matter, are also paramount for arriving at a fuller, more unified vision of oneself and humanity.

Whereas in *The Sexual Language* Guindon was more invested in the formation of the homosexual pattern and the inherent tragedy behind its inculcation and entrenchment, in *The Sexual Creators* Guindon is now more concerned with expressing our sexual selves in the most meaningful ways possible, to grow through the sexual language “into a whole self,” moving “beyond mere tolerance toward reconciliation and toward a factual recognition of the gay, my neighbor and my beloved sister or brother in Christ.”³⁰⁵ Guindon argues for a sexual fecundity that is capable of producing itself in gay relationships, which are nonetheless not without their own challenges and shortcomings. As Robert E. Goss writes, “One of the most creative Catholic moral theologians in the twentieth century was André Guindon, who contextualizes sexual

³⁰⁰ Braman, *Meaning and Authenticity*, 50.

³⁰¹ André Guindon, *The Sexual Creators: An Ethical Proposal for Concerned Christians* (New York: University Press of America, 1986), 168.

³⁰² Braman, *Meaning and Authenticity*, 52.

³⁰³ “Self-transcendence and authenticity go hand in hand, and authentic self-transcendence is conditioned by what we have named conversion.” See Braman, 59.

³⁰⁴ Braman, 53-54.

³⁰⁵ Guindon, 163-164.

relationships within the notion of sexual fecundity. Sexual fecundity includes the dimension of the Christian tradition that is understood as procreativity and much more.”³⁰⁶ Guindon lays out a renewed notion of sexual fecundity based on sensuality and incarnational tenderness. Gays and lesbians can help us recover meaning in the sensuality and tenderness of our bodies in an age of de-sensitization. Furthermore, Guindon writes that “the virtue of sexual integration requires a sexual activity which is expressive of one’s own truth, of one’s real sexual identity,” as opposed to a fragmented identity “which cannot operate as an integrated self.”³⁰⁷ Notions of liberating love and loving community are touched upon as well by Guindon, in the context of love of God and neighbor and the dignity of every human person constituted in the image of God. As James F. Keenan notes, “Andre Guindon applied to the lives of gay and lesbian persons his proposal that sexual activity should be understood as a language ... Guindon prompted moral theologians to listen not only to the experience of gay and lesbian persons, but also to their language.”³⁰⁸ Gays and lesbians, according to Guindon, can offer a distinct understanding of the divine image through an incarnational flow of tenderness, wholeness and sexual integration. While outlining the shortcomings of homosexuality, Guindon equally departs from traditional church teaching on sexuality, specifically the manualist tradition, by arguing that “sexual intercourse should be viewed as an ingredient of human intimacy, not merely a function of reproduction ... the church should concentrate less on sexual practices and more on the overall quality of human intimacy.”³⁰⁹ By expanding on the function of sexuality beyond the “narrow and restrictive”³¹⁰ procreative definition, Guindon creates both a metaphorical and literal space for gays and lesbians to be able to contribute positively to the Christian community. God’s command “Be fruitful and multiply”³¹¹ in Genesis can be interpreted to mean fruitfulness in other loving ways as well: “Gay persons whose sexual language is fruitful in faithfulness to a partner ... have indeed mastered the art of sexual love in a way which can only build Christian community. They celebrate love with a gratuity which testifies to the fact that their love is Christian love.”³¹² For Gregory Baum, Guindon’s developmental notion of human sexuality as a language used to express “joy, friendship and compassion”³¹³ has led to a re-thinking of sex and sexual ethics amongst many Catholic theologians. As David M. Perrin writes, “There is something inherently mysterious in the human that grounds the capacity for transcendental values such as justice, reconciliation, love, and peace. These values cannot be reduced to human pragmatism : they are the product of a call from elsewhere, however we define or describe their point of origin.”³¹⁴ Moreover, while homosexuality falls short of the ideal complementarity of man-woman humanity, Guindon also argues that in acting in accordance with who they really are, gays and lesbians are simply living out their own truth in authenticity: “Does a gay’s moral dilemma

³⁰⁶ Robert E. Goss, “Challenging Procreative Privilege by Queering Families,” in *Queering Christ: Beyond Jesus Acted Up* (Oregon: Resource Publications, 2002), 100.

³⁰⁷ Guindon, 186.

³⁰⁸ James F. Keenan, “The Open Debate: Moral Theology and the Lives of Gay and Lesbian Persons,” *Theological Studies* 64, no. 23 (127-150), <http://cdn.theologicalstudies.net/64/64.1/64.1.7.pdf>.

³⁰⁹ D’Arcy Jenish, “The wrath of Rome: A priest’s views on sex upset the Vatican,” *Maclean’s* (1993), <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1993/2/15/the-wrath-of-rome>.

³¹⁰ Jenish, para. 4.

³¹¹ Gen 1: 22-23

³¹² Guindon, *The Sexual Creators*, 179.

³¹³ Jenish, “The wrath of Rome: A priest’s views on sex upset the Vatican,” para. 7.

³¹⁴ Perrin, *Studying Christian Spirituality*, 133.

consist in choosing between being a gay (the immoral choice) and not being a gay (the moral choice)? Is this a reasonable choice for one who is irreversibly homosexual? ... There are enough gay bibliographies nowadays to convince anyone who is not incurably prejudiced that for many persons gayness is their only choice.”³¹⁵ For Guindon then, the only viable and ethical choice is to live out their homosexuality the way anyone else ought to live out their sexuality, by being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable, being responsible and finally, being-in-love.

The subject living out his truth freely, in the context of homosexuality and conversion, involves deciding “what kind of person he wishes to be, what he wants to make of himself ... he is the one responsible for constituting himself through his various choices and decisions.”³¹⁶ While sexual behavior and identity will most likely not change, the awareness and acknowledgment of such challenges and shortcomings can result in a life of self-acceptance, understanding and flourishing. The question then really becomes how the homosexual, as well as any human person for that matter, can fully integrate their sexuality into a life of “wholeness and completion.”³¹⁷ Conversion then, in this specific context, involves the homosexual fully understanding themselves and who they are, having a deeper self-awareness with regards to the possibility of sexual fluidity³¹⁸ and other avenues of pleasure, love and fulfillment (as with heterosexuals) and acknowledging both promises and pitfalls. For Paglia, “gay men should confront the elements of haphazard choice in their erotic history, which began in the confusion, shame and inarticulateness of childhood.”³¹⁹ For example, the homosexual can be called to explore and fulfill another dimension of his being in and through encounter with a woman, just as how a heterosexual can be called to explore other possibilities for fuller living when the sight and presence of another male elicits homoerotic feelings. The thought and writings of Emmanuel Levinas provide supplementary material which address, according to Michele Saracino, “being human in terms of gift. Being opened, orientated, and postured by the Other is a gift of relationship.”³²⁰ By appropriating Levinas’ notion of *Being-for-the-Other* in relation to Guindon’s notion of the sexual language, the possibility of achieving sexual authenticity by answering the call of the Other brings to the forefront the reality of expansion of horizons: “The Other turns the subject inside out, that is, opens the subject to being human for others.”³²¹ This notion of *Being-for-the-Other* paves the way for deeper insights into the fluidity of one’s own sexual desire, all the while preserving the irreducible alterity of the Other. Seen in this light, sexual ethics is concerned, at the most fundamental level, with what it means to be fully human and how living a sexually authentic and authentically sexual life involves integrating our sexual selves, often associated with pure lust and base instincts, into possibilities for fuller, richer

³¹⁵ Guindon, *The Sexual Creators*, 160-161.

³¹⁶ Braman, *Meaning and Authenticity*, 55.

³¹⁷ Braman, 56.

³¹⁸ A man I once conversed with revealed that up until around the age of twenty-eight, he only considered himself as gay and therefore attracted to other men. Then, he described a sort of “switch” that went off in his brain in which he suddenly felt pulled in another direction, toward women. A friend who identifies as “gay” revealed to me that he found a woman to be very attractive, but could never pursue the possibility of a romantic/sexual relationship due to identity as “gay.” These 2 anecdotal examples demonstrate the nuance and complexity of sexuality and sexual fluidity, as well as the “blind spot” Lonergan describes, in which any insights which threaten our horizon are repressed.

³¹⁹ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 78.

³²⁰ Saracino, Michele. “Introduction,” 17.

