

PHAVISMINDA Journal

Volume 10 (May 2011): 89-122.

***THE PROBLEMATICS OF HOMOSEXUALITY: CAN FOUCAULT
LIBERATE THE GAYS? (AN EXPOSITION, EVALUATION,
AND CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF HOMOSEXUALITY)***

Eddie R. Babor, LL.B., Ph.D.

Holy Name University

Tagbilaran City

(eddiebabor@yahoo.com)

Introduction

The problematics of homosexuality can be sketched in the context of recognition, repression, concealment, and disclosure. All these involve public policy, social legislations, and morality.

This paper is developed into three parts, namely: (1) Exposition; (2) Evaluation; and (3) Critical Analysis. In the last part, the paper attempts to draw much of Foucault's thoughts on homosexuality.

The topic may appear boorish as it is being placed on the lofty grounds of philosophy since, usually, what we know of philosophy is its cunning, bristling, animated, and sometimes, even a throbbing "romance" with "reality" through the dynamism of epistemology, metaphysics, ontology, ethics, modernism, postmodernism, post-postmodernism, structuralism, hermeneutics, existentialism, phenomenology, pragmatism, positivism, deconstruction, critical theory, and so on. In a word, philosophy requires some heavy and hard dosages of "painful" thinking, concentration, reflection, analysis, synthesis, comparison, and the like. At any rate, the topic is warrantable since it is indexed under philosophy of sex that includes "procreation, contraception, celibacy, marriage, adultery, casual sex, flirting, prostitution, homosexuality, masturbation, seduction, rape, sexual harassment, sadomasochism, pornography, bestiality, and pedophilia" (<http://www.uno.edu/-asoble/pages/PSINTRO.HTM>. Accessed 19 August 2009).

The sexy matter and interest pertains to one of the issues cited under the purview of philosophy of sex, that is, homosexuality. Whether we like it or not, homosexuals abound anywhere—although their being one is impressively kept in the closet of secrecy and confidentiality of their own creativity, or in their daring spirit to "move out" from their "closet" and openly dispose their stature as homosexuals. Their presences vary, although they are ever constitutive in all walks of life. Some are working in the holy

altar of God as a prelate (a bishop, a cardinal, a clergyman, a pastor, a minister, or even perhaps, a nun, and even an altar boy, or a *sacristan*). Some of them are in active military service (including those gay and lesbian graduates of prestigious military academies, like Philippine Military Academy in Baguio City, or the West Point in the USA. Accordingly, there are 66 thousand gays, lesbians, and bisexuals in active military service in America, (*Time*, Vol. 175, No.6, March 2010: 13), law enforcement (gay and lesbian graduates of PNPA or Philippine National Police Academy and those who, without any other options left for them to be accepted in the agency, opt to hurdle the police training in the ranks), judiciary (gay and lesbian judges and prosecutors), legislative bodies (gay and lesbian senators, congressmen, governors, mayors, and councilors), legal counsels (gay and lesbian lawyers), media (tri-media: gay and lesbian newscasters, commentators, writers, journalists, and columnists), movie industry (gay and lesbian directors, actors, comedians), arts (gay and lesbian singers, musicians, poets, and the like), fashion designs (gay and lesbian fashion designers), beauty parlors (gay and lesbian hair stylists and make up artists), including those who are not so fortunate enough since they are destined to earn a living in public toilets, wet markets, and restaurants, among others, like in the academe – that is, gay and lesbian mentors, teachers, professors, deans, including university or college presidents and even board members.

Homosexuality: An exposition

A closer look at the issue of homosexuality will lead us to know that it emanates from the kinds of sexualities (biological) which we generally known as male and female – although in the research conducted by Anne Fausto-Sterling, she contends that there are five sexes among humans, namely: (1.) males; (2.) females; (3.) “those with one ovary and one testis, each functional; (4.) those with ovaries, but also distinct sized penises, and sometimes beards and deep voices; and (5.) those with testes, but also [have] vagina[s], and sometimes breast” (Available at <http://www1.umn.edu/ships/gender/phil'sex.htm>. Accessed 19 August 2005). For purposes of this study, however, it is good to stick only to the male and females archetypes.

From the kinds of sexualities, there arose the notion of sexual orientations that to Foucault are concocted by the manipulative power entwined in the bio-medical structure in society. The proponents of this concept divide sexual orientation into three categories, namely: (1) heterosexuality; (2) homosexuality; and (3) bisexuality. Of these three categories, homosexuality has suffered a turbulent fate. It has attracted a lot

of attention in the context of bias, prejudice, discrimination, and even violence. Terms such as transgender, cisgender, transexual, metrosexual, and transvestite, had been, with banter, associated with it, although its usual variants are the gays, for males, and lesbians (derived from the name of the Greek island called Lesbos where Sappho, a renowned poet, wrote her poems that expressed her amorous relationships with young women) for females.

Specifically from among the gays, their breed is composed of catamites and pederasties—the ones who the archaic Greeks show spite and bitter criticisms as explained by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality*, Volumes 1, 2, and 3. In addition, swardtalk terms such as “queer, faggot, fairy, poof, and homo” are, likewise, ascribed to them (Available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). In the Philippines, gays are called “pa-girl,” “malambot,” “boyet,” “pamhin,” “paminta,” and “maya” (Available at http://en.wikipilipinas.org/index.php?title=Homosexuality_in_the_Philippines. Accessed 26 January 2010).

Undeniably, however, there is a glaring discrimination that the homosexuals have suffered since the time they started their disclosure to the public regarding their status. The discrimination levelled at them can be traced to the mainstream society’s attitude toward such issues as sodomy or carnal copulation through rectal coition, *fellatio* or introduction of the penis of one man into the mouth of the other (Peschke, 2001: 454), homophobia, and masochism. To sprinkle more flavor to this sardonic attribution, there is what Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick calls “homosexual panic” that refers to a legal defense strategy employed by heterosexual men who physically attack gays. Heterosexual men arm themselves in this mode of defense pursuant to the idea that almost all straight men are deeply scared of homosexual advances. Thus, physical assault of heterosexual men on gays is justifiable (Sedgwick, 1990: 19). Despite this seemingly tragic plight, homosexuals have managed to bind themselves together and (apparently succeeded) to defend their cause—that is, to assert their rights as human beings, however as gays, and as denizens of certain states or republics.

In the Philippines, gays are victorious in founding and enlisting themselves in organizations such as “*ProGay*” (a gay rights organization based in Metro Manila), “*Babaylan*” (an organization based in the University of the Philippines, Dilliman campus that accepts lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transexuals (LGBT), “*LAGABLAB*” (a legislative advocacy network for gays based in Metro Manila), “*Can’t Live in the Closet*” (an activist group composed of lesbians who are also based in Metro Manila), “*IWAG*” (a gay

social support group based in the South, specifically, Davao City), “GAHUM” (a Cebu based organization which is exclusively constituted of gays who banded themselves together for purposes of providing support and advocacy of their own interests), “STRAP” (a lesbian composed group based in Metro Manila whose members call themselves as disciples of the Society of Transsexual Women in the Philippines, “Order of St. Aelred” (a gay center designed to handle the spiritual needs of gays, especially those who are in Metro Manila), “Metropolitan Community Church Philippines” (a “church” that caters to the spiritual needs of gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgenders. Notably, this is the ever first LGBT church in the world that pioneered in administering same sex or gay marriage in the Philippines), and “Philippine Womyns Bisexual Network,” or the so-called “WomynBiNet” [(an organization that addresses the issues of womyn bisexuals in the Philippines). Available at http://en.wikipilipinas.org/index.php?title=Homosexuality_in_the_Philippines. Accessed 26 January 2010].

To pursue our goal in this paper, it is important to raise this question: Is homosexuality one of the glaring issues of the day? It appears that homosexuals are claiming for a regular, rather than a casual, membership, specifically in the mainstream society. Thus in the Film Center of the Philippines, cultural shows hosted by “dancing women” are generally composed of gays, instead of true-blue women. In addition, *Gay Pageants* or *Miss Gay Beauty* contests are getting commonplace. In this regard, it is good to ask: Is homosexuality talk of the town of the day? Congresswoman Bellaflor Angara-Castillo even attempted to pass House Bill 2051 that allowed marriages between a man and another man and between a woman with another woman. But this proposed bill, however, was vehemently opposed by her colleagues in Congress including the clergy.

Consequently, the President of *Progressive Organization of Gays* (ProGay), Oscar Atadero, fought back and claimed that legislators and clergymen grossly missed to understand the “true” context of the bill. Atadero complained that they (legislators and the clerics), pursuant to their objections of the bill, equally fail to show respect to their rights as gays or homosexuals. Accordingly, this proposed bill “claimed to protect the rights of homosexuals and to prevent their being discriminated upon by society and their immediate family members” (*Philippine Daily Inquirer*, February 28, 2002: A3). In addition, its authors maintained that the bill did not yield to an advocacy of same-sex marriage, but only on matters that pertain to domestic partnership among gays and lesbians.

