

Part I

Social and Historical Approaches to Sexualities

A historical perspective is vital in allowing us to perceive the development of attitudes to sexuality, in particular social contexts. The first section of the book provides this perspective in order to situate the articles in subsequent sections, and contains three articles which examine successive historical periods. But the articles can simultaneously be seen as raising three central questions in the study of sexualities which underlie the concerns of this book: How is sexuality socially organized? How do we research sexuality? And how do the ways in which sexuality is narrated and represented shape the ways in which it is experienced?

One central theme raised by these three articles is the relationship of transformations in sexual life to broader social transformations associated with the concept of modernity. Understandings of modernity are highly contested, and an over-reliance on the concept can be associated with teleological understandings of social progress, which assume a linear pattern of social development. Nevertheless it remains a crucial concept for understanding sexual transformations, and the articles here suggest how sexualities have been affected by the emergence of specifically modern forms of society, as well as by tendencies associated with more recent shifts giving rise to notions of late or postmodernity. The concepts of late modernity and postmodernity are subject to continuing debate (Giddens 1991; Bauman 1992), but there are significant commonalities between the ways in which these concepts characterize contemporary societies, and many social theorists now endorse the view that modernity either has been transcended or has shifted significantly in character.

The first article, by Randolph Trumbach, dramatically introduces the idea that understandings of gender and sexual identity are socially and historically specific. Employing comparisons between cultures worldwide, Trumbach describes the emergence since the eighteenth century of a 'new sexual system' in specifically modern and Western societies, which has subsequently come to have a profound influence on many other sexual cultures. He argues that the early eighteenth

century in Europe saw the appearance of a third gender, and henceforth there were men, women and sodomites, the last of these representing the emergence of a distinctive minority, later labelled homosexual. This was associated with the emergence of new heterosexual roles, which gave rise to patterns of extra-marital sex that endured until the middle of the twentieth century. Distinctive forms of prostitution, illegitimacy and violence in marriage were associated with these developments. For much of the period, female sexual lives were organized through forms of family life, which varied by social class. Trumbach argues that working-class life focused on extended families based on patriarchal dominance, while among the upper classes less oppressive patterns of relationships, organized around romantic courtship and tender care of children, began to emerge. This organization of gender and sexuality continued until fundamentally disrupted by the changes that gathered pace after the mid-twentieth century. From this period, with shifts towards less hierarchical relationships between men and women across the class divides, it became possible for the gender order to be radically challenged.

William Simon, one of the founders of what became known as the social constructionist approach to sexuality, chronicles the development of sex research in the twentieth century. In doing so he examines the ways sexual knowledges were formulated. A number of conceptual questions are raised about how sexuality is researched, ranging from questions of methods and methodology to issues of politics, ethics and the philosophy of social science. These are issues which are vital to consider when interpreting articles throughout *Sexualities and Society*.

Simon organizes his article around the notions of the modernization and postmodernization of sexuality. His concern is less with the broad sweep of modernity, and more with the effects of the modernism of the twentieth century upon sex research. He argues that the social nature of the sexual order was disguised for most of the period of modernization by the naturalizing zeal of the theorists of sexuality, as sexual science made strenuous efforts to dehistoricize the erotic. It dissolved the multiple meanings of sexuality into universal identities, which reaffirmed pre-given distinctions. As a result, the controversial and implicitly challenging work of the modernizers of sex could be presented as objective and factual, presenting the 'truth' of sexualities. Postmodernization, on the other hand, can be seen as denaturalization, recognizing the plurality of sexualities and the role of human beings in producing sexual categories. Meanings change over time as the socio-cultural context changes. Today it becomes not only possible but also necessary to talk of *homosexualities* or *heterosexualities*, and the sexual is seen not as a given but as problematic. Sexual forms are not the realization of a 'biological mandate'. Instead sexualities have to be seen as the result of a process of construction and negotiation, shifting over time and within the life cycle.

Ken Plummer's article is concerned with the way we tell stories about sexuality and live within specific sexual narratives (see also Plummer 1995). Plummer's article can be seen as representing a growth of interest in the constitutive role of culture in recent work on sexuality, and more particularly growing attention to the role of narratives and/or discourses in shaping understandings and experiences of sexuality. Much of this work has been influenced by post-structuralism,

though Plummer's work itself develops from the symbolic interactionist tradition.