³²¹ Saracino, 18.

human living, “an ever deepening understanding of spiritual and life values.”³²² But *Being-for-the-Other* does not preclude the possibility of the subject also being transformed. As Lonergan writes, “For openness is the possibility of self-transcendence, but conversion is the key step to actual achievement. It is entry into a new horizon.”³²³ The Other’s irreducible alterity calls the subject to authentic sexual wholeness and recognition of the full continuum and fluidity of sexual desire. But Guindon identifies the lack of the other’s otherness as a deficiency in homosexuality:

To be fruitful, sexual relationships between human beings presuppose both sameness and differentness ... Fecund sexual relationships between human beings, then, also presuppose differentness that whereby the other is really other. Otherness is the basic condition of real mutuality. The other is, by definition, one who is different from myself, therefore one who may unsettle me, disturb me, astonish me, challenge me. Conflict, its negotiation through interaction and reconciliation, is the very law of moral development ... Yet, the other’s otherness in the male-female sexual dialogue carries within it a potential for self-discovery in one’s male-female humanity which is not present in the same-sex otherness of the other.³²⁴

The apparent tension then, for the homosexual, is between recognizing this deficiency or shortcoming while still living in accordance with who they are, with the only viable option they have. The other’s otherness as unsettling and disturbing however, brings to bear one of Lonergan’s insights which we have touched upon already, specifically with regards to the *scotosis* or ‘blind spot’ which prevents unwanted insights from challenging preconceived notions of self and identity, but which also can prevent one from achieving conversion. As Lonergan reminds us, “encounter is the one way in which self-understanding and horizon can be put to the test.”³²⁵

For Guindon, homosexuality is stuck in an ahistorical contingency of sameness which amounts to the consummation of only one half of humanity. “This is the fundamental tragedy of homosexuality” writes Guindon, “the incapacity to assume the “other” and the “other’s” difference profoundly, lovingly, creatively.”³²⁶ No political and legal change will ever fully normalize homosexuality and homosexual unions, according to Guindon, because to be a male homosexual is to be an outsider cut off from one part of male – female humanity. For Paglia however, therein lies the revolutionary power of homosexuality as a form of ‘rebel love.’³²⁷ Classifying heterosexuality as the norm or ideal is what gives homosexuality its revolutionary and transcendent force. Paglia invites dissidence of every kind and celebrates homosexuality as both revolutionary and necessary, while nonetheless still positing heterosexuality as the ‘norm.’ Indeed, she questions whether homosexuality is “a permanent solution to the problems of the

³²² Andre Guindon, “Sexual Fecundity,” in *The Sexual Language: An Essay in Moral Theology* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977), 183.

³²³ Lonergan, *MT*, 389.

³²⁴ Guindon, *The Sexual Creators*, 168-69.

³²⁵ Lonergan, *MT*, 232.

³²⁶ Guindon, “Homosexuality,” 336.

³²⁷ Paglia titles the section in her essay “No Law in the Arena” that deals with homosexuality as “Rebel Love: Homosexuality,” 67.

nuclear family? Do we want the sexes forever divorced, in a state of perpetual alienation?”³²⁸ Part of the challenge therefore, lies in re-thinking the ways in which we classify ourselves sexually into categories by understanding that “gay” and “straight” are modern inventions and products of the Industrial Age which have taken shape in the form of identity politics today. In the context of male homosexuality and sexual ethics more broadly, both Lonergan and Paglia would champion the need for self-questioning and re-examining what it means to be human in light of sexual freedom and self-determination beyond preoccupations with self-definition and entrenched, codified sexual categories. Homosexuality may be “a brave and necessary drive for male autonomy,”³²⁹ but continual self-questioning and self-awareness in light of new data and insights are also necessary for living authentically. When Paglia asserts that “perhaps bisexual *responsiveness* is all we can hope for,”³³⁰ she was not arguing that gay men should yield to women’s sexual power in their own erotic lives, but rather that the recognition of any degree of attraction to the opposite sex should be followed up with an enquiry into one’s own self-development. This involves introspection and attention into the processes of one’s own cognitional operations of being attentive, intelligent, reasonable, responsible and *authentic*. But while it is perfectly natural for a person to derive pleasure from a person of the same sex, the drive to procreate is also immensely powerful at a basic biological level. For Paglia, the drive to procreate is present in the homosexual no matter the degree, and his refusal to enter man-woman humanity is partly choice, his wrestling with and contestation of Nature’s Law: “There *is* an element of choice in all behavior, sexual or otherwise. It takes an effort to deal with the opposite sex; it’s safer with your own kind. The issue is one of challenge versus comfort.”³³¹ Indeed, it may very well be the case that gay men who have never had any intimacy with the opposite sex may suddenly find themselves curious and intrigued as they become more self-aware about aspects of their developmental steps. It would also be worthwhile to examine their own relationships to their mothers and the way that half-eroticized relationship may have blocked them from adult contacts with women,³³² which in turn would have further led to the solidification of a “gay” identity. If anything, self-knowledge of this kind would only contribute positively to re-evaluating our self-entrenched identities along a wider continuum of pleasure, as well as leading more fulfilling, sexually liberated lives: “Self-questioning is crucial.”³³³

While Paglia’s essay deals with the subject of homosexuality from more of a historical, psychological and cultural perspective, Guindon on the other hand, provides the ethical viewpoint necessary for understanding homosexuality and sexuality more broadly from a theological perspective. In *The Sexual Creators*, Guindon lays out his vision as follows:

In the case of gays and lesbians, the main ethical issue lies in their willingness (or unwillingness) to achieve the truth of their existence by creatively expressing themselves in the light of their living options, and by wisely discerning appropriate means. If the

³²⁸ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 90.

³²⁹ Paglia, 92.

³³⁰ Paglia, 94.

³³¹ Paglia, 90.

³³² “He becomes his mother’s confidant against her prosaic husband, a half-eroticized relationship that may last a lifetime and block the son from adult contacts with women.” See Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 75-6.

³³³ Paglia, 91.

moral task consists in making one's own truth or in making sense of one's own life, then we are finally coming to grips, in this approach, with the crucial question of an ethical project for lesbians and gays.³³⁴

Despite the shortcomings in homosexuality and homosexual unions, Guindon is clear to point out that the best options for gays and lesbians is to love their truth in accordance with who they are authentically. Authenticity, as we have seen with Lonergan, involves living in accordance with the transcendental precepts of experiencing, understanding, judging, deciding and being-in-love. As Lonergan writes, "By deliberation, evaluation, decision, action, we can achieve a real self-transcendence by becoming principles of benevolence and beneficence, by realizing values. In the measure each of us succeeds in doing so, he exists authentically. In the measure he fails, he exists unauthentically."³³⁵ True authenticity then, for Lonergan, involves both knowing and doing³³⁶ as well as being attentive to unwanted insights, but the integration between knowing and doing equally involves judgments of value and personal responsibility. The discovery that one is responsible for oneself is intricately tied to "the significance of personal value"³³⁷ because one course of action will be more valuable, more conducive, more desirable to the "ethical project" of "making one's own truth or in making sense of one's own life," that Guindon describes. For gays and lesbians, this involves harnessing the power of their unique talents and gifts in service to their partners and the wider community: "it is through knowledge and appreciation of others that we come to know ourselves and to fill out and refine our apprehension of values."³³⁸ For Guindon, gays and lesbians have a crucial role to play in the realization of God's kingdom on Earth.

While Guindon deals with the subject of homosexuality and sexual ethics within the context of Catholic moral theology, Paglia approaches the subject from a much broader vantage point as a cultural philosopher who synthesizes a century-long anthropological and psychological survey on homosexuality. Paglia's main thesis is that homosexuality is "an *adaptation*, not an inborn trait."³³⁹ For Paglia, "homosexuality is not normal," but is rather "a challenge to the norm"³⁴⁰ of male-female humanity, since "in nature, procreation is the single, relentless rule."³⁴¹ She does delve, however, into possible biological factors: "There may indeed be a genetic component predisposing some people toward homosexuality, but social factors in childhood play a significant role in determining whether that tendency manifests itself or not."³⁴² She then claims that "genetic factors, if they exist, are probably more likely to appear in men, because of the complex process of hormonal masculinization of the fetus (always initially female in form), where variations or disturbances might occur."³⁴³ She does however, refrain from also delving into a more expansive biological account due in large part to her caution "about a theory that

³³⁴ Guindon, *The Sexual Creators*, 163.

³³⁵ Lonergan, *MT*, 386.

³³⁶ Lonergan, 38.