Whatever HB 2051 really meant, at least in the minds of its proponents, we cannot deny that society today is too busy in entertaining, or hesitating to entertain, full-fledged and self-confessed gays and lesbians. In this regard, is homosexuality a matter of birth, or of choice, or of behavior, or of orientation? Is it an innate construct so that homosexuals are, so to say, “born-that-way”? Can it be considered as some kind of “Divine Error,” or a blatant manifestation of a weak spot in Darwin’s theory of Natural Selection? Can it be recognized and accepted as a “way of life” as Foucault recommends? Or must it be considered as a sinful condition and disgraceful disposition? Or should it rather be considered as an illness such as emotional and a psychosexual inadequacy? If it is some kind of illness, can it be cured? Could there be any space for healing, specifically in the emotional, psychological, and social dimensions in the development of a homosexual? Can it be justifiably accepted as a connatural attribute of individuals in this species so that their being such should be welcomed and considered as natural as heterosexuality or bisexuality—with due respect to the kinds of biological sex (*supra*)? In addition, some biblically rooted concerns may be raised such as: Did God create only a male (in the person of *Adam*) and a female (in the person of *Eve*) as the Genesis account of creation narrates? Was it possible that other than the male and the female sexualities God also created gays and lesbians, or even bisexuals, such as the one that is biblically cited in the case of Sodom and Gomorrah? All these questions will be treated in the succeeding pages of this paper.

Jean-Paul Sartre, one of the most influential existentialists, claims that whatever decision which one makes for himself/herself, one makes it for others (Sartre, 1965: 295). So, if one has resolved his/her doubt whether he/she is a true-blooded male or a true-soft-blooded female and finally comes to grip with a firm decision to be a full-time member of the community of “gays or “lesbians,” then, all of us have to admit that the male and female archetypes of sexualities are not enough to constitute the concept of sexuality. To be added to the taxonomy should be a man with the following features: he actually has a woman’s heart, mind, and lives the life of a woman and a woman with the following attributes: she actually thinks, feels, and lives as a man. At any rate, there are gays (*She-Men*) who managed to hide their odor, color, and texture in the crevices and shadows of darkness. They are those who brush aside the so-called “coming-out-process” in the trade of gayism. They operate like KGBs or “*Ka Gabii Bayot*” (literally, those who become/transform as gays at night time), or PMAs, meaning, “*Pedikyor, Manikyor, Alot*” (literally, those who work in

parlors as beauticians). However, it must be made clear that homosexuality is not a kind of sexuality (biological) but rather a result of one's sexual orientation.

Comparatively, gays are better organized than their lesbian counterparts (the *He-Women*). In fact, Justo C. Justo, a confessed gay who is a writer and a one time councilor in Pasay City, founded the "*Home for the Golden Gay*" (cited in Extra-Extra, GMA, Channel 7, March 04, 2002, hosted by Paolo Bediones and Miriam Quimbao). The "*Home for the Golden Gay*" is the haven of the worn-out, over-exposed, overused, or perhaps, extremely exhausted gays or *She-Men*.

Ostensibly, the enterprise of lesbians is much less established. As a result, they are "less persecuted for their sexual behavior than [the] male homosexuals" (Genovesi, 2003: 263). This is understandable, perhaps, because they are seemingly aloft and are quite hard to be readily identified. In fact based on records, when the gays were outlawed and banned in England in the 19th-century, the lesbians had successfully escaped the ban because Queen Victoria refused to recognize the concept (Available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). The disadvantage of this "invisibility" is that the needs of lesbians have been oftentimes overlooked, and lesbians lacked historical role models of their lifestyles. Does this mean that gays are more open with their status than their lesbian comrades?

Meaning of homosexuality/homosexual

The term "homosexuality" was coined by an Austrian-born novelist who eventually became a German psychologist named Karoly Maria Benkert in 1869 [other sources, however, take her name as Karl-Maria Kertbeny. (Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010; also at <http://www.gayhistory.com/rev2/events/1869b.htm>. Accessed 25 January 2010; and also at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality>. Accessed 25 January 2010)]. Its definition is varied. They are as follows: (1) It is a sexual attraction and a physical and emotional involvement with someone of the same sex, viz., male with male, female with female (Available at <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010); (2) It pertains to "sexual attraction toward members of one's own sex" or a "sexual activity with another person of the same sex" (*Random House Webster's College Dictionary*, 2001: 632); (3) It is defined as "a persistent, predominant erotic attraction to persons of the same sex which is often (though not necessarily) allied with sexual activity" (Peschke, 2001: 454);

(4) Homosexuals are “individuals who more or less chronically feel an urgent sexual desire towards, and a sexual responsiveness to, members of the same sex, and who seek gratification of this desire predominantly with members of the same sex” (Genovesi, 2003: 253); (4) A homosexual is a person “who is motivated, in adult life, by a definite preferential erotic attraction to members of the same sex and who usually (but not necessarily) engages in overt sexual relations with them” (Marmon, 1965: 4); (6) A homosexual is an adult person “whose primary affectional and genital orientation is toward the same sex” (Nelson, 1979: 201).

These definitions underscore “adulthood” and “sexual, emotional, and physical attraction” of one to the members of his/her own sex. This means that homosexuality does not occur at childhood. In this case, it may sound absurd if one asks this question: Is the sperm of a gay also gay and that of a lesbian, lesbian? It is equally absurd if one talks of a “gay” spermatozoa, a “lesbian” oocyte, a “gay” or a “lesbian” embryo, or a fetus, although, as we will see later, some scholars (Dean Hamer, Peter Copeland, Michael Bailey, Richard Pillard, and Simon LeVay) talk of “*gay gene*” or a “*gay brain*.”

It is important to note that homosexuality, like heterosexuality, is found in all cultures at all periods of history. However, it has undergone a thousand of years of prejudice, discrimination, and oppression enshrined in religious and legal prohibitions, popular fear, and has often been met with violent opposition. Yet, many cultures have managed to integrate some aspects of homosexuality into some acceptable and recognized social forms. Since the 1960s, in most Western countries, homosexuals have become vocal advocates of their own cause.

The emergence of the term “homosexuality” reflected a growing awareness of the existence of diverse sexual patterns. For some critics of the homosexual phenomenon, the term homosexuality is intended as a neutral alternative to the traditional language of sin, degeneracy, and perversion that had dominated the thinking about same-sex activities, including marriages, in the West, and which had their roots in biblical prohibitions, that is, the biblical accounts in Sodom and Gomorrah (Available at <http://www.conservativapedia.com/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). However, the word soon became part of the new language of sexology (the scientific study of sexual behavior). For many, homosexuality has transcended from being a sin to being a sickness.

Homosexuality: An evaluation

A landscape of the “causes” of homosexuality

Experts maintain that there are generally two theories that can help explain the occurrence of homosexuality, namely, medical (biological) and psychosocial.

a. Medical

The biological theory argues that homosexuality is an inherent and, probably, hereditary condition that affects some people. Negatively, it can be seen as a pathological distortion of the natural sexual drive of a person caused, perhaps, by the imbalances of hormones or chromosomal (genetic) accidents or, more recently, in a surprising rebirth of biological explanations, like the result of a “*gay gene*,” or a “*gay brain*” as suggested by Dean Hamer, Peter Copeland, Michael Bailey, Richard Pillard, and Simon LeVay (Bailey & Pillard, 1991: 48, 1089-1096; also, LeVay, 1993: 38). In this perspective, homosexuals are individuals who are products “of some genetic code or some pre- or post natal hormonal influence” (Genovesi, 2003: 264). In this theory, Hamer and his colleagues claim that there could be a genetic and unchangeable theory that can help explain the phenomenon of the homosexual behavior. In their research, they conclude that homosexuality is inborn and a normal variant of human sexuality. As a result, the tri-media, including the gay activists, started to proclaim about what, to them, scientists call “gay gene” or “gay brain.” However, it is not Hamer’s team who coined these queer terms; it is the media and the activists instead. What Hamer and his team did was to study a common type of behavioral genetics which they termed “linkage theory.” In this investigation, they tried to “look for a chromosomal variant in the genetic material” of the respondents, after which they tried to “determine whether that variant is more frequent in family members who share the particular trait” (<http://www.narth.com/docs/istheregene.html>. Accessed 10 February 2010). In this research, Hamer and company concluded that homosexuality runs in the blood. They supported this claim after they concluded their study of the “family history of 114 gay men and found out that their brothers, maternal uncles, and maternal male cousins were not likely to be homosexuals than would be expected among the general male population.