Plummer is also concerned with modernity, but now concentrating on the important role of modernist and 'late modern' stories or narratives in constructing the forms and patterns of sexual life. Humans are story-telling beings, and through stories we create our world. There has been a proliferation of sexual stories since the eighteenth century, but only in the late twentieth century have these stories gained a mass audience. The sexual stories we tell are deeply implicated in moral and political change, and shifting stories of self and identity carry the potential for radical transformations of the social order. Over the past generation we have seen a change in the forms and organization of the stories we tell each other, and late modern stories reveal and create a multiplicity of new projects, new constituencies, new possibilities for the future. These are stories of human life chances, of emotional and sexual democracy, of pluralistic forms of sexual life, opening the way for a new culture of intimacy and what Plummer describes as 'intimate citizenship'.

References

- Bauman, Z. 1992: *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
Giddens, A. 1991: *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
Plummer, K. 1995: *Telling Sexual Stories: Power, Change and Social Worlds*. London: Routledge.

Sex and the Gender Revolution

Randolph Trumbach

Around 1700 in northwestern Europe, in England, France, and the Dutch Republic, there appeared a minority of adult men whose sexual desires were directed exclusively toward adult and adolescent males. These men could be identified by what seemed to their contemporaries to be effeminate behavior in speech, movement, and dress. They had not, however, entirely transformed themselves into women but instead combined into a third gender selected aspects of the behavior of the majority of men and women. Since a comparable minority of masculinized women who exclusively desired other women did not appear until the 1770s, it is therefore the case that for most of the eighteenth century there existed in northern Europe what might be described as a system of three genders composed of men, women, and sodomites.

[...]

In the eighteenth century these new meanings and the reorganization of long-standing forms of sexual behavior produced among men (but not among women) what the late nineteenth century described as a heterosexual majority and a homosexual minority. The terms *heterosexual* and *homosexual* were nineteenth-century inventions. But the behavioral patterns they described came into existence among men in the first generation of the eighteenth century. It is difficult to understand that homosexuality and heterosexuality are conditions that were socially constructed first for men at a specific moment in time and then for women because the development of the late-nineteenth-century descriptions over the last hundred years has tended to leave most Westerners with the conviction that a heterosexual majority and a homosexual minority are biological constants that must have been present in all times and places. The heterosexuality of the majority is usually taken for granted – how can the human race otherwise have continued to exist? The homosexuality of the minority has been more

difficult to understand or to accept. For this very reason, a brief analysis of the differences in Western homosexual behavior before and after 1700 will clarify what it means to say that an exclusive male heterosexual majority first appeared in Western societies in the early eighteenth century.

To understand the nature of homosexual acts in European society before 1700, one begins from the presumption increasingly made by historians, sociologists, and anthropologists that homosexual behavior in all human societies has been organized by differences either in age or in gender. From this it is apparent that the postmodernist presumption that sexual forms are unlimited cannot be true. In some societies like ancient Greece or Renaissance Italy sexual behavior was structured by differences in age, and adult men had sexual relations both with women and with adolescent males who were sexually passive. In other societies like those of traditional South Asia the majority of both adult and adolescent males had relations both with women and with a minority of passive adult men who had been socialized into a lifelong third-gender role that combined elements of male and female behavior. This fundamental distinction is sometimes difficult for modern Western scholars to see since in their society any experience of homosexual desire assigns an individual to a decided minority without reference to the age or gender of the person desired. From this practice of their own societies Western scholars presume the presence in all times and places of an effeminate minority of males exclusively interested in other males and use this presumption to misinterpret the evidence for homosexual behavior in the ancient Mediterranean world and in European societies before 1700.¹