³³⁷ Lonergan, 39.

³³⁸ Lonergan, 237.

³³⁹ Paglia, 76.

³⁴⁰ Paglia, 70.

³⁴¹ Paglia, 71.

³⁴² Paglia, 72.

³⁴³ Paglia, 73.

defines gays as *a priori* incomplete men.”³⁴⁴ In so doing, Paglia seems to suggest that sexual orientation is free and fluid in one respect, while still taking into account the various biological, environmental and socio-cultural conditions that contribute to homosexuality and sexual orientation. Just as the artist “combines male and female in the act of creation,” ... “it is possible that gay men are caught midway between the male and female brains and therefore share the best of both.”³⁴⁵ The gay brain, according to Paglia, is continually “switched on;” there is “a sensory or perceptual openness,” an “artistic sensitivity and rich and vulnerable emotionalism”³⁴⁶ to the homosexual. This harkens back to the theories of Ulrichs, Kiernan and Lydston and their hypotheses regarding male and female principles synthesized within the homosexual. Gay consciousness, which is “stunningly expansive and exquisitely precise,” is ultimately linked to what Paglia terms the “art gene.”³⁴⁷ The art gene is responsible for artistic talent, which Paglia sees as purely “inborn.”³⁴⁸ Furthermore, “men are not born gay; they are born with an artistic gene;”³⁴⁹ when gay men claim they were gay as far back as they can remember, “gay men are remembering their isolation and alienation, their differentness, which is a function of their special gifts.”³⁵⁰ Brian Graham notes that Paglia “is mostly interested in what kinds of experiences may foster homosexuality in men. If a man is interested in same-sex sexual relations, it is owing to a biologically-determined artistic tendency *and* how that is handled in life.”³⁵¹ The etiology of homosexuality put forth by Paglia is dynamic and multi-faceted, predicated on both vast knowledge *and* experience, both freedom and determinism. Despite Paglia’s libertarian philosophy, we are neither fully free nor fully determined, but somewhere-in-between. Indeed, as Graham further notes, Paglia “constructs sexual orientation as an aspect of personality partly based on experience, presenting a view which goes against the grain of the contemporary reference for purely biological explanations of sexual orientation.”³⁵² With Paglia, we see that a truly comprehensive etiology of homosexuality is dependent on the subject’s own interdisciplinary expertise and their ability to assimilate and incorporate such data in a way that is attentive, intelligent, reasonable and responsible.

Paglia maintains she does not understand exclusive heterosexuality nor exclusive homosexuality. She speaks from experience when she argues that the stringent divide between gay/straight has done more harm than good insofar as it has led to further ossification and an entrenchment of identity divorced from the nuanced and ambiguous realities of sexual desire: “These hard lines drawn between heterosexuality and homosexuality are so tiresome. Everyone, male or female, is capable of bisexual experience and pleasure. Classical Athenians certainly behaved like that at the height of ancient Greek culture ... Why not maximize potential erotic

³⁴⁴ Paglia, 73.

³⁴⁵ Paglia, 75.

³⁴⁶ Paglia, 75.

³⁴⁷ Paglia, 75.

³⁴⁸ Paglia, 75.

³⁴⁹ Paglia, 75.

³⁵⁰ Paglia, 76.

³⁵¹ Brian Russell Graham. “Paglia’s Central Myth,” *Akademisk Kvarter* 8 (2014): 109-118, http://www.akademiskkvarter.hum.aau.dk/pdf/vol8/BrianRussellGraham_PagliasCentralMyth.pdf.

³⁵² Graham, “Paglia’s Central Myth,” 117.

adventures?”³⁵³ By rejecting gay/straight dualism, Paglia offers an alternate vision of sexuality and the human person, one which is ultimately predicated on the recognition of the “fluid continuum of human sexuality,” as well as the “presence of pleasure-promising homosexual impulses”³⁵⁴ within heterosexuals. Graham notes that this is completely in line with Paglia’s sixties vision, marked primarily by an expansion of consciousness through experience and the study of the Humanities: “Literature, Dionysian and Apollonian, represents a repository of the kinds of examples we need and should imitate in the ‘arena’ society.”³⁵⁵ At the same time however, Paglia goes on to observe that exclusive homosexuality has rarely or never occurred throughout history and that it requires explanation: “Given the intense hormonal surge of puberty,” which draws the two sexes together, “the total absence of adult heterosexual desire is neither normal nor natural, and it requires explanation.”³⁵⁶ While Paglia praises the traditions of the Graeco-Roman, Near East, China and Japan for their idolatry of male beauty and the sexual desirability of pretty boys by men, “Judeo-Christianity is unusual in finding the practice of boy-love abhorrent.”³⁵⁷ Key to Paglia’s analysis however, is her “resistance toward monosexuality”³⁵⁸ due in part to her rejection of the dichotomy between straight/gay, but also because she fears that it would only lead to a further state of alienation between the sexes. She questions: “But is homosexuality a permanent solution to the problems of the nuclear family? Do we want the sexes forever divorced, in a state of perpetual alienation?”³⁵⁹ Paglia’s answers to these problems are manifold, but are seemingly primarily centered on a rejection of identity politics in favor of a “pagan education” that would “sharpen the mind, steel the will, and seduce the senses.”³⁶⁰

Paglia distinguishes between “two principle kinds of homosexuality.”³⁶¹ The first is most ancient and rooted in “identification with the mother, perceived as a goddess,” and she gives the example of today’s glamorous drag-queens as a survival of the “castrated, transvestite priests of Cybele, honored in disco-like rites of orgiastic dance.”³⁶² The second kind of homosexuality on the other hand, represents the exact opposite: a turning away and rejection of the mother and of female power all together, what she calls “a heroic rebellion against her omnipotence.”³⁶³ The male homosexual is “autoerotic,” in that “homosexuality may be a symptom of a state which approaches self-sufficiency and integration, and so looks for affection less to an opposite than to a replica.”³⁶⁴ A rejection of femaleness in turn, results in a turning toward an idealization of masculinity, symbolized in the ‘hunk’ for example. Paglia views the “modern gay male as occupying the ultimate point on a track of intensifying masculinity, shooting away from the mother, who begins every life story ... Every man must define his identity against his mother. If

³⁵³ Kazemi, “Camille Paglia on Rihanna, Identity Politics, and Sexuality,” para. 21.

³⁵⁴ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 70.

³⁵⁵ Graham, “Paglia’s Central Myth,” 115.

³⁵⁶ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 71.

³⁵⁷ Camille Paglia, “Homosexuality at the Fin de Siècle,” in *Sex, Art, and American Culture*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), 23.

³⁵⁸ Graham, “Paglia’s Central Myth,” 114.

³⁵⁹ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 90.

³⁶⁰ Paglia, 94.

³⁶¹ Paglia, “Homosexuality at the Fin de Siècle,” 23.

³⁶² Paglia, 23.

³⁶³ Paglia, 23.

³⁶⁴ Quoted in Paglia, *SP*, 378.

he does not, he just falls back into her and is swallowed up.”³⁶⁵ Because Paglia views civilization from “the perspective of art, not morality,”³⁶⁶ she conceives of this movement away from the mother as the basis for the creation of culture and civilization: “Every gay man pursuing another man is recapitulating that civilization-forging movement away from the mother.”³⁶⁷ And in that civilization forging movement outward, a variety of innovation and cultural advance has resulted from homosexuality. “For me,” Paglia asserts, “civilization is art, and art is the highest record of humanity ... anything that contributes to art must be nurtured and preserved. What seems irrefutable from my studies is that male homosexuality is intricately intertwined with art.”³⁶⁸ Male homosexuality might indeed be the “key to understanding the whole of human sexuality”³⁶⁹ as Paglia maintains, because gay men, for the most part, have not only understood the power of female sexuality over other men as a result of their own internalized feminine sensibility, but also because in longing for the masculine, they appreciate and see masculinity for what it truly is in all its “glamorous perfection.”³⁷⁰ Yet this is where the “inherently tragic” dimension of male homosexuality comes into play, “for it posits as glamorous perfection precisely what most loathes it and cancels it out” (heterosexual masculinity).³⁷¹ In worshipping the masculine, gay men are ultimately “guardians of the masculine principle.”³⁷² Following this dilemma, “gay men are aliens, cursed and gifted, the shamans of our time.”³⁷³ What second-wave feminism failed to see, according to Paglia, is that male identity is fragile and combustible, continually in need of reassurance and orientation towards reality by the female principle. Paglia writes that “It is woman’s destiny to rule men ... Gay men and artists create a realm marked off from woman’s power, but most men require women to center them and connect them to the underworld of emotional truth.”³⁷⁴ Demarcated sacred spaces such as gay bathhouses and the ritualized world of gay pornography have allowed gay men to create an identity for themselves outside of female influence. Masculinity is restless and unstable for Paglia, because men spend their entire adolescent and adult lives carving out an identity for themselves against the at-times domineering influence of their mothers and wives, that is, against the all-encompassing power of the feminine: “All of us emerge from the body of a mystical female giant. Boys are swamped in the female realm ... To progress into manhood, boys must leave the women’s world behind ... Because boys lack a biological marker like menstruation, to be a man is to be not female ... Masculine identity is embattled and fragile.”³⁷⁵ Homosexuality is a revolt against procreative Mother Nature, which drives the two sexes together to reproduce. The drive to differentiate themselves and create an identity separate from women is inextricably linked to the etiology of homosexuality. As Paglia writes, “We have the right to thwart nature’s procreative compulsions, through sodomy or abortion. Male homosexuality may be the most valorous of attempts to evade the femme fatale and to defeat nature. By turning away from the Medusan mother, whether in