In some families, gay relatives could be traced back for three generations. Because the homosexual uncles and male cousins of the gay subjects were raised in different households, [Hamer and his team]

hypothesized that a genetic factor was involved” (<http://www.skeptictank.org/gaygene.htm>. Accessed 10 February 2010). Unfortunately, in the institutionalization or replication phase of the research, said research failed to pass the process. Other scientists who conducted the same research via replication did not arrive at the same finding and conclusion (<http://www.narth.com/docs/istheregene.html>. Accessed 10 February 2010). Critics of the theory were quick to air out their reactions such as “the theory is used only by the gay activists to support their propaganda and, somehow, justify their queer existence” (<http://forum.prisonplanet.com/index.php?topic=105636.0>. Accessed 19 February 2010). The more mature reaction is that “[t]here is no consensus among scientists about the exact reasons that an individual develops a heterosexual, bisexual, gay, or lesbian orientation” (Ibid.). Also, some express that “Although much research has examined the possible genetic, hormonal, developmental, social, and cultural influences on sexual orientation is determined by any particular factor or factors...” (Ibid.).

The definition of homosexuality as a medical or a biological condition, indeed, has led to a quest relative to the issue on the causes of heterosexuality. What are the causes that make the majority of the population heterosexual? If at all, a biological explanation regarding the occurrence of homosexuality is available, then it is also equally important to inquire on matters that could help explain the causes of heterosexuality. But there is a pronounced prejudice that is bitterly pressed against the homosexuals. To this effect, any attempt that “is made to explain the homosexual orientation” necessitates some comparable efforts meant to “uncover the causes of heterosexuality” (Genovesi, 2003: 261). That only a few people have undertaken some substantial research on the causes of heterosexuality indicates the dominance of the view that homosexuality is an abnormality that needed to be explained, while heterosexuality, which leads to procreation, is construed as the unquestioned norm of human sexuality (Available at <http://www.conservativapedia.com/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). However, after a century of debate and scientific investigations, the question relative to the causes of heterosexuality remains as inconclusive as ever. There is, therefore, no diametrical claim that could ultimately explain the cause/s of the phenomenon on homosexuality.

Such explanations led, in turn, to some positive views regarding homosexuality. If homosexuality has a biological explanation, and is, in itself, a specific sexual orientation, can't it be considered as something “natural” like heterosexuality? Many homosexual activists have, in fact,

argued this since the 19th-century. But no matter how convincing and endearing these explanations may be, they (homosexual activists)—like in the negative view cited above—have to bear the misfortune that such theory (the *gay gene* or the *gay brain*) is not being completely proven and is subjected to a high tone of validity.

b. Psychosocial

The adherents of this theory maintain that homosexuals are people who are “affected, conditioned, or nurtured by their psychological and emotional environment in such a way that they come to be attracted to members of the opposite sex” (Genovesi, 2003: 264). The most famous thinker who is associated with such explanation is Sigmund Freud. To the renowned founder of Psychoanalysis, homosexuality is not a neurotic illness. He makes it clear that

Homosexuality is assuredly no advantage, but it is nothing to be ashamed of, no vice, no degradation; it cannot be classified as an illness; we consider it to be a variation of the sexual function produced by a certain arrest of sexual development [(Freud (1935), as cited by Ruiteenbeek, 1963: 1-2; also available at <http://psychotherapy/papers.wordpress.com/2008/11/12/kirby1>. Accessed 10 February 2010)].

But despite his assuring words that show some solid guarantees that homosexuality is not an illness, he opines that “homosexuality is a variation of the sexual function produced by arrest of sexual development, and attributed homoeroticism to insufficient repression of the original bisexual disposition” (Available at <http://psychotherapy/papers.wordpress.com/2008/11/12/kirby1>. Accessed 10 February 2010). In the *Three Essays* which Freud wrote in 1905, he argues, on the one hand, that homosexuality comes to the fore through the “Oedipus conflict and the boy’s discovery that his mother is ‘castrated.’” This produces intense castration anxiety causing the boy to turn from his castrated mother to a ‘woman with a penis.’ On the other hand, “if a ‘negative’ or ‘inverted’ Oedipus complex occurs, a boy seeks his father’s love and masculine identification by taking on a feminine identification and reverting to anal eroticism” (Ibid.). Whereas Freud is not convinced that homosexuality is an illness he, however, believes that it is some kind of sexual inadequacy which he traces as a frustration or interruption of the usual process of psychosocial development in achieving heterosexuality.

Freud explains that early childhood development undergoes some psychosexual stages of the libido, that is, from the oral to the anal, then, to the genital stages. With this in mind, Freud clarifies that adult sexuality should be properly placed in the context of penile-vaginal intercourse. Because of this, he argues that adults who resort to oral and anal forms of sexual gratifications are sexually immature in that they fail to transcend and pass from their childhood sexual expressions (Ibid.). To this degree, Freud maintains that homosexuality is caused by “a *libidinal arrest* (in the phallic stage) or [a] failure to reach the final psychosexual stage of genitality due to a blockage of the energetic force” (Ibid.).

Homosexual Orientation in Contradistinction to Homosexual Activity

One may have a homosexual orientation, yet he/she may not directly or necessarily engage in homosexual activities. This means that homosexual activities cannot be conclusively postulated among people who have homosexual orientations. In fact, Ellis and Hirschfeld, as cited by Peschke, argue that “it should not be understood that not all persons with a homosexual constitution also engage in active homosexual practices” (Peschke, 2001: 454).

Accordingly, homosexual orientation is just one of the categories of sexual orientation, namely, heterosexual (those who have sexual or romantic attraction or relation with people of the opposite sex), homosexual (those who have sexual and romantic attraction or relation with those of their own sex), and bisexual (those who have sexual or romantic attraction or relation to both men and women).

It (sexual orientation) is defined as “an enduring pattern of or disposition to experience sexual, affectional, or romantic attractions primarily to men, to women, or to both sexes” (Available at <http://e..wikipedia.org/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). It is also understood as “an individual’s sense of personal and social identity based on those attractions, behaviours expressing them, and membership in a community of others who share them” (Ibid.). Based on these meanings, sexual orientation is intrinsically entangled in the inter-subjective relation of a person. In this light, “sexual orientation is always defined in relational terms and necessarily involves relationships with other individuals” (Ibid.). It is therefore, “integrally linked to the intimate personal relationships that human beings form with others to meet their deeply felt needs for love, attachment, and intimacy” (Ibid.).

The category of sexual orientation, somehow, determines the kind of sexual acts that a person may engage into. A person who has homosexual orientation may resort to having sexual acts with those who belong to his/her own sexuality, in the same manner that a heterosexual person will have the same to people who belong to the opposite sex. The bisexual, however, will have sexual activities with those who are both male and female. But, it must be made clear that heterosexual individuals may perform sexual activities that are usually done by homosexuals. These individuals are aptly called pseudo-homosexuals. It may not be duly categorized as a sexual orientation inasmuch as it is not something that is learned through exposure or association. It is rather caused by the need for a sexual gratification which is not available because of some given circumstance, like if one is in prison, or one is stationed in an area as a soldier where there are no available members of the opposite sex. It is, therefore, the absence of heterosexual outlets that cause soldiers, prisoners, among others, to become temporary homosexuals (See Peschke, 2001, 454; also Genovesi, 2003: 259).

Cultural Variations in Attitudes

Recent approaches have tried to understand homosexuality in the ambit of social and historical dimensions. This approach, however, pays lesser focus on what causes homosexuality and puts more emphasis on the factors that shape the attitudes that resulted one to become a homosexual. It is worthy to note, however, that different cultures respond to the problematics of homosexuality in different ways that, in turn, help to determine whether it is possible to live a homosexual life or develop a distinctive homosexual identity.

In a global scale, there seems to have been two social patterns that allowed a certain acceptance of some aspects of homosexuality, specifically on the part of gays. The first which can be seen historically in cultures as far as East Asia, Melanesia, the Islamic world, and the ancient Mediterranean, more or less tolerated homosexual behavior as long as it is between an adult male and a youth, usually as part of the processes by which the young male was accepted as a full man. This, being accepted as part of their cultural pattern, normally affects their traditional family life. The second great pattern, embracing cultures from the Philippines to Madagascar, and some tribal societies in Africa and North America, accepted some forms of same-sex behavior as long as the homosexually inclined man has triumphally "become," or lived as a woman, or the woman to become, or lived as a man (Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality>. Accessed

26 January 2010). There have been various attempts to assess the percentage of population that is predominantly or exclusively homosexual. In the study of Hagmaier and Gleason, as cited by Peschke, “Five percent of the male population and about half that incidence for women is an estimate which appears in a number of reliable studies” (Peschke, 2001: 453-454). The work of Alfred Kinsey in the late 1940s has been used to suggest that this was as many as 10 per cent, although more recent research has suggested a much lower figure – perhaps, 1 to 2 per cent in Britain, France, and the United States (Available at <http://www.conservativapedia.com/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). However, worldwide evidence suggests that this is a misleading assessment; while Western-style identities have begun to spread throughout the world, the homosexuals have never become the dominant population. In many parts of the world, ranging from Turkey to large parts of Asia, Africa, and South America, homosexuality remains a taboo. The Muslims, including the Jews, have laws that punish severely those who are proven as homosexuals. Even in Western countries, prejudice remains, and legal systems are often discriminatory (Genovesi, 2003: 265).