This distinction between homosexual behavior organized by differences in either age or gender therefore reorients the historical quest into a more fruitful path and makes it possible to understand the nature of the change that occurred in Europe around 1700. In European society before 1700 probably most males felt desire for both males and females. Adult men expressed this by having sexual relations with adolescent males and with women. This pattern of behavior was of very long standing in Western societies. It had appeared in ancient Greece and Rome, in early Christian Europe, and in Europe of the later Middle Ages. This is sometimes doubted by modern readers because the sources are fragmentary and literary, and a historian like John Boswell was always determined to find an exclusive homosexual minority and to deny the plain presumption of his sources that homosexual activity occurred between most men and boys. But the brilliant work of Michael Rocke on the exceptional sources from Renaissance Florence allows the pattern to be displayed with statistical certainty. By the age of thirty, one of every two Florentine youths had been implicated in sodomy, and by the age of forty, two of every three men had been incriminated. Sodomy was therefore so widespread as to be universal. But it was always structured by age. Between fifteen and nineteen, boys were always passive. Individuals between nineteen and twenty-three were in a transitional phase in which they were either active or passive but with the older partner always active. After twenty-three men were always active. During this third period young men sometimes also went to female prostitutes. At thirty they married. Sodomy was illegal, and the church taught that it was immoral. But male opinion largely approved of it as long as adult men were always active. There were, in other words, two competing systems of morality in Christian societies, but the actual

sexual behavior of men had changed very little from what it had been in the ancient pagan Mediterranean world.²

[...]

But in the 1690s opinion changed after a new way of organizing homosexual desire appeared throughout the modernizing societies of northwestern Europe, in England, France, and the Netherlands. No longer did differences in age justify sexual relations with males in the libertine's mind. Instead adult men with homosexual desires were presumed to be members of an effeminate minority. They were given a status similar to that of the hijra in Indian society or the berdache among the North American tribal peoples, who had passive sexual relations with the majority of males in their societies. European society had begun to move from one to the other of the two worldwide systems for organizing homosexual behavior: from a system in which subordination was achieved by differences in age to one whose focus was a third-gender role for a minority of men. In the old system all males had passed through a period of sexual passivity in adolescence. In the new system, the majority of males could not conceive of themselves as passive at any moment; passivity was instead for the minority, the homosexuals (as they have been called since the late nineteenth century), who from childhood were socialized into their deviant role. European societies in the early eighteenth century gave such sodomites a status equivalent to that of the most abandoned women. The majority of men were supposed to avoid any sexual contact with them. But such contact nonetheless occurred, and when it did, it caused profound anxiety to adolescents and adult men – but also perhaps profound excitement.³

The new effeminate adult sodomites can be documented among the London poor because of the attacks against them made by the Societies for the Reformation of Manners. These sodomites constructed around themselves a protective subculture of meeting places and ritual behavior. A few who seem to have been involved in prostitution played out a largely feminine identity. They took women's names, spent nearly all their time in women's clothes, and were referred to as 'she' and 'her' by their male and female acquaintances. Their male customers in some cases must have known that these prostitutes were genital males, but in other cases perhaps they did not, since some sodomites worked the streets as members of a group of female prostitutes. The gender identity of these transvestite males was not entirely feminine because they sometimes wore men's clothes and were prepared to take the active or inserter's role in sexual intercourse. They were neither male nor female but a third gender that combined some characteristics from each of what society regarded as the two legitimate genders. A few such men may have existed before 1700, when they were likely to have been confused with biological hermaphrodites who sometimes changed (though illegally) from the male or female gender to which they had been assigned at birth. After 1700, however, transvestite adult men who clearly possessed male genitalia and whose bodies showed no ambiguity were classified as part of a larger group of effeminate men who were supposed to desire sexual relations only with other males, who might be either adult or adolescent.

These men, for whom the formal term was *sodomite*, were in the slang of the streets known as *mollies*, a term that had first been applied to female prostitutes. Many of them could not be identified as sodomites outside the context of the molly-house, or tavern. Some of them were married with children, and others provided themselves with female companions so that they could pass with their neighbors. Once inside the molly-house, they displayed many of the feminine characteristics of the male transvestite prostitute: they took women's names and adopted the speech and bodily movements of women. On some occasions, especially at dances, some of them dressed entirely as women. Some sodomites in the molly-houses played men to match the role of female prostitute that others took. But all of these men were obliged to play two roles, one in the public world in which they worked and spent most of their time and another in the molly-house. Some men, of course, could not disguise their effeminacy in public and as a consequence were abused or blackmailed. This suggests that they had internalized their gender role to such a degree that they could not hide it, even though that would have been very much to their advantage in the public world. But in the public mind, all the men in the molly-houses – as well as those who used the public latrines, the parks, the cruising streets, or the arcades to find sexual partners – belonged to the same category no matter what their behavior in the public sphere. All were members of a third gender who deserved to be treated with contempt. Some were hanged in the few cases where anal penetration and seminal emission could be proven. And others were fined, imprisoned, and sentenced to stand in the public pillory, where a few were stoned to death.