³⁶⁵ Paglia, “Homosexuality at the Fin de Siècle,” 23.

³⁶⁶ Paglia, 22.

³⁶⁷ Paglia, 23.

³⁶⁸ Paglia, 22.

³⁶⁹ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 67.

³⁷⁰ Paglia, 86.

³⁷¹ Paglia, 86.

³⁷² Paglia, 24.

³⁷³ Paglia, 86.

³⁷⁴ Paglia, 80.

³⁷⁵ Paglia, 85.

honor or detestation of her, the male homosexual is one of the great forgers of absolutist Western identity.”³⁷⁶

Both Paglia and Guindon do not deny or downplay biological “procreativity,” if anything, they preserve the heterosexual norm while still carving out a metaphorical and literal space in which other sexualities like male homosexuality play a *necessary* and vital role within culture. In short, an integration of Paglia and Guindon’s writings reveal a more honest and balanced view regarding the promises and pitfalls of male homosexuality; in the process however, we equally get a celebration of life itself and the freedom to explore alternative ways of ‘fruitfulness.’ As we have seen, ‘fruitfulness’ is not solely limited to biological procreativity; for Guindon, fruitfulness, in the context of homosexuality, can mean gays and lesbians, through a sexual language of their own, can help us re-discover and embody sensuality and incarnational tenderness. The absence of biological procreativity does not exclude other ways in which gays and lesbians can ‘bear fruit,’ and contribute to the greater community and by extension, help us re-think and re-evaluate the role and power of sex and sexuality, as well as meaning and value in the spiritual quest for wholeness and fulfillment. As Goss notes, “Guindon does not reserve the notion of human sexual procreativity primarily for heterosexual marriage, but applies it to celibates and gays/lesbians. He explores the possibility that gay/lesbian sexual language can be procreative or fruitful for the human community.”³⁷⁷ Guindon’s spiritual and theological vision is, as a result, heavily predicated on mutuality, reciprocity and compassion, on love of one’s neighbor and the importance of inclusion of sexual minorities within the Christian community. For Paglia, gay men in particular have clearly ‘born fruit’ through the making and development of culture and art throughout history as a result of the intricate link between homosexuality and art. Twenty years after the writing of her seminal essay “No Law in the Arena,” Paglia would go on record to defend her views regarding the etiology of homosexuality:

As I argued in my manifesto, “No Law in the Arena” in *Vamps & Tramps* (1994), no one is born gay. Homosexuality is an adaptation, resulting from a mercurial interaction of inborn traits with unpredictable familial and cultural conditions. In my libertarian system, government has no right whatever to dictate what we do with our bodies, which we own and which were endowed upon us by nature. Indeed, I contend that homosexuality is perfectly natural, as copiously demonstrated by its historical frequency during periods of overpopulation worldwide.

What I see as inborn in so many (but of course not all) gay men is actually the artistic gene, a perceptual sensitivity that separates or alienates them from other boys in childhood and that leads much later to gay identity at puberty. Gay men whom I have met over my lifetime in Europe and Brazil as well as in North America seem startlingly often to have a visual acuteness, mental mobility, and verbal aptitude that straight men rarely have unless they are artists.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁶ Paglia, *SP*, 14-5.

³⁷⁷ Goss, “Challenging Procreative Privilege by Queering Families,” 101.

³⁷⁸ Kazemi, “Uncensored: Camille Paglia on Rihanna, Identity Politics, and Sexuality, 24-25.

The apparent contradiction in Paglia's statement is that homosexuality, while *natural*, is not *normal*. While Paglia argues in favour of a certain genetic predisposition toward homosexuality, she rejects the notion that people are born 'gay.' Paglia, in true Freudian fashion, adds a psychological layer onto the sociological model by arguing that the child is not predisposed by the family dynamic; the family dynamic helps shape the direction his sexuality will eventually take in the form of sexual identity, but the predisposition would have already been there from birth. Paglia insists on the highly fluid nature of sexuality and sexual desire into adulthood despite the formation and consolidation of a sexual identity at puberty. Genetic influences or predispositions are not to be confused with the "gay gene" however, for which no hardline scientific evidence exists. Homosexuality is both natural and complex in that homosexual potential exists in everyone to varying degrees, which according to Paglia, should be recognized, acknowledged and celebrated as part of what she refers to as a "pagan strategy" of developing and expanding our "sensory responses."³⁷⁹ The language of expansion, openness and potential are recurrent throughout Paglia's essay and can be considered as integral aspects of her spiritual and theological vision.

Homosexuality Today

The previous sections of this chapter have provided a historical overview of some of the significant etiological theories of homosexuality that arose throughout the twentieth century. The twentieth century saw great developments in the fields of biology and endocrinology, which in turn led to a quest on the part of some medical circles to find a purely biological explanation for the etiology of homosexuality, specifically the 'gay gene.' While no hardline scientific evidence exists regarding a purely biological explanation, the scientific literature does indicate that the etiology of homosexuality is multi-faceted and that there is a biological component which predisposes some people to a homosexual orientation. The final section of this chapter provides an overview and synthesis of some of the mainstream scientific literature on the etiology of homosexuality and gives an indication of the direction in which such studies are headed based on current patterns and trends. The data indicates that there is no one 'etiology,' in the sense of a single causation factor. We can speak of etiology in terms of multiple causation factors or rather multiple 'etiologies'; the etiology of homosexuality is dynamic and multi-variant. In the midst of such dynamism and complexity, there is a freedom and openness of the enquirer seeking answers to questions in light of ever-emerging experience, data and insights. Studies into the etiology of homosexuality are ongoing and are a testament to the desire to know and understand ourselves as human beings, as well as to the beauty and rich complexity of sexuality as an intricate part of being human.

One of the trends and patterns across the scientific literature reveals that the development of a homosexual orientation is preceded by a period of gender nonconformity which may persist into adulthood. The work of Michael Bailey and their co-authors demonstrates that a large amount of cross-cultural data exists to conclude that there is a tendency for the development of a homosexual orientation to be "preceded by childhood gender nonconformity: a pattern of behavior somewhat like that of the other sex."³⁸⁰ This pattern would support the conclusion that homosexuality is a *variation* from heterosexuality, typically preceded by gender nonconforming

³⁷⁹ Paglia, "No Law in the Arena," 71.

³⁸⁰ Bailey et al., "Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science," 46.

behavior. Furthermore, Bailey categorizes scientific findings into 2 camps: social (social environmental) and nonsocial (hormonal, genetic, nonsocial environmental), but maintains that “there is considerably more evidence supporting nonsocial causes of sexual orientation than social causes.”³⁸¹ Ritch Savin Williams however, in responding to Bailey’s work, argues for a continuum-based model of sexuality, one which is not predicated on categories (gay, straight, bisexual), but rather one which recognizes and acknowledges nuance and overlap rather than separation.³⁸² This harkens back to Paglia’s insights that homosexual potential exists within everyone and that it can manifest itself under the right circumstances. In terms of genetic factors, Williams writes that “a continuum perspective suggests that homoeroticism and gender nonconformity are related to their *degree* of genetic loading or expression, in utero hormone environment, and maternal immune response to a male fetus.”³⁸³ This also harkens back to Paglia’s claim regarding the existence of genetic factors and the “complex process of hormonal masculinization of the fetus (always initially female in form), where variations or disturbances might occur.”³⁸⁴ Williams hypothesizes what specific variations or disturbances in “quantity, timing and quality (e.g., number of genes, markers or receptors; epigenetic factors, critical neurodevelopmental windows; individual vulnerability; environmental triggers and their interactions)”³⁸⁵ can look like, but the overall prevailing pattern or trend across the data is that there seems to be a biological basis for sexual orientation, even though research into its etiology requires further study and assessment.