Recent Social Developments

Neither the Mediterranean nor the tribal cultural pattern allowed the emergence of what has become the dominant Western pattern in the 20th-century: the idea that homosexuality could form the basis for a separate sexual and social identity and way of life (it is in this realm where Foucault’s campaign to establish a homosexual life anchored on the relationship of friendship heavily tilt to the losing end). This idea probably first emerged in the new urban cultures that developed from the early modern period. Cities allowed groups of people who felt differently to come together in relative anonymity, and develop alternative lifestyles (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). At first, these subcultures, usually of what were seen as effeminate men, and to smaller extent masculine women, were secretive and subject to strong persecution. During the 20th-century, however, they gave rise to ever more complex social networks, and to a strong sense of community among self-identified homosexuals, who were beginning to resist the hostile labelling of them as sick creatures.

This was the basis for the Gay Liberation Movement which emerged powerfully in the United States in 1969, symbolically originating in the New York Stonewall Riots in June that year, and soon rapidly becoming influential throughout North America, Australia, and Western Europe

(<http://www.conservativapedia.com/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010). This movement has been very influential, even for the many who never took part of it. It asserted the equal validity of homosexuality with heterosexuality; it rejected medicalizing terms, and popularized new self-descriptions, such as “gay”. It emphasized the importance of pride in being a lesbian or a gay—this, apparently, almost makes homosexuality an ideology.

The idea that lesbians and gays are distinct groups of people has been challenged radically by “queer activists” who argue that sexuality is a matter of choice, and that the difference between homosexuality and heterosexuality is practically social and historical, rather than being theoretically construed as fundamental, essential, or a biological reality. This has retrieved the focus on the debate on causation. It is possible that some people develop predominantly homosexual desires as a result of a variety of genetic, psychological, or social factors. This is still not known, however. In the end, the notion on causation is not the important question. What ultimately matters is whether homosexuality offers the possibility on the viability of life choices and a fulfilling way of living. The evidence of recent years shows that clearly it can, though resistance to this evidence is still very strong.

Are the determined “causes” of homosexuality valid and licit? Could it be more humane and modest if we use factors that may help explain why one is a homosexual? This is the pleading of the Catholic Bishops of America. The Bishops assert:

It seems well established by now that there is indeed no one ‘cause’ of homosexuality. It is probably better, in fact, not to speak at all of causes in the strict sense but rather of factors that contribute to the genesis and growth of homosexuality, for the origins of our sexual orientation—whether heterosexual or homosexual— are deeply rooted in our experiences, and they undoubtedly reflect a convergence of many biological, psychological, and sociological circumstances (NCCB, *Principles to Guide Confessors*, 1973: 5-8).

HOMOSEXUALITY: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Do homosexuals breathe the air of conquest of recognition in the social structures and the strata of biopower? Or is it better for them to repress their sexual desires and embrace a strong resolve of concealment, rather than step into the swift moves of disclosure? Can Foucault successfully liberate them in the realm of these problematics of being homosexuals?

Horkheimer once argued that a “critical attitude... is wholly distrustful of the rules of conduct with which society as presently constituted provides each of its members” (1973: 207). Is this attitude that Horkheimer talks about directive of Foucault’s? In *Critical Theory*, Horkheimer notes: “...a theory is critical to the extent that it seeks human emancipation to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them” (1982: 244). Is the theory that Foucault develops emancipative enough of the homosexuals from their enslavement of the repressive regime of the predominantly heterosexual society? True enough, homosexuals are members of the human species; they are undoubtedly and intrinsically subjects. Hence, as subjects, should they also deserve to be reified? To Horkheimer, the subject of critical thinking is “a definite individual in his real relation to other individuals and groups, in his conflict with a particular class, and finally, in the resultant web of relationships with the social totality” (1973: 211).

Anchored on the thought-constructs cited above, it is proper to ask the following questions: Is it wrong to be a homosexual? Are homosexuals irresponsible freaks? Leo Bersani’s (Foucault’s bosom friend in California) answer is that they are “trying to persuade straight society that [they] can be good parents, good soldiers, and good priest” (Bersani: 1995: 113). They even deserve a warm applause and some burning congratulatory remarks since from among the other sex deviants mentioned by Richard von Krafft-Ebing (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_von_Frafft-Ebing. Accessed 22 February 2010) as zoophiles and zoerasts and also by Hermann Rohleder as auto-monosexualists, mixoscopophiles, gynecomasts, presbyophiles, sexoesthetic inverts, and dyspareunist women as cited by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality*, Volume I (1978: 43) they are the only ones who survive.

Are the homosexuals their sexuality? Is one one’s sexuality? Is one one’s social orientation? Is it their homosexuality that accounts to the totality of the personhood of homosexuals? Is the homosexual orientation of the homosexuals far off important than their being persons? It is not we who choose our sexuality (including our sexual orientations); it is our sexuality that chooses us. Our sexuality is part and parcel of our, to Heidegger, facticity, our thrownness into the kind of life that we have.

The fact is our sexuality is just one of the component parts that make us humans, in the same manner that our sexual orientation cannot categorically account for the totality of our personhood. For this Genovesi remarks:

People do not choose their sexual orientation. Nobody simply makes up his or her mind to become a homosexual or a

heterosexual. Homosexuals no more make a conscious choice to be physically or sexually attracted to members of the same sex than heterosexuals consciously choose to be erotically attracted to members of the opposite sex. Rather, at some point in their development homosexuals ‘discover’ that they are sexually drawn to members of the same sex, just as heterosexuals ‘discover’ that they are physically attracted to members of the opposite sex (Genovesi, 2003: 255).

Based on the above argument, it is not sinful, or immoral, or illegal for one to be a homosexual. In fact, the Catholic Church makes it explicit that “gays and lesbians do not choose their homosexual condition” (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, par. 2358. Available at <http://www.scborromeo.org/ccc/p3s2c2a5.htm>. Accessed 27 August 2009). In this sympathetic statement of the Catholic Church, it appears that homosexuals are given due affirmation inasmuch as their being so is not a product of their own decision or choice. Their being homosexual, therefore, is something that must be construed as part of their uniqueness. For this, Genovesi has the following words to say:

Whether we refer to someone as a ‘homosexual’ or as ‘an individual with a homosexual orientation,’ the basic truth is simply that every person who is attracted to members of the same sex is unique, no less than is every person who is attracted to members of the opposite sex (Genovesi, 2003: 261).

To castigate homosexuals, therefore, with banter, violence, scorn, injustice, and discrimination amounts to an affront of their personhood. All these result to a reductionist scheme against homosexuals. To reduce homosexuals to their sexual orientation is equivalent to reducing the totality of their personhood to a mere accident of sexuality. As explained above, no homosexuals have graciously chosen or have gloriously decided to be so.

The Catholic Church, including some scholars, like Genovesi, indeed, is trying to be apologetic to the homosexuals. This course of action is justifiable in so far as it upholds the status of homosexuals as homosexuals – meaning their state of homosexuality is a result of sexual orientation. Nobody, based on this perspective, has the right to punish or to discriminate the homosexuals for this reason, one way or another. However, a distinction must be made between what a homosexual is and what a homosexual does sexually.

As has been presented, there is no problem with the homosexuals pursuant to the fact that their status is a result of their sexual orientation.

The problem comes in only when their behavior or activities are the ones that are given emphasis. Undeniably, the Catholic Church accepts homosexuals as homosexuals. The objection, however, lies in their acts as homosexuals. According to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Art. 2357:

Basing itself on Sacred Scripture, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity, tradition has always declared that 'homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered.' They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.