Sexual relations between women, on the other hand, were not prosecuted. When they occurred, the women were not described as masculinized until the last generation of the century, when some women were categorized as sapphists or tommies, as the effeminate male minority had been called sodomites or mollies since the beginning of the century. Throughout the century there were some women who cross-dressed, and they were sometimes prosecuted for it; but their cross-dressing was undertaken so that they could pass safely in a male occupation rather than to sexually attract women. It was essential that their disguise be fully convincing; any ambiguity that might arise from the mixing of gender traits (as male sodomites mixed them) would have led to their discovery and the failure of their purpose. Among some of these cross-dressing women, there were a few who eventually married women and perhaps even engaged in intercourse with an artificial penis. These women had crossed the gender boundary and were condemned for it, but other women who lived as husbands to women for many years – but against whom no sexual charges were leveled – seem to have passed unscathed. After 1770 there were occasional examples of aristocratic women (sometimes singly, sometimes as part of a female couple) who were either romantically or sexually attracted to women and who cross-dressed in the ambiguous way that effeminate sodomites did. They were accepted when the romance was stressed and the sex vigorously denied, and condemned and ostracized when it was otherwise. It was, however, always much more possible to be unaware that sexual relations between women existed in any form than it was to be ignorant of the existence of effeminate male sodomites.⁴

For most of the eighteenth century, therefore, sexual relations between women still occurred in the context that had applied to sexual relations between males in the seventeenth century, when persons who engaged in sexual relations with their own gender were presumed to be attracted to the other gender as well, and when sexual acts with one's own gender did not compromise an individual's standing as masculine or feminine. Only sexual passivity in an adult male or sexual activity by a woman who used an artificial penis or a supposedly enlarged clitoris had endangered an individual's gender standing. Such individuals, along with biological hermaphrodites, were likely to be viewed as dangerous, since they passed back and forth from active to passive rather than remaining in the passive female or active male conditions to which they had been assigned at birth. Only the temporary passivity of adolescent males whose bodies had not yet acquired secondary male characteristics did not threaten this system. Seventeenth-century society had therefore presumed that although there were three kinds of bodies (men, women, and hermaphrodites), there were only two kinds of gender (male and female).

After 1700 this system was replaced by another for men but not for women. For males, there were now two kinds of bodies (male and female) but three genders (man, woman, and sodomite) – since the sodomite was supposed to experience his desires and play his role as a result of a corrupted education and not because of his bodily condition. For women, the old system of three bodies and two genders could still be presumed. But men had entered a new gender system by changing the nature of their sexual relations with each other: men no longer had sex with boys and women – they now had sex either with females or with males. They were now supposed to be either exclusively homosexual or heterosexual. The majority of men now desired only women. This necessarily brought them into more intimate relations with women, and their intimacy could threaten the continuing male desire to establish domination. This dilemma was in part resolved by assigning those men who desired males to a third gender role that was held in great contempt. This role played its necessary part in the new relations between men and women produced by the emergence of individualism and equality in eighteenth-century society since it guaranteed that, however far equality between men and women might go, men would never become like women since they would never desire men. Only women and sodomites desired men, and this was true for males from adolescence to old age.

The new heterosexual role for the majority of men that was produced by the system of three genders that came into existence after 1700 affected men of all social classes. It resulted in a pattern of extramarital sexual behavior that endured until the middle of the twentieth century. [...] The women who engaged in these extramarital relations did not, however, have their behavior structured by a standard of exclusive female heterosexuality. Their sexual lives were organized instead by the forms of family life that during the eighteenth century came to vary considerably by social class. Poor women, whether as wives, widows, or maids, were bound by the forms of the traditional patriarchal household and family in which servants, children, and wives were subordinated to the authority of older, dominant, and supposedly provident men. Women from the middle and landed classes, on the other hand, lived in families constructed by increasingly

egalitarian relations that found expression in romantic courtship, the close friendship of husbands and wives, and the tender care of children. [...]