While studies into the etiology of homosexuality tend to favor, based on scientific and empirical data, some degree of a biological basis for homosexuality, most data indicates that there is no single causation factor. Human beings are complex, multi-faceted creatures who operate on many different dimensions: biological, sociological, environmental, cultural and so forth, and so as a result, it is quite natural that studies into sexuality and human nature would yield nuanced, complex and multi-varied results. As Eleanor Whiteway and Denis Alexander note, “no putative cause of same-sex attraction has a sufficient empirical basis to demonstrate its causal role in same-sex attraction ... same-sex attraction is likely to be caused by a complex interplay of factors, both biological and environmental, and that causal pathways are unique to the individual.”³⁸⁶ Both favor a dynamic and protean view of the human person in which no single causation factor can ever fully capture the rich, complex reality of human living:

it should not be assumed that a single cause or causal chain is responsible for such a complex phenomenon ... it is very likely that many different causes are operating in tandem, and that causes are operating in different ways across the cohort of same-sex attracted individuals, in ways that are likely to be gender and culture specific ... all influences are in reality completely integrated within the life of a developing individual,

³⁸¹ Bailey et al., “Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science,” 46.

³⁸² Savin-Williams, “Sexual Orientation: Categories or Continuum? Commentary on Bailey et al. (2016),” 37.

³⁸³ Savin-Williams, 40.

³⁸⁴ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 73.

³⁸⁵ Savin-Williams, “Sexual Orientation: Categories or Continuum? Commentary on Bailey et al. (2016),” 40.

³⁸⁶ Whiteway and Alexander, “Understanding the causes of same-sex attraction,” 17.

meaning that no one should expect to find the ‘cause’ of an individual’s same-sex attraction.³⁸⁷

While Bailey and Williams’ articles partly dealt with political considerations in light of scientific findings, Whiteway and Alexander’s article makes more of an ethical commentary and reminds readers that it can be quite tempting to get lost in the science and data while forgetting the that there is a human person behind such data. What both authors present therefore, is an integration between science, ethics and theology: “Every individual, regardless of sexual orientation, is made in God’s image, and in considering an array of impersonal data, it is important to keep in mind that behind the statistics are human individuals, each one of whom is loved deeply by God.”³⁸⁸ The authors admit that their article “necessarily deals with averages and generalizations,”³⁸⁹ due to the highly complex nature of the subject matter, but as we have seen with the freedom and openness of Lonergan’s subject, the human person cannot merely be defined or reduced categorically. As Perrin puts it: “the recognition of the transcendent quality of the self is a refusal to reduce human transcendence to the causal laws of science, the rational function of the human mind ... The self cannot be reduced to a series of objective functions or to objective knowledge of the self.”³⁹⁰

Lastly, to take note of is the scientific evidence that same-sex attraction frequently changes. Jeremiah Keenan disagrees with what he sees as LGBT activist dogma which claims that sexuality is “immutable” and cites a study conducted by Savin-Williams on a group of 12, 000 Americans aged between 16 and 22 to support his argument.³⁹¹ In the study, individuals were asked three times over the course of a six-year period whether they had same-sex attraction or opposite-sex attraction since their last interview. For example, approximately 1.5 percent of 17-year-old males who were interviewed reported *only* having same-sex attraction to other males, whereas five year later, 70 percent of that 1.5 percent majority reported only have attraction for women.³⁹² While most of the scientific literature supports a multi-variant etiological model without any single overarching, causation factor, Keenan concludes that most studies have refrained from making the claim that sexuality is immutably fixed over time and therefore, cannot change due to lack of scientific evidence.³⁹³ This speaks to both the complexity and dynamism of human nature and human potentiality. This also again relates to the “open posture of Lonergan’s subject,”³⁹⁴ which has been recurrent throughout this study, as well as the openness of the subject to authenticity in and through self-transcendence. Authenticity in this case involves both homosexual and heterosexual men listening to the call of wonder initiated by the other and from within themselves to recognize and potentially explore another dimension of

³⁸⁷ Whiteway and Alexander, 18.

³⁸⁸ Whiteway and Alexander, 18.

³⁸⁹ Whiteway and Alexander, 18.

³⁹⁰ Perrin, *Understanding Christian Spirituality*, 134.

³⁹¹ Jeremiah Keenan, “While You Probably Think Same-Sex Attraction is Fixed, Researchers Don’t,” *The Federalist*, April 5, 2018, <https://thefederalist.com/2018/04/05/probably-think-sex-attraction-fixed-researchers-dont/>.

³⁹² Keenan, para. 11.

³⁹³ Keenan, para. 7, 16.

³⁹⁴ This quote is taken directly from the title of Michele Saracino’s chapter title, “The Open Posture of Lonergan’s Subject,” in *On Being Human: A Conversation with Lonergan and Levinas*.

their sexuality and humanity. The notion of wonder in particular is essential to openness according to Lonergan, because wonder emerges out of questioning and out of a desire to know, to expand and transcend. As Saracino writes, “authentic subjectivity emerges in this being opened up by wonder and challenged to transcend oneself ... authentic subjectivity is born in the eros to know, that is, in the birth of the question, which leads the person to a posture of wanting to transcend his/her previous horizon.”³⁹⁵ Moreover, if sexual attraction can fluctuate regardless of identity, then rather than deny or reject such potentially threatening and unsettling insights about attraction to another sex, authenticity would require being attentive, being intelligent, being reasonable and being responsible. As Saracino further writes, “The ideal and authentic subject ... develops in and through attending to these patterns of experience.”³⁹⁶ The rejection of gay/straight dualism in favor of a more “alternative, continuum-based perspective regarding the nature of sexual orientation”³⁹⁷ speaks to the freedom of the human person Lonergan refers to in his writings, as well as his own “rejection of the static notions of faculty psychology to the more dynamic and protean leanings of intentionality analysis.”³⁹⁸ Paglia herself notes that “a gay versus straight opposition simply perpetuates a false dualism and guarantees the oppression of gay men, who will always lose that conflict and, because of their vulnerability when cruising, will pay with their blood in the streets.”³⁹⁹ Moreover, an expansion of horizons and conversion in this case, would involve rejecting the biases of entrenched, static sexual categories that comes with accepting the view that sexuality is “immutable” in favor of new models, new structures for thinking about the human person: “humanity is not static; rather, it develops ... these differences need not appear limiting; rather, they should be understood as distinctive gifts and potentialities for development.”⁴⁰⁰

Conclusion

While this chapter has presented a broad survey of some of the most significant and noteworthy etiological models of homosexuality in the twentieth century, the conversation between Camille Paglia, André Guindon and Bernard Lonergan points to a revised framework for thinking about homosexuality and sexual ethics, a framework which posits a multi-variant approach to etiology that integrates insights from science, literature, art, history, culture, theology and spirituality. Paglia’s theoretical model for example, while heavily Freudian, nonetheless speaks to the present moment by drawing heavily on the role of consciousness and human experience. So, while the first half of this thesis focuses primarily on etiological models in the context of science and medicine as they were conceived in the nineteenth century, Paglia and Guindon demonstrate how there are other ways of approaching and understanding the topic of homosexuality, such as spiritually and theologically. Guindon in particular, provides a theological basis for enriching and diversifying our methodological approach. Lonergan’s views on method provides a supplemental framework for organizing the data as well as for

³⁹⁵ Saracino, “The Open Posture of Lonergan’s Subject,” 76-7.

³⁹⁶ Saracino, 88.

³⁹⁷ Savin-Williams, ““Sexual Orientation: Categories or Continuum? Commentary on Bailey et al. (2016),” 37.

³⁹⁸ Saracino, “The Open Posture of Lonergan’s Subject,” 91.

³⁹⁹ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 70.

⁴⁰⁰ Saracino, 89.

understanding what both Paglia and Guindon were up to and what they were able to accomplish in light of the conflicts and tensions they inherited regarding the variously competing etiological models covered throughout this study.