The church upholds the idea that man is the ontological complementary of woman and vice-versa. It is the mandate of natural law that such is the plight of the sexes – one that is readily available in the heterosexual relations, but clearly not in homosexual ones. In fact, Art. 2337 of the same source says: “This man-woman complementarity is seen as being physical (two in one flesh), psychological (the male’s joy in the presence of the female), and spiritual (he leaves his own family to commit himself to her.” The church, further, makes more succinct remarks and sharp discourses that only a man and a woman can give a lifelong mutual commitment for love. The same source narrates: “Sexuality, in which man’s belonging to the bodily and biological world is expressed, becomes personal and truly human when it is integrated into the relationship of one person to another, in the complete and lifelong mutual gift of a man and a woman.” The nuance of complementariness among heterosexuals is given also much emphasis by some scholars who support the mandates of the Catholic Church against homosexual love and sexual acts. Ronald Lawler, Joseph Boyle Jr., and William May have the following words:

... the lovemaking of spouses is directed either toward having children, or is expressive of a love that essentially includes an orientation toward the fruitfulness of procreation. The love of spouses can and must be enduring because it is essentially related to enduring goods; but homosexual love simply is not ordered to any transcendent good that essentially requires of the partners utter self-giving and faithfulness until death. A marital kind of friendship cannot obtain among homosexuals; their sexual act cannot express a marital kind of love, for they cannot be what spouses are. Their sexual acts cannot be procreative and cannot express a love that is inherently fruitful and procreative (Lawler, Boyle, & May, 1985: 201).

The above teaching of the Catholic Church and the remarks of some notable scholars are all anchored on some biblical accounts. It is important to note some of them. In the Old Testament, we have the following accounts: Leviticus 18:22 warns: "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is abomination" and Leviticus 20:13 is more horrible; it promises death to those who perform homosexual acts. It says: "If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death." The New Testament shows its own share of condemning the homosexual acts in the following: Romans 1: 26-27 notes: "For this reason, God gave them over to degrading passions; for their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural, and in the same way also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire toward one another, men with men committing indecent acts and receiving in their own persons the due penalty of their error." This text is a bit broader in that it punctures the skulls of the homosexuals both as gays and lesbians. In its own vogue of criticizing the homosexuals 1 Corinthians 6:9 has the following lines: "Do not be deceived: Neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God. This passage is more aggressive. It condemns not only the homosexuals, but also the other offenders who are bound not to heaven, but somewhere else - well, said passage does not provide the exact location to where these species of offenders will go, anyway. In, more or less, the same tenor, 1 Timothy 1:10 follows suit. It says: "...the law is good...realizing the fact that law is not made for the righteous person, but for those who are lawless...ungodly...sinners...for murderers and immoral men and homosexuals."

So, sexual activity is acceptable both to society and to God, based on the above presentation, only if it conforms with the course of natural law, that is, only heterosexuals are allowed to have a wide latitude to enjoy it, specifically in the context of marriage. If this is the case, then, "Sex is boring," laments Foucault (Davidson, 1994: 115). Obviously, boredom is an effect of a biting monotony which is anchored on over exposure of something that is regularly or routinely done so that what one does in this manner becomes absurd or meaningless. So, what is in sex that Foucault sees as boring? By sex here he means the sexual activity, not the biological sex (sexuality) that one is. Somehow, his remark is influenced by the thoughts of one of his mentors, that is, Immanuel Kant. To Kant, sex "makes the loved person an object of appetite.... Taken by itself, it is a

degradation of human nature” (Kant, 1963: 1963). With his pessimism with sex, the seem-to-be-sexual-stoic German philosopher, “For the natural use that one sex makes of the other’s sexual organ is enjoyment, for which one gives oneself up to the other. In this act, a human being makes himself into a thing” (Kant, 1996: 62). So what can we do with Kant? Nothing. Let us leave him like that. He is not like us who wish to go deeper into the problematics of sex. For all we know, sex is a gift that God has given us specifically for the purpose of begetting His children. In other words, sex is not its own reward. It is not an end in itself, but only a means to an end.

So, if sexual activity is routinely done by heterosexuals, which is the usual case, then to those who are not heterosexuals, such act is indeed boring – according to how Foucault views the act. Even when the heterosexuals have invented a lot of tricks on how to achieve arousal and eventually climax or orgasm, like the several kinds of sexual positions, or sexual gymnastics, or sexual acrobatics that are available in a renowned erotic literature which is fondly called *Kamasutra* and in some pornographic magazines, like *Playboy*, *Hustler*, *Younger Babes*, *FHM*, among others, all these sexual maneuvers are boring to Foucault since they are performed by monotonous partners, the heterosexuals. Why don’t they try some other techniques through which the sexual enthusiast may find meaning in what he/she does? Why not a male have another male for the satisfaction of his sexual appetite so do with a female with another female for the same goal and direction? So, why not become a homosexual? What is wrong with becoming one? To Foucault, the homosexual is a life that is replete with adventure and creativity.

He (Foucault) is not alone in his advocacy of giving due honor, respect, and recognition to homosexuals, especially the gays. He espouses some radical ideas that to him will lift the spirit, condition, and status of gays. Some scholars of note support Foucault by contending that if homosexuals can install a stable union, like that of the marriage of the heterosexuals, then such union must be accepted as an alternative mode of heterosexual marriage. The proponents of this argument, in the caliber of John McNeill, Gregory Baum, Anthony Kosnik, Daniel Maguire, among others, argue that homosexuals “should be granted the same right to sexual intimacy as other persons, although they would also have to strive after the same ideals of mutual support and fidelity” (See Peschke, 2001: 460). In contradistinction to the arguments upheld by Lawler, Boyle, and May, as cited above, Michael Sandel argues that “gay and lesbian relationships can realize the same goods that heterosexual relationships do” (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January

2010). Together with Sandel, other equally prominent scholars like Bruce Bawer and Andrew Sullivan invest some considerable energy to fight for the drafting and promulgation of legislations that could grant equality among homosexuals, including the right for same-sex marriage (Ibid.).

Foucauldian Strategies in Defense of Homosexuals: Can He Liberate the Gays?

According to the accounts of Didier Eribon, one of the close associates of Foucault, one time when he and Foucault were invited by Jacques Lacan for dinner, Foucault once emphatically made an itchy remark: “There will be no civilization as long as marriage between men is not accepted” (Eribon, 1991: 25). He wants to be their Paraclete; their saint; their saviour. Is Foucault wrong on this? In this averment, Foucault appears to assume the impersonation of a prophet for gays. In this seeming amplitude, he prophesies that civilization will crumble if gays are not given due acceptance, specifically in the context of matrimonial union. Davidson, another Foucauldian scholar, keenly observes that Foucault has a lot of interests in taking homosexuality in a new plane, that is, to see it as a new form of relation, or a new form of love (Davidson, 1994: 149). True enough, Foucault’s interest in fortifying the welfare of gays are well expressed in his writings, specifically *The History of Sexuality*, Volumes I (*An Introduction*, 1976), II (*The Use of Pleasure*, 1984), and III (*The Care for the Self*, 1984); *Sex, Power, and Political Identity*; and *Friendship as a Way of Life, Live Interviews*.

In *Friendship as a Way of Life* Foucault writes:

Is it possible to create a homosexual mode of life? This notion of mode of life seems important to me.... It seems to me that a way of life can yield a culture and an ethics. To be ‘gay,’ I think, is not to identify with the psychological traits and the visible marks of the homosexual, but to try to define and develop a way of life (1966-1984: 206-207).

The above passage allows Foucault to have a vivid imagination and direction that the homosexuals are capable of establishing their own “world,” their own society, their own culture, their own parameters of the norms of right and wrong, and their own way of life that is premised on the conviction that all these are part and parcel of their uniqueness.

In *The History of Sexuality*, Volume I (*An Introduction*), Foucault evinces: “... homosexuality began to speak in its own behalf to demand that its legitimacy or ‘naturalness’ be acknowledged...” (1976: 101). To Foucault, the notion of sex must not be restrained in the auspices of

heterosexuality, specifically in matrimony and procreation. This leads Foucault to maintain:

... to reduce sex to its reproductive function, its heterosexual and adult form, and its matrimonial legitimacy fails to take into account the manifold objectives aimed for, the manifold means employed in the different sexual politics concerned with the two sexes, the different age groups and social classes (Ibid.: 103).

In the text above, Foucault alludes to the idea that homosexuality should be embodied in the classification of sexualities so that they must not only be categorized as males and females, but also homosexuals. To this effect, Foucault does not consider homosexuality as a result of sexual orientation but as a biological sex *per se*. He writes: "Homosexuality appeared as one of the forms of sexuality when it was transposed from the practice of sodomy.... The sodomite had been a temporary aberration; the homosexual was now a species" (Ibid.: 43). To Foucault, the success of the extraction of the concept of homosexuality from the vile of sodomy allowed it as a seemingly acceptable category of sexuality. This is affirmed by Gary Gutting, the editor of *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. He notes: "[A] more interesting case is the inverse fates of sodomy and homosexuality. Previously sodomy had been violently condemned as a religious profanation and homosexuality tolerated as an amorous equivocation" (Gutting 1994: 55).

Despite his insistence that homosexuality may succeed to carve itself as its own species so that it may be registered as one of the kinds of sexualities, Foucault is aware that it is indexed as one of the grave sins. He opines:

On the list of grave sins, and separated only by their relative importance, there appeared debauchery (extramarital relations), adultery, rape, spiritual or carnal incest,... sodomy, or the mutual 'caress.' As to the courts, they ... condemned homosexuality as well as infidelity, marriage without parental consent, or bestiality" (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, Vol. I, 1974: 38). In consonance to the classification of these acts as grave sins, they are also considered as those that are "contrary to nature," and are, likewise, "contrary to law" (Ibid.).