Heterosexuality, patriarchy, and romance always operated in the persistent presence of men's violence. The violence might appear as an expression of men's contempt for the prostitute or in their attempts to cure themselves of the prostitute's venereal disease by forcing themselves on prepubescent girls; or in courtship when marriage could be offered as a compensation for rape; or after marriage by the husband who to establish his sexual domination of his wife or the absolute possession of her property could treat her in ways that would certify him as mad if used against anyone else. Heterosexuality and the family were also in constant dialogue with Christian religion in its different forms. The last gasps of traditional reforming urban piety appeared early in the century in the Societies for the Reformation of Manners, which attempted to control prostitution and other forms of extramarital relations by turning to the secular magistrates after the church courts had failed. For them sexual sin was equally reprehensible in men and in women. But the Evangelicals at the end of the century were more concerned about the prostitute than about her male customer, for without realizing it, they had become affected by the presumptions of the new male heterosexuality. Women throughout the century were more likely than men to make Christianity their bulwark against the libertine's justification of his practices. But since male heterosexuality made it increasingly difficult for men to enter into intimate relations with a male God, it is likely that the tie between sex and religion was weakened even for those men who were not self-consciously libertine.

[...]

A number of the previous attempts to interpret the history of eighteenth-century sexuality have dealt with many of the forms of behaviour described here. They have not, however, organized themselves around the presumption that heterosexuality and homosexuality are not biological givens but are instead socially constructed aspects of male and female gender roles that did not appear until the early eighteenth century, when the modern Western culture system in which we still live first arose. Michel Foucault originally intended that his history of sexuality should start in the early eighteenth century, and it is with that period that his introductory volume is mainly concerned. Foucault seems to have been struck by the literature against masturbation that first appeared in that period and used it to document the origins of what were for him the repressive structures of modern society. But he did not see in that volume any connection between masturbation and homosexuality. Instead he argued in a paragraph that has had an influence out of all proportion to its importance that the modern sense of the homosexual as a distinct kind of person did not appear until the late nineteenth century. In an interview two years before his death, however, he apparently changed his mind and declared that homosexuality first became a problem in the eighteenth century. But his followers (many of whom have tied their work to his first declaration) have not so far taken up their master's later position. Foucault's account of the eighteenth century (in what admittedly was to have

been merely an introduction) is also unsatisfactory because it fails to deal with the histories of adultery and prostitution.⁵

Foucault's argument that modern homosexuality was a product of the late nineteenth century – which was simultaneously made by Jeffrey Weeks on the basis of a much more serious documentation – has been used by Jonathan Ned Katz and Kevin White to argue that modern heterosexuality must therefore similarly have been a product of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries. But all four of these historians make the same mistake and fail to see that the late-nineteenth-century discussions of homosexuality and heterosexuality (in which the words were first coined) did not invent the roles that they considered. By 1880 modern Western homosexuality and heterosexuality had existed for nearly two hundred years. The new names therefore only represent a new stage in the public discussion of these roles, however much the discussion may have changed the political environment in which the roles were enacted.⁶

[. . .]

There remain a series of large speculative questions that establish the need for a new kind of history. [. . .] Why did a new sexual system come into existence in all of northwestern Europe (in England, France, and the Netherlands) in the early eighteenth century? Why did the division into heterosexual and homosexual roles occur first in men, and at what point did the distinction (or some variant of it) become crucial for the gender identity of women? What connection was there between the distinction into heterosexual and homosexual roles and the development of the ideals of romantic marriage and domesticity? When did a system that first appeared in northern Europe and North America spread to the rest of the Western world, to southern, central, and eastern Europe, and to Latin America; and how did the system change during this process of diffusion? And finally, why did a system of almost three hundred years' standing begin to change considerably after 1960, and did it change sufficiently to warrant the description of being postmodern? No-fault divorce, widespread premarital sexual relations between men and women who were not engaged to marry, widespread birth control, the expectation that women should have equal pay and equal access to work and that men should share in the duties of childrearing, the decline in prostitution, the control of venereal disease, and the appearance for the first time in most Western societies of a gay and lesbian movement – all these occurred together in a single generation, and in the very same countries that first experienced around 1700 the modern sexual system that these new forms of behavior have to some extent displaced. [. . .] It is apparent that we do not have much of an idea why or how cultural systems change rapidly in the course of a single generation, whether the change occurs around 1700 or around 1960. It is as baffling as trying to explain the rise and fall of diseases – the plague, syphilis, smallpox, or AIDS. It is enough to begin the analysis of the division of the sexual world into a homosexual minority and a heterosexual majority that has been one of the most salient features of the modern Western culture that first appeared in the generation after 1700.