In line with Lonergan's epistemological and existential anthropology, the human person is therefore dynamic rather than static. The kind of revolutions both Paglia and Guindon describe do require, in a sense, a conversion of sorts, as well as authenticity in and through self-transcendence. As Lonergan writes, "For openness is the possibility of self-transcendence, conversion is the key step to actual achievement. It is entry into a new horizon."⁴⁰¹ The relationship between dialectic and foundations in Lonergan helps clarify the manner in which the conflicts, tensions and resolutions from the past are synthesized and resolved in Paglia and Guindon in a new context, a new foundation from which new questions, new challenges and new opportunities can arise: "So it is on the fourth level, of dialectic, that we really encounter the past ... in dialectic we meet persons that originate values and disvalues, and through that meeting we are invited to an existential illumination and to a modification, perhaps a reorientation, of our lives."⁴⁰² This reorientation, for Lonergan, ultimately has to do with values and the pursuit of meaning and values. Through an appropriation of Lonergan's method, we arrive at an appreciation of the manner in which the theories and models covered throughout this study, beginning in the nineteenth century with the emergence of the scientific study of sex, culminate in both foundations established by Paglia and Guindon, as well as more contemporary foundations established by the likes of Bailey et al., Savin-Williams and Keenan with their own respective scientific models and data. As Lonergan states, "Foundations provides the criteria that resolve the conflicts brought to light by dialectic."⁴⁰³ Moreover, Guindon absorbs, interprets and re-evaluates the entire tradition of Catholic moral theology and sexual ethics and consolidates the conflicts and tensions from the past in foundations and lays out an open path for human progress, a new vision of what it means to be a 'sexual creator,' not limited to biological procreativity. Likewise, Paglia absorbs and synthesizes the entire Western tradition in her understanding of human sexuality and in turn lays out a vision of revolution and transformation inspired by her Sixties libertarian philosophy and insistence on the significance of expansion of consciousness through education, particularly art history, "which exposes us to the many ravishing forms of human beauty."⁴⁰⁴ In presenting a historical overview of the etiology of homosexuality, this study has in turn made "explicit the opposed views of historians, to classify them, relate them, and if possible, reduce them to their roots ..."⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰¹ Lonergan, *MT*, 389.

⁴⁰² Lonergan, *MT*, 381.

⁴⁰³ Lonergan, *MT*, 396.

⁴⁰⁴ Paglia, "No Law in the Arena," 94.

⁴⁰⁵ Lonergan, *MT*, 395.

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to provide a historical overview of the etiology of homosexuality, starting from the nineteenth century with the emergence of the scientific study of sexuality and the birth of sexual modernism, up until the present. Through the emergence of the scientific study of sex in the nineteenth century, we start to see a methodological shift for thinking about sex and sexuality as well as the emergence of sexual identity as a modern phenomenon, all of which coincide with the emergence of the term ‘homosexual.’ Certainly, a future study would provide a much more all-encompassing overview of homosexuality dating back to pre-historic times, to as far back as the current historical and cultural records allow. A future study would also go in more depth in terms of presenting a more thorough overview of the scientific literature in the twentieth century, in terms of the enormous strides and developments made in hormonal and genetic research. Careful selections were made in order to preserve an interdisciplinary balance between medical and scientific findings on the one hand and the philosophical, cultural and theological implications and dimensions of homosexuality on the other.

This thesis has offered a holistic, multi-variant definition of homosexuality as an adaptation and variation and has rejected a categorical model (gay/straight) in support of a fluid, continuum-based model of sexual desire and sexual orientation based on the work of Camille Paglia and Ritch Savin Williams. Sexuality is fluid and malleable in some respects as seen in the study conducted by Williams and cited by Keenan, yet the role of experience, cultural conditions and environment play a determining role in the development of sexual identity as well. Most of the literature leans heavily toward a biological or genetic explanation for the etiology of homosexuality, even though scholars like Paglia have been resistant and “cautious about a theory that defines gays as *a priori* incomplete men.”⁴⁰⁶ Paglia celebrates homosexuality as a ‘rebel love’ that has contributed enormously to art and civilization, yet calls for universal bisexuality as part of her pagan vision for social transformation and renewal. Paglia’s theology and spiritual vision entail a “perceptual openness”⁴⁰⁷ and an expansion of our sensory responsiveness, which she sees as fundamental aspects of gay consciousness.

My manuscript’s intended purpose has been to offer a fair and realistic understanding of homosexuality that is free from the biases of political correctness. As Bailey writes, “scientifically, sexual orientation is an important, fundamental trait that has been understudied because it is politically controversial. This is a mistake. In fact, the more politically controversial a topic, the more it is in the public interest to illuminate it in a revealing and unbiased manner.”⁴⁰⁸ Moreover, much of the scientific literature on homosexuality today leans heavily towards a dynamic and multi-variant explanation, whereby a purely biological, or a purely social constructivist stance, no longer holds sway. This thesis in turn upholds what Hammack refers to

⁴⁰⁶ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 73.

⁴⁰⁷ Paglia, 75.

⁴⁰⁸ Bailey et al., “Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science,” 46.

as “a moderate stance between essentialism and constructivism,”⁴⁰⁹ all while making the fundamental argument that research into the etiology of homosexuality would not be complete without taking into account the spiritual and theological dimensions of the human person. But this has equally involved taking note of the advantages and shortcomings of homosexuality, which have been addressed in great depth by Camille Paglia and André Guindon. Paglia’s theory of homosexuality is predicated on her integration and synthesis of the entire Western cultural tradition, while Guindon offers a more theological and ethical understanding of homosexuality predicated on his notions of the sexual language, sexual fecundity and otherness. Particularly through his notion of sexual fecundity, Guindon carves out a metaphorical space in which homosexual unions can contribute a great deal to the Christian community and the larger community as a whole in a manner that is fruitful and procreative as well, despite the obvious absence of biological procreativity; in turn, Guindon’s work makes us think about what it means to be fruitful and procreative in alternate, loving ways. At the same time however, homosexuality falls short of the ideal of man-woman humanity which simply cannot be duplicated in homosexual unions; there is something irreducible and unalterable about the opposite sex or in other words, the other’s *difference*, which draws the two sexes together in the fullness of man-woman humanity. Goss summarizes Guindon’s main argument by noting that “the other’s otherness challenges each partner in his/her assumptions about the opposite sex. Same-sex relationships, according to Guindon, run the risk of gradually losing the sense of mystery of the other with its differences, conflicts, and negotiations.”⁴¹⁰ The other’s otherness calls the subject to an open posture, leading to the possibility of conversion and authenticity in and through self-transcendence. The other however, as seen briefly with Levinas, not only reveals the irreducible alterity of the other, but also reveals something about myself as both object and subject. Scientific data suggests that sexual orientation is not immutable and can change, but authenticity in turn requires that the human person be open, attentive and receptive to such current and future possibilities, that they be attentive to such experiences, intelligent in their understanding of such insights and experiences, reasonable in their judgments about what course of action to take, as well as responsible in a way that is consistent with the outcome of the previously listed operations of consciousness. The case can be made that gay men who disregard and reject sexual and/or romantic attraction to the opposite sex because it challenges and unsettles their own “gay identity” are acting inauthentically, as would heterosexual men who disregard and reject the wonder and call to openness in the presence of another man who elicits previously unacknowledged sexual and/or romantic feelings in them. Paglia reminds us that “if counselling can allow a gay man to respond sexually to women, it should be encouraged and applauded, not strafed by gay artillery fires of reverse moralism.”⁴¹¹ Likewise, Paglia equally calls on heterosexuals to accept the “presence of pleasure-promising homosexual impulses in themselves.”⁴¹² Paglia points to the misleading straight/gay dichotomy and calls on everyone to discover the full range of sexual desires within themselves, regardless of sexual orientation. But this would also require gays to be trace back their developmental steps, to be attentive to the potential for any sexual responsiveness to the other gender. These possibilities bring to light Lonergan’s notions of conversion, transcendence and authenticity as part of a broader strategy

⁴⁰⁹ Hammack, “The Life Course Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm,” 268.

⁴¹⁰ Goss, “Challenging Procreative Privilege by Queering Families,” 101.

⁴¹¹ Paglia, “No Law in the Arena,” 78-9.

⁴¹² Paglia, 70.

for arriving at truth and human progress, hence the insistence on the role of self-questioning and self-knowledge in Paglia and Guindon as central to this thesis.