In *The History of Sexuality*, Volume II (*The Use of Pleasure*), Foucault complains that Christianity has associated sexual act with evil, sin, the Fall, and death, whereas antiquity invested it with positive symbolic values (1984: 14). Along this sordid objection, he quips that Christianity has "consigned

pleasure to the realm of death and evil” (Ibid., 16). Foucault, here, misses the point of the ecclesial restriction of sexual gratification. True, the Church maintains the descriptions of sexual acts as narrated by Foucault, but they are only addressed to those who enjoy sex sans matrimony. He also oversights the fact that the Church glorifies sexual pleasure, yet, such should be celebrated only in the matrimonial bond. Outside this scope, all forms of sexual pleasures are doomed to perdition, chaos, and even death.

Foucault is aware that Christianity consistently stands its ground in demanding for a “monogamous marriage and laid down the principle of exclusive procreative ends within the conjugal relationship” (Ibid.: 14). He is at the same time aware that Christianity asserts “the disallowance of relations between individuals of the same sex... [in fact] Christianity strictly excluded such relationships, while Greece exalted them, and Rome accepted them, at least between men” (Ibid.).

As a historian, it is a cinch on the part of Foucault to trace how the archaic Greeks have conceptualized and understood human sexuality. What Foucault discovers is that the Greeks do not consider homosexuality as immoral – obviously, they didn’t have the term yet in their language. To Foucault, the Greeks “did not recognize two kinds of ‘desire,’ two different or competing ‘drives’ each claiming a share of men’s hearts or appetites” (Ibid., 188).

A lot of fantastic things are discovered by Foucault in his study of ancient Greek culture. One of them is that the Greeks are bisexuals. They can, simultaneously, or in turn, “be enamoured of a boy or a girl; that a married man could have *paidika*; that it was common for a male to change to preference for women after ‘boy-loving’ inclinations in his youth” (Ibid.: 188). Living in the plane of bisexuality, the Greeks have “... free choice they allowed themselves between the two sexes...” (Ibid.). The Greeks believe that their bisexual nature is determined by their natural erotic proclivity to both sexes. To them, “... what made it possible to desire a man or a woman was simply the appetite that nature had implanted in man’s heart for beautiful human beings, whatever their sex might be” (Ibid.).

Foucault, with much vigor, notes well enough that Greek laws – including conventional rules of conduct and procedure – allow courtship between a man and a boy. The suitor being called *erastes* and the one courted *eromenos*. Foucault narrates that the *erastes* has rights and obligations to make. Part of his obligation is to give gifts and render some services to the *eromenos*. Because of this, he can assert his right to have a just reward. The *eromenos*, in turn, has the obligation to assume, like not to reduce

himself to the level of one who is “easy-to-get-type.” He should, therefore, not “yield too easily.” In addition, he is bound not to “accept too many tokens of love, and from granting his favors heedlessly and out of self-interest, without testing the worth of his partner” (Ibid.). Finally, he is required to “show gratitude for what the lover had done for him” (Ibid.: 196). Once their relationship is sealed, both are, by operation of law, required to be faithful to each other.

Further, Foucault observes that Greek laws, specifically in Athens, punish criminal offenses like rape (of slaves or children) and male prostitution, “but nothing prevented or prohibited an adolescent from being the openly recognized sexual partner of a man” (Ibid.). On the contrary, the same laws harshly punish male prostitutes – those males who collect or demand or receive payment for sexual services and those who are duly identified as having indiscriminate number of sexual partners. These punishments are disqualification to discharge “the office of priest or acting as an advocate of the state” (Ibid.); “debarred from holding any magistracy in the city or abroad...” (Ibid.: 218). Further, “He could not serve as a herald or ambassador, nor become a prosecutor or ambassador” (Ibid.).

With much enthusiasm, Foucault pursues on the manner through which courtship is established in ancient Greek life. He provides with vivid description that the *erastes* was openly permitted “to pursue a boy [*eromenos*], chase after him, watch for him in those places where he might pass and catch hold of him where he happened to be...” (Ibid., 197). Yes, the boys’ bodies were adored by men because of their virility, charm, vigor, and pleasurable physique (Ibid., 200). But Foucault notices that the boy’s attractiveness is bound for a certain limitation. He observes that a boy can’t be a perpetual object of a pleasure to men. When he (boy) grows older into a man, his being an object of pleasure perishes; the only exceptions are the Stoics. Says Foucault: “[T]he first beard was believed to be that fateful mark; and it was said that the razor that shaved it must sever the ties of love [between the *erastes* and the *eromenos*]” (Ibid., 199).

Foucault also notices that the Greeks have distaste for catamites. To them, the catamites are beholders of “certain shameful behaviors” (Ibid., 191); “...people [Greeks] criticized... men who frequented overaged boys” (Ibid.: 199). In the same breath, they, too, frown on pederasties. Foucault says that “one should note that people criticized...boys who were willing to play a role that no longer corresponded to their virility” (Ibid.). The Greeks believe that “...it [is] not good to love a boy who [is] past a certain age, just as it [is] not good for him to allow himself to be loved” (Ibid., 201).

Foucault also notes that the homosexual relation among ancient Greeks is not conditioned by structures. He writes, “[I]n the case of a man or boy who were in a position of reciprocal independence and between whom there was no institutional constraint, but rather an open game (with preferences, choices, freedom of movement...), the principle of regulation of behaviors was to be sought in the relation itself, in the nature of the attraction that drew them toward one another, and in the mutual attachment that connected them” (Ibid., 202).

In *The History of Sexuality*, Volume III, Foucault laboriously inquires on the views of Artemidorus (also called Daldianus, a Greek expert on dream interpretation). He notes that the latter vividly captures how nature designs sexual acts or sexual positions among animals and humans. According to Foucault, Artemidorus designs a theory which the latter believes to be nature’s paradigm itself. In this, Artemidorus shows how animals and humans come to terms with sexual engagement. It runs:

... nature has established a definite form of sexual act for each species, one and only one natural position from which animals do not deviate: ‘For example, some animals mount from behind, such as the horse, ass, goat, bull, stag, and other four-footed animals. Others join their mouths first, such as the adder, the dove, and the weasel... Others have no contact at all... for example, fish. Similarly, humans have received a very specific mode of union from nature: the face-to-face position, with the man extended full length on top of the woman (1984: 23).

Ostensively, animals have completely obeyed this nature’s design relative to sexual “conduct.” On the contrary, humans (probably, because of their rationality that allows them to be creative) have designed other sexual positions – like those cited above - that include anal or rectal sex (sodomy) and oral sex (oral eroticism).

As Foucault passionately chronicles Artemidorus’ accounts on sexual acts, he notes that the latter considers “[a]ll the other positions... yielding to wantonness and licentiousness” (Ibid., 23). To Artemidorus, these acts are awful and are by themselves morally wrong (Ibid.).

According to Foucault, Artemidorus has firmly maintained that sexual intercourse always requires penetration (Ibid.). But, he, however, does not clearly indicate if this penetration is exclusive to penile-vaginal one. So what happens if sexual intercourse is had by a man with another man, or by a woman with another woman? To Artemidorus, “Between two men, penetration, the manly act *par excellence*, is not a transgression of nature

(even if it can be considered as shameful...). But in the case of intercourse “between two women...[the act is] unnatural as human intercourse with a god or animal” (Ibid.; 24-25). Here, Foucault puts forward his sharp observation that Artemidorus is biased in contending that the right course of action in sexual intercourse is the much needed penetration. This is because Foucault admits that intercourse between two men is possible through oral or anal sex. Inasmuch as women are by nature equipped with hollows (vagina) rather than extensions (penis), penetration is impossible for them to perform. As a result, Artemidorus qualifies sexual intercourse of two women as unnatural; hence, abominable and distasteful.

To Foucault, to single out penetration (penis to vagina, or penis to mouth or anus) as “the core of sexual activity” redounds to a structure on the play of power “within a social scenography” (Ibid.: 30). Foucault writes:

Artemidorus sees the sexual act first and foremost as a game of superiority and inferiority: penetration places the two partners in a relationship of domination and submission. It is victory on one side, defeat on the other. It is a status that one asserts, or a condition to which one is subjected (Ibid.).

Other than the binary of the notions of “superiority” and “inferiority” lodged in penetration as the sole mechanism of sexual intercourse, Foucault also notes that “Artemidorus also sees it as an ‘economic’ game of expenditure and profit; profit, the pleasure that one takes, the agreeable sensations that one experiences; expenditure, the energy necessary for the act, the loss of semen – that precious vital substance – and the fatigue that ensues” (Ibid.).