Notes

- 1 This distinction was introduced into historical scholarship in Randolph Trumbach, 'London's Sodomites: Homosexual Behavior and Western Culture in the Eighteenth Century,' *Journal of Social History* 11 (1977): 1–33.
- 2 K. J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1978); Eva Cantarella, *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1992); Craig Williams, *Roman Homosexuality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); John Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), and *Same-Sex Unions in Pre-modern Europe* (New York: Villard Press, 1994); Michael Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), and 'Male Homosexuality and Its Regulation in Late Medieval Florence,' Ph.D. diss., State University of New York at Binghamton, 1989.
- 3 A full discussion is forthcoming in the second volume of *Sex and the Gender Revolution, The Origins of Modern Homosexuality*. For my earlier discussions, see Trumbach, 'Gender and the Homosexual Role in Modern Western Culture: The 18th and 19th Centuries Compared,' in Dennis Altman et al., *Which Homosexuality* (London: GMP Press, 1989), pp. 149–69, and 'Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment England,' in *Forbidden History: The State, Society, and the Regulation of Sexuality in Modern Europe*, ed. John C. Fout (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 89–106. For the sodomitical subculture in the Netherlands, see Theo van der Meer, *De Wesentlijke Sonde van Sodomie en Andere Vuyligheeden: Sodomieten vervolgingen in Amsterdam, 1730–1811* (Amsterdam: Tabula, 1984) (of which there is an English summary in van der Meer, 'The Persecutions of Sodomites in Eighteenth-Century Amsterdam: Changing Perceptions of Sodomy,' in *The Pursuit of Sodomy: Male Homosexuality in Renaissance and Enlightenment Europe*, ed. Kent Gerard and Gert Hekma [New York: Haworth, 1989], pp. 263–301), 'Sodomy and the Pursuit of a Third Sex in the Early Modern Period,' in *Third Sex, Third Gender*, ed. Gilbert Herdt (New York: Zone Books, 1994), pp. 137–212, and *Sodoms Zaad in Nederland* (Nijmegen: Sun, 1995). For the French subculture, see Michel Rey, 'Parisian Homosexuals Create a Lifestyle, 1700–1750: The Police Archives,' *Eighteenth-Century Life* 9 (1985): 179–91, and 'Police and Sodomy in Eighteenth-Century Paris: From Sin to Disorder,' in Gerard and Hekma, *The Pursuit of Sodomy*, pp. 128–46; and Jeffrey Merrick and Bryant T. Ragan Jr., eds., *Homosexuality in Modern France* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- 4 Randolph Trumbach, 'London's Sapphists: From Three Sexes to Four Genders in the Making of Modern Culture,' in Herdt, *Third Sex, Third Gender*, pp. 111–36, and 'The Origins and Development of the Modern Lesbian Role in the Western Gender System: Northwestern Europe and the United States, 1750–1990,' *Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historiques* 20 (1994): 287–320. See also Emma Donoghue, *Passions between Women: British Lesbian Culture, 1668–1801* (London: Scarlet Press, 1993).
- 5 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, An Introduction, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978); Didier Eribon, *Michel Foucault* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), p. 316.
- 6 Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming Out* (London: Quartet Books, 1977), and *Sex, Politics, and Society* (New York: Longman, 1981); Jonathan Ned Katz, *The Invention of Heterosexuality* (New York: Dutton, 1995); Kevin White, *The First Sexual Revolution: The Emergence of Male Heterosexuality in Modern America* (New York: New York University Press, 1993).