While Lonergan's writings do not touch upon homosexuality, the integration of his insights on method have served a tremendously valuable purpose in systematizing the major patterns, insights and achievements across historical lines beginning in the nineteenth century with the emergence of a wide array of competing etiological theories, particularly the debate between whether homosexuality was inborn or acquired. The nineteenth century witnessed the emergence of sexual modernism through the writings of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll who made sexual variance imaginable through the inclusion of case studies, interviews and testimonials in their texts. Integrating Lonergan certainly helped classify the wide array of theories into distinct camps or schools of thought, as well as helped identify areas of tension, conflict and resolution between these competing schools of thought. What becomes abundantly clear was that there was a shift that occurred as a result of the Enlightenment from a religious and theological worldview to a more secular and scientific view of the human person. The birth of science in turn led to a variety of medical practitioners speculating and hypothesizing about the etiology of homosexuality from a physiological perspective, meaning an attempt to classify the 'invert' or homosexual as physically different from his heterosexual counterpart, whether it had to do with traditionally feminine features and traits or physical abnormalities involving the penis and anus. The second chapter picked up from the contributions of Krafft-Ebing and Moll and traced the emergence of a new generation of scholars and practitioners in the form of apologists for homosexuality, namely Edward Carpenter, John Addington Symonds, Havelock Ellis and Magnus Hirschfeld. This section in particular focused on these four transitional figures who wavered and rebelled against the pathology/degeneracy arguments which had dominated nineteenth century sexology and psychiatry. There was a shift in methodological framework from a purely physiological approach and the study of isolated sexual acts without any attention given to context, to a psychological approach which focused more on issues of identity, as well as an increased interest and preoccupation with androgyny and hermaphroditism. We see the latter especially in the work of John Addington Symonds and Edward Carpenter who trace their own thought to the theories of Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, whose notion of the Urning as a female soul in a male body sought to provide an all-encompassing etiological theory predicated on biological and spiritual factors. The notion of "the intermediate sex" or "third sex" – a creature that was anatomically male yet whose psyche/soul was female – was a direct by-product of this shift in sexual attitudes at the turn of the century. Furthermore, the etiological models of the nineteenth century paved the way for Freud's own pioneering work in the fields of psychology and sexuality in the early twentieth century, but we then also saw how Freud's own theories were misinterpreted and misappropriated in the service of political ends. Therefore, although Lonergan's seminal text, *Method in Theology*, is primarily concerned with the tools theologians employ in the development and creation of their respective theologies, this study demonstrates how such tools and methodologies can also be applied to a historical overview of the etiology of homosexuality, as well as for illuminating the tensions and conflicts, resolutions and foundations that came about in light of emergent and competing etiological models. Lastly, a conversation between Paglia, Guindon and Lonergan reveals a new framework for thinking about homosexuality, one which is not solely based on medical and scientific data, but which assimilates data and insights from spirituality, theology and ethics in favor of a more holistic and comprehensive model.

Bibliography

- Bailey, Michael J, Paul L. Vasey, Lisa M. Diamond, S. Marc Breedlove, Eric Vilain and Marc Epprecht. "Sexual Orientation, Controversy, and Science." *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 12, no. 2 (2016): 45-101. doi: 10.1177/1529100616637616.
- Barrett, Jonathan. "Misusing Freud: Psychoanalysis and the Rise of Homosexual Conversion Therapy." *Psi Sigma Siren*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2014): 4-14.
https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1027&context=psi_sigma_siren.
- Bauer, Edgar J. "Magnus Hirschfeld's Doctrine of Sexual Intermediaries and the Transgender Politics of (No-)Identity." In *Past and Present of Radical Sexual Politics*, edited by Gert Hekma, 41-55. Amsterdam: Mosse Foundation, 2004.
- Bergler, Edmund. *Homosexuality: Disease or Way of Life?* New York: Hill and Wang Inc., 1957.
- Braman, Brian J. *Meaning and Authenticity: Bernard Lonergan and Charles Taylor on the Drama of Human Existence*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- Brennan, Patrick McKinley. "Asking the Right Questions: Harnessing the Insights of Bernard Lonergan for the Rule of Law." *Journal of Law and Religion* 21, no. 1 (2005): 3.
- Carpenter, Edward. *Love's Coming of Age*. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1986.
- Carpenter, Edward. *Homogenic Love and its Place in a Free Society*. Manchester: The Labour Press, 1984.
- Carpenter, Edward. "The Intermediate Sex." In *Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach*, edited by Donald Webster Cory, 139-206. New York: The Julian Press Inc: 1956.
- Carpenter, Edward. *Some Friends of Walt Whitman: A Study in Sex-Psychology*. London: J.E. Francis, 1924.
- Carpenter, Edward. *The Intermediate Sex: A Study of Some Transitional Types of Men and Women* (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1908),
<http://www.edwardcarpenter.net/ecinttit.htm>.
- Chevalier, Julien. *Une Maladie de la Personnalité: L'Inversion Sexuelle*. Paris: G. Nason, 1893.
- Coleman, Jonathan E. "'Surely it Deserves a Name:' Homosexual Discourse Among Ellis, Carpenter and Symonds," Master's Theses, (University of Kentucky, 2010),
https://uknowledge.uky.edu/gradschool_theses/628.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, "Note on the Book by Fr. André Guindon, O.M.I The

- Sexual Creators: An Ethical Proposal for Concerned Christians,” University Press of America: Lanham-New York-London, 1992,
https://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19920131_book-guindon_en.html.
- Daly, Gabriel. “Theology 18: The Problem of Original Sin.” *The Furrow* 24, no. 1 (1973): 13-26, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27679676>.
- Dose, Ralf. *Magnus Hirschfeld: The Origins of the Gay Liberation Movement*. Translated by Edward H. Willis. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2014.
- Ellis, Havelock. *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*. Watford: University Press, 1897.
- Flanders, Sara, Francois Ladame, Anders Carlsberg, Petra Heymanns, Despina Naziri, and Denny Penitz. “On the Subject of Homosexuality: What Freud Said.” *The International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 97 (2016): 933-950, doi: 10.1111/1745-8315.12520.
- Forel, August. *The Sexual Question*, trans. C.F. Marshall (New York: Rebman, 1908).
- Freud, Sigmund. “Letter to an American Mother.” *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 107 (1951): 787. <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/pwh/freud1.asp>.
- Freud, Sigmund. *An Autobiographical Study*. London: Hogarth Press, 1935.
- Gilkison, Taylor. “The Transformation of Gender and Sexuality in 1920’s America: A Literary Interpretation.” *Honors College Capstone Experience/Thesis Projects*, Paper 682 (2017): 1-65. https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/stu_hon_theses/682/.
- Goss, Robert E “Challenging Procreative Privilege by Queering Families.” In *Queering Christ: Beyond Jesus Acted Up*, 88-112. Oregon: Resource Publications, 2002.
- Guindon, André. *The Sexual Creators: An Ethical Proposal for Concerned Christians*. New York: University Press of America, 1986.
- Guindon, André. “Homosexuality.” In *The Sexual Language: An Essay in Moral Theology*, 299-377. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977.
- Guindon, André “Sexual Fecundity.” In *The Sexual Language: An Essay in Moral Theology*, 163-220. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977.
- Graham, Brian Russell. “Paglia’s Central Myth.” *Akademisk Kvarter* 8 (2014): 109-118.
http://www.akademiskkvarter.hum.aau.dk/pdf/vol8/BrianRussellGraham_PagliasCentralMyth.pdf.
- Greenberg, David. *The Construction of Homosexuality* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