But for practical reasons and purposes, would the reproductive organs of two gay men (penis) and of two women (vagina) who are engaged in “sexual intercourse” to each other fit each other? If the true purpose of sex is only pleasure, then there will be no valid objections that can be advanced in this particular homosexual sexual engagement. But on the contrary, if the *telos* of sexual intercourse is pleasure that is meant for procreation, then the sexual gratifications had by the homosexuals is unacceptable. So, what genitals really fit the other? According to Nicholas Davidson, it is the genitals of the male that fit to that of the female. He writes:

Men and women fit together. Their body parts fit together, whatever the specific physiological processes involved may be. Their contrasting sexual fantasies, emotions, and behaviors fit together. Heterosexual intercourse is deeply fulfilling in a way

that is lacking in any other form of sexual experience (Davidson, 1988: 92).

Clearly, Davidson has a firm grip on the notion that outside heterosexual sex, there is no fulfilment – that is, in the paradigmatic of procreation. If Foucault, however, were still alive (anyway he died in 1984) he will forcibly refute Davidson by contending that there is much glory and fulfilment in the sexual acts done by homosexuals, *sans* procreation. His experiences as a gay can readily vouch for this. Accordingly, he had a very colorful gay life experience, especially when he started making lectures in America, specifically in Berkeley, California through the loving and amiable invitation of Leo Bersani, a noted gay professor in the University of California, Berkeley (<http://subsite.berkeley.edu/gaybears/foucault/> Accessed 11 January 2010). In this locus, the life style of our superstar has dramatically changed. He started enjoying the night life here with his fellow gays, enjoying the morbid aroma of drugs, especially (LySergic Acid Diethylamide, or popularly known as LSD, gay bath, among others that their breed enjoy with the soaring height of ecstasy (Ibid.).

As a gay who has wilfully liberated himself from the “closet,” he casually confessed that he has a lover for 20 years named Daniel Defert. But the latter left him in favor of his burning desire to join the ultra-Maoist Gauche Proletarienne in Germany (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Foucault. Accessed 11 January 2010). Consequently, Foucault was left alone in his campaign to make people understand what a homosexual life actually is.

Conclusion

The problematics of homosexuality may entail the following: First, should it be included and eventually accepted and recognized as one of the kinds of biological sex (sexuality) so that, instead of having only males and females, we also have to accommodate an additional species, that is, the homosexuals? In this sphere, it is proper to raise some theological questions: Is it possible that God created also homosexuals as reflected in the story of Lot (Sodom of Gomorra)? Are the Jews, in the Genesis account of creation, not bias of the kinds of sexes that they accounted only Adam - *Adama* in Hebrew which means “soil,” “clay,” or “dust - for males, Eve - *Hamma* in Hebrew which means “the Living One” – (Babor, 2007: 348) for females and viciously excluded the homosexuals? And by the way, who was the first person to confidently classify the biological sex of humans only in the categories of males and females? Did the Jews pioneer on this? So, is it plausible that there were truly homosexuals in the

taxonomy of God's creation, however, the chroniclers of God's manifested work - the Jews - were prejudiced by their presence? But, accordingly, before Christ was born homosexuality was already practiced by the Africans. In fact, "The first recorded homosexual couple in history is commonly regarded as Khnumhotep and Niankhknum, an Egyptian male couple who lived around 2400 BCE (see <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010).

So, should it be included and eventually accepted and recognized as one of the kinds of biological sex (sexuality)? The answer is, Foucault is not aggressively demanding for it to be so. He left to the homosexuals, especially the gays, the task to creatively come to terms with this direction. He believes that time will come that homosexual marriage will eventually become a norm, an ethics, in civilization like what he said (*supra*).

Second, will Foucault's vision of placing homosexual relation in the domain of friendship prosper so that repression is no longer necessary because society will readily affirm them as regular members? Will the homosexual relation, placed in the paradigm of friendship, survive the acid test on the notion of procreation as one of the terminal consequences of an amorous relation? Can sodomy and *fillatio* be repudiated in this condition? If at all this scheme is pursued, the remedial measures could be that gays will undergo an implantation of uterus in their reproductive system. In addition, they may have their penises removed and replace them with vaginas. Once they are equipped with vaginas, they may enjoy what technology can offer to them in this interest, like hymen repair, hymen restoration, vaginal rejuvenation, vaginal tightening, vaginal relaxation, and labioplasty (Babor, 2007: 253). They should also undertake breast implantation or breast augmentation.

Foucault's project requires that a new dimension of relationship between people, specifically gays, should be discovered. Love between man and woman, based on societal norms, is a multidimensional relationship. It involves not only sex, but friendship as well. "Foucault essentially argues that, if society perceived the friendship aspect of homosexual relationships in the same way, instead of focusing solely on sex, that whole new categories of relationships would be discovered" (Available at <http://depts.washington.edu/keywords/wiki.index.php?title=Michel>. Accessed 10 January 2010). To make this possible, homosexual must install their distinct "way of life." As has been cited, Foucault opines that a "way of life" can "yield a culture and ethics." In this regard, the homosexual "way of life" can be welcomed and accommodated to expand the terrain and dimension of societal norms. This means that instead of having the

usual male and female kinds of sexuality, heterosexuals – for those who are straight – and homosexuals – for the gay and lesbians can be constructed. In this case, the homosexuals’ establishment of their own “way of life” makes them better able to manifest to society the grade of friendship they have in their relationship, thereby making themselves gain power. But what are the norms through which this homosexual “way of life” can be erected and be securely moored? It appears that there is none. The existing systems of power are firmly closed for a homosexual “way of life.” For this, Paul Rabinow remarks:

Foucault’s idea of the homosexual’s insight into the fabric of culture comes from existing ‘slatwise’ – counter to norms. It is ... a self-defeating prophecy that the homosexual should gain insight into the society and construct his own way of life by setting in motion processes that preclude his ability to gain said insight (Ibid.).

To this effect, Foucault, again, leaves a challenge to the homosexuals that they must exert some considerable efforts that eventually, the “way of life” that they will establish will be recognized by society, the Church, the legislators, and the jurists included.

Third, can legislations on gay marriages gain global acceptance and approval? In the Philippines alone, will the legislators be willing enough to enact laws that will uphold gay rights and other interests, like adopting a child for an offspring, protection, among others?

In the *Order of things*, Foucault asserts that human sciences (biology, economics, philosophy) “...analys[e]s ... what man is in his positivity (living, speaking, labouring being) to what enables this same being to know (or seek to know) what life is...in what way he is able to speak” (1994: 355). Will this insight be of help to homosexuals to know deeply who they are and in what manner can they speak for themselves with captive notice specifically from the quarters of legislators, moralists, and the clerics – they, being those who take the lead in pressing much difficulties on the part of gays to be accepted as normal members in society? The problem with this is that the homosexuals do not seemingly have problems regarding self-understanding. The true problem is that the non-homosexuals are not willing to accommodate them as normal members in society. In this case, social science cannot help the homosexuals to achieve their goals – that is, to be free from discrimination, ridicule, and the like. Ergo, drafting some laws in their favor and interest cannot be easily passed in the hands heterosexual legislators.

In *Archaeology of Knowledge*, Foucault's thoughts on homosexuality can be treated on the level of language. To this degree, the discourse *homosexuality is an illness or a disease* "... cannot be hidden, it is not visible; it is not presented to the perception as the manifest bearer of its limits and characteristics. It requires a certain change of viewpoint and attitude to be recognized and examined in itself" (1972: 111). Yes, critics of homosexuality can hardly be stopped from believing that something is truly wrong with homosexuality. In fact, John Thorp, a Foucauldian scholar, has noted some theories which to him are great remedies for the problematics of the homosexuality to be understood. These are the theories: (1.) Planophysical Theory. This explains that homosexuality is an error of nature, a freak, or a result of some hormonal defects. This is where the concept of Hamer and company on "gay gene" or "gay brain" theory belongs; (2.) Doliophysical Theory. This pertains to the notion that homosexuality is produced by nature. However, nature fails to fully compensate the true nature of homosexuals. As a result, homosexuals become the "soft spots" of nature; and (3.) Sociobiological Theory. This embraces the idea that homosexuals are neither product of nature nor of nurture. To avoid the breed of homosexuals, kin selection and parental manipulation may be controlled. Thorp remarks: "I admire these theories very much for their brilliant ingenuity, but I believe that there are difficulties of detail with each of them" (Available at <http://www.fordham.edu/haisall/med/thorp.html>. Accessed 09 October 2009). But, no matter how attractive Foucault's contention may be, the heterosexual majority in society will never stop to believe that homosexuality per se is not normal, that is, their sex is a threat to the straight guys out there in the mainstream society. Even when it is a cinch to accept the contention that we do not choose our sexuality, rather our sexuality chooses us, yet, the stigma that is embedded in the soul of a homosexual is so hard for straight guys to efface.