- Halperin, David M. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality: And Other Essays on Greek Love*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Hamilton, Gilbert Van Tassel. "Defensive Homosexuality: Homosexuality as a Defense Against Incest." In *Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach*, edited by Donald Webster Cory, 354-369. New York: The Julian Press Inc: 1956.
- Hammack, Phillip L. "The Life Course Development of Human Sexual Orientation: An Integrative Paradigm." *Human Development* 48, no. 5 (2005): 267-290. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000086872>.
- Hays, Richard B. "Relations Natural and Unnatural: A Response to John Boswell's Exegesis of Romans 1." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 14, no. 1 (1986): 184. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40015030>.
- Himes, Michael J. "The Human Person in Contemporary Theology: From Human Nature to Authentic Subjectivity." In *Introduction to Christian Ethics: A Reader*, edited by Ronald Hamel and Kenneth Himes, Mahwah, 49-62. New York: Paulist Press: 1989.
- Ivory, Yvonne. "The Urning and His Own: Individualism and the Fin-de-Siècle Invert." *German Studies Review* 26, no. 2 (2003): 333-352. <https://doi-org.lib-ezproxy.concordia.ca/10.2307/1433329>.
- Jenish, D'Arcy. "The Wrath of Rome: A Priest's Views on Sex Upset the Vatican." *Maclean's* (1993). <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1993/2/15/the-wrath-of-rome>.
- John Addington Symonds to Edward Carpenter, 29 December 1892. In *Nineteenth-Century Writings on Homosexuality: A Sourcebook*, edited by Chris White, 92-3. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Karlen, Arno. "The Scientific Overture." In *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, 181-198. W.W. New York, Norton & Company Inc: 1971.
- Karlen, Arno. "The Apologists." In *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, 213-227. W.W. New York, Norton & Company Inc: 1971.
- Karlen, Arno. "Cure or Illusion." In *Sexuality and Homosexuality: A New View*, 572-606. W.W. New York, Norton & Company Inc: 1971.
- Kazemi, Alex. "Uncensored: Camille Paglia on Rihanna, Identity Politics, and Sexuality." *V Magazine*, March 27, 2017. <https://vmagazine.com/article/uncensored-camille-paglia-rihanna-identity-politics-sexuality/>.
- Keenan, James F. "The Open Debate: Moral Theology and the Lives of Gay and Lesbian Persons." *Theological Studies* 64, no. 23 (127-150) <http://cdn.theologicalstudies.net/64/64.1/64.1.7.pdf>.

- Keenan, Jeremiah. "While You Probably Think Same-Sex Attraction is Fixed, Researchers Don't." *The Federalist*, April 5, 2018. <https://thefederalist.com/2018/04/05/probably-think-sex-attraction-fixed-researchers-dont/>.
- Kennedy, Hubert. "Karl Heinrich Ulrichs: First Theorist of Homosexuality." In *Science and Homosexuality*, edited by Vernon Rosario, 26-45. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Lambroso, Cesare. *Criminal Man*, trans. Mary Gibson and Nicole Hahn Rafter (North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2006).
- "Lesbian Feminist Camille Paglia: 'Sexual Orientation is Fluid and Can Change'," *Voice of the Voiceless*. Accessed March 2, 2021. <https://www.voiceofthevoiceless.info/lesbian-feminist-camille-paglia-sexual-orientation-is-fluid-and-can-change>.
- Loneragan, Bernard. "Cognitional Structure." In *Collection: The Collected Works of Lonergan* vol. 3. Edited by Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran, 205-221. New York: Herder and Herder, 1988, 210.
- Loneragan, Bernard. *Method in Theology*. Edited by Robert M. Doran and John D. Dadosky. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.
- Lucas, Peter. "Self-Knowledge and Power." In *Ethics and Self-Knowledge: Respect for Self-Interpreting Agent*, 167-177. Preston: Springer, 2011.
- Mancini, Elena. *Magnus Hirschfeld and the Quest for Sexual Freedom*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Marhoefer, Laurie. *Sex and the Weimar Republic: German Homosexual Emancipation and the Rise of the Nazis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015.
- McPartland, Thomas J. "Lonergan's Philosophy of History: Ontological, Epistemological, and Speculative." *Revista Portuguesa De Filosofia* 63, no. 4 (2007): 961-989.
- miedqy0. "Camille Paglia 1992 Interview." *YouTube* video, 24:20. August 12, 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KcvuqHZcICE&t=624s>.
- Myers Lee, Steven. "Irving Bieber, a Psychoanalyst Who Studied Homosexuality, Dies." *The New York Times*, August 28, 1991. <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/08/28/nyregion/irving-bieber-80-a-psychoanalyst-who-studied-homosexuality-dies.html>.
- Not Straight from Germany: Sexual Politics and Sexual Citizenship since Magnus Hirschfeld*. Edited by Michael Thomas Taylor, Rainer Herrn and Annette Timm. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2017.
- Oosterhuis, Harry. *Stepchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry, and the Making of Sexual Identity* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

- Oosterhuis, Harry. "Sexual Modernity in the Works of Richard von Krafft-Ebing and Albert Moll." *Medical History* 56, no. 2 (2012). doi: 10.1017/mdh.2011.30.
- Paglia, Camille. *Sexual Personae: Art and Decadence from Nefertiti to Emily Dickinson*. New York: Vintage, 1991.
- Paglia, Camille. "Homosexuality at the Fin de Siècle." In *Sex, Art, and American Culture*, 22-25. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Paglia, Camille. "Junk Bonds and Corporate Raiders." In *Art, Sex, and American Culture*, 139-212. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.
- Paglia, Camille. "No Law in the Arena: A Pagan Theory of Sexuality." In *Vamps & Tramps: New Essays*, 19-94. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.
- Paglia, Camille. "The Guide Interviews Camille Paglia - Has the gay movement turned down the wrong path? - Bill Andriette talks with Paglia about sex, violence, gay bashing, and liberation." By Bill Andriette, *The Guide*, January 1999, https://www.ipce.info/library_2/files/paglia_guide.htm.
- Paglia, Camille. "Introduction." In *Free Women, Free Men: Sex, Gender Feminism*. New York: Vintage Books, 2017.
- Perrin, David M. *Studying Christian Spirituality*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Peters, John Durham. "Introduction: The Problem of Communication." In *Speaking into the Air*, 1-31. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Pickett, Brent. "Homosexuality." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Stanford, Spring 2021. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality/>.
- Pope Paul VI. *Dignitatis Humanae*. December 7, 1965. https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html.
- Pyun, Jeanie. "Camille Paglia on Hugh Hefner's Legacy, Trump's Masculinity and Feminism's Sex Phobia." *The Hollywood Reporter*, 2 Oct. 2017, hollywoodreporter.com/news/camille-paglia-hugh-hefners-legacy-trumps-masculinity-feminisms-sex-phobia-1044769.
- Robinson, Paul A. "Havelock Ellis and Modern Sexual Theory." *Salmagundi*, no. 21 (1973): 27-62. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40547346>.
- Rolheiser, Ronald. *The Holy Longing: The Search for a Christian Spirituality*. New York: Image, 2014.

- Saracino, Michele. "Introduction." In *On Being Human: A Conversation with Lonergan and Levinas*, 13-22. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2013.
- Saracino, Michele. "The Open Posture of Lonergan's Subject." In *On Being Human: A Conversation with Lonergan and Levinas*, 61-91. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2013.
- Savin-Williams, Ritch C. "Sexual Orientation: Categories or Continuum? Commentary on Bailey et al." *Psychological Science in the Public Interest* 17, no. 2 (2016): 37-44. doi: 10.1177/1529100616637618
- Sheldrake, Philip. *Spirituality: A Brief History*. 2nd ed. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Symonds Addington, John. "A Problem in Modern Ethics." In *Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach*, edited by Donald Webster Cory, 3-100. New York: The Julian Press, 1956.
- Tamagne, Florence. "Awakening: Working to Construct a Homosexual Identity." In *A History of Homosexuality in Europe: Berlin, London, Paris, 1919-1939*, 159-160. New York: Algora Publishing, 2006.
- Tardieu, Ambroise. *Etude Medico-légale sur les Attentats aux Moeurs* (Paris: J.B Bailliere, 1857).
- Tarnowski, Benjamin. *Pederasty in Europe* (California: Brandon House, 1967).
- The Oxford Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Thompson, M. Guy. *The Truth About Freud's Technique: The Encounter with the Real*. New York: New York University Press, 1994.
- Thompson, R.J.E. "Greek taistia and tibV." In *Ratio et res ipsa: Classical essays presented by former pupils to James Diggle on his retirement*, edited by Paul Millett, S.P. Oakley and R.J.E. Thompson. Oxford: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Vider, Stephen and David S. Byers. "A Half-Century of Conflict Over Attempts to 'Cure' Gay People." *TIME*, February 12, 2015. <https://time.com/3705745/history-therapy-hadden/>.
- Weeks, Jeffery. *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800*. London: Longman, 1981.
- Whiteway, Eleanor and Denis R. Alexander. "Understanding the Causes of Same-Sex Attraction." *Science and Christian Belief* 27, no.1 (2015): 17-40. https://www.scienceandchristianbelief.org/serve_pdf_free.php?filename=SCB+27-1+Whiteway+Alexander.pdf.