In *Discipline and Punish*, this question can be asked: Are homosexuals guilty of their being homosexuals? Apparently, many ascribe of intrinsic immorality to the homosexuals pursuant to their inherent stature as "guilty creatures." "It made the guilty man the herald of his own condemnation. He was given the task, in the sense, of proclaiming it and thus attesting to the truth of what he had been charged with:..." (1995: 43). True enough, society has condemned the homosexuals and has charged them of grave immoral and criminal offenses even when they have not committed any act expressive of their proclivity as homosexuals. Hence, to be a homosexual is

to live in a life that is already condemned and punished. To be a homosexual is in itself a crime, a penalty.

So, can Foucault liberate the gays from these obstacles? Sadly, he died without accomplishing fully his prophetic mission, that is, to emancipate the homosexuals. In fact, he envisioned to write eight volumes of his *The History of Sexuality* project. But after AIDS (Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome) claimed his life in 1984 (http://www.mcm.edu/_dodd1/TWU/FS5023/Foucault.htm. Accessed 19 February 2010), he ended only in accomplishing the third volume with a sleazy manuscript for the fourth volume which he categorically decided not to be published after his death.

Foucault's followers are orphaned by AIDS, a rabid and a fatal disease that is usually associated with the gay life style. But no matter what, Foucault's spirit actively and passionately moves the homosexuals, especially the gays, to come to terms with their liberation from the oppressive structures of biopower in society. The heavy tasks laden on the shoulders of these unique species of humans are continuously moving. The homosexuals are not yet done with their tasks. What they need are their collective global efforts that all homosexuals in the world, underscoring the gays, will come to terms with an honest "confession" of their being what they are so that all them in the different walks of life, especially those who are holding power, will lobby and march with them in the militant way to demand and declare their freedom and emancipation. Like Karl Marx, they may shout to all the citizens of this planet earth the solemn assertion: All gays in the world unite! We will lose nothing but the chains of discrimination and prejudice that the straight society has ascribed to us.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Babor, Eddie. 2006. *Ethics: The philosophical discipline of action*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
- _____. 2007. *The human person: Not real but existing*. Manila: C & E Publishing.
- _____. 2009. *Bioethics: A guide to a healthcare provider*. Manila: C & E Publishing.
- Bailey, J.M. and Pillard, R. 1999. *A genetic study of male sexual orientation*. USA: Archives of General Psychiatry.
- Beauchamp, Tom. *Philosophical ethics: an introduction to moral philosophy*. New York: (ndp).
- Bersani, L. 1995. *Homos*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Borowitz, Eugene. 1986. *Introduction to religious existentialism*. New York: Delta Books.
- Buco, Luz, et al. 1999. *Introduction to psychology*. Manila: Rex Book Store.
- Davidson, Nicholas. 1988. *The failure of feminism*. New York: Prometheus Books.
- Eribon, Didier. 1991. *Michel Foucault*. Translated by B. Wing. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The history of sexuality*. Vol.1. New York: Vintage Book.
- _____. 1984. *The history of sexuality*. Vol. 2. New York: Vintage Book.
- _____. 1986. *The history of sexuality*. Vol. 3. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. 1973. *Madness and civilization*. Trans. By Richard Howard. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____. 1981. *Power/knowledge*. Trans. By R. James Goldstain and James Casianto, USA: Italian Cooperative Editri.
- _____. 1977. *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and writings*. Edited by Colin Gordon. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. 1995. *Discipline and punish*. Trans. By Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____. 1994. *The order of things: An archaeology of human sciences*. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____. 1972. *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. Trans. By A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Genovesi, Vincent. 2003. *In pursuit of love: Catholic morality and human sexuality*. Quezon City, Philippines: Jesuit Communications Foundation.
- Gutting, Gary, ed. 1984. *The Cambridge companion to Foucault*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamer, D. and Copeland P. 1994. *The science of desire: The search for the gay gene and the biology of behavior*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hettlinger, Richard. 1974. *Sex isn't that simple: The new sexuality on campus*. New York: Seabury.
- Horkheimer, Max. 1973. *Critical theory: selected essays*. Trans. By Matthew J. O'connell, et al. New York: Continuum Books.
- _____. 1973. *Traditional and Critical theory*. Trans. By Matthew O'connell, et al. New York: Continuum Publishing.
- Jay, Martin. 1973. *The dialectical imagination: A history of the Frankfurt school and the institute of social research*. Canada: Little Brown and Company.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1963. *Lectures on ethics*. Translated by Louis Infield. New York: Harper and Row.
- _____. 1996. *The metaphysics of morals*. Translated by Mary Gregor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufmann, Walter. 1965. *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Lawler, Ronald, Boyle, Joseph, Jr., & May, William. 1985. *Catholic sexual ethics*. Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor.
- LeVay, S. 1993. *The sexual brain*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

- Macey, David. 2007. *Critical theory*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Marmon, Judd, ed. 1965. *Sexual inversion*. New York: Basic Books.
- May, Todd. 2006. *The philosophy of Foucault*. Hong Kong: Acumen Publishing.
- McNay, Louis. 1983. *Foucault: A critical introduction*. New York: Continuum Books.
- McNeill, John. 1976. *The church and the homosexual*. Kansas City: Sheed Andrews and McMeel.
- Nelson, James. 1979. *Embodiment: an approach to sexuality and Christian theology*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Books.
- National Conference of Catholic Bishops. 1973. *Principles to Guide Confessors in Questions of Homosexuality*. Washington: United States Catholic Conference.
- Peschke, Karl. 2001. *Christian ethics: Moral theology in the light of Vatican ii*. Volume 2. Manila: Logos Publication.
- Rabinow, Paul. 1984. *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Rush, Fred, ed. 2006. *The Cambridge companion to Critical theory*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Schroyer, Trent. 1970. *The critique of dominion: The origins and development of critical theory*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. 1990. *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wachterhauser, Brice, ed. 1995. *Hermeneutics and modern philosophy*. New York: State of New York Press.
- Woods, Richard. 1978. *Another kind of love*. New York: Doubleday.

Articles

- Co, Alfredo. 2009. Discourse on sex, metasex, ethics, and human sexuality. *Karunungan: A Journal of Philosophy* 26: 1-21.
- Davidson, Arnold. 1984. Ethics as ascetics: Foucault, the history of ethics and ancient thought. In *The Cambridge companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Fourez, Gerard. 1984. The sexual revolution in perspective. In *The sexual revolution*, edited by Gregory Baum and John Coleman. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1963. Letter to an American mother. In *The problem of homosexuality in modern society*, edited by Ruiteenbeek. New York: Dutton Books.
- Guinan, Michael. 1983. Homosexuals: A Christian pastoral response. In *A challenge to love: Gay and lesbian Catholics in the church*, edited by Robert Nugent. New York: Crossroad Books.
- Hanks, Susan. 1984. The sexual revolution and violence against women: The boundary between liberation and exploitation. In *The sexual revolution*, edited by Gregory Baum and John Coleman, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Kingston, Mark. Subversive friendships: Foucault on homosexuality and social experimentation. Available at <http://raul/cbs.dk/index.php/foucault-studies/article/view/2634>. Accessed 08 October 2009.

- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1965. Existentialism is a humanism. In *Existentialism From Dostoevsky to Sartre*, Walter Kaufmann. New York: Meridian Books, 1965.
- _____. 1965. Self-deception and falsehood. In *Existentialism from Dostoevsky to Sartre*, Walter Kaufmann. New York: Meridian Books.

Electronic sources

- Foucault, Michel. *Friendship as a way of life*. Available at <http://depts.washington.edu/keywords/wiki/index.php?title=Michel>. Accessed 07 January 2010.
- Halter, Ed. The origin of the species. Available at <http://www.villagevoice.com/2004-02-03/books/the-origin-of-species/1>. Accessed 19 February 2010.
- McWhorter, Ladelle. Foucault's genealogy of homosexuality. Available at http://www.ics.purdue.edu-smith132/French_Philosophy/Sp94/fouca.pdf. Accessed 18 February 2010.
- Thorp, John. *The social construction of homosexuality*. Available at <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/med/thorp.html>. Accessed 09 October 2009.
- <http://www.contempaesthetics.org/newvolume/pages/article.php?articleID=244>. Accessed 07 January 2010.
- <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MRC/audiofiles.html#foucault>. Accessed 07 January 2010.
- <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010.
- <http://www.conservativapedia.com/Homosexuality>. Accessed 26 January 2010.
- <http://www.gayhistory.com/rev2/events/1869b.htm>. Accessed 25 January 2010.
- <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality>. Accessed 25 January 2010.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Foucault. Accessed 11 January 2010.
- <http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/gaybears/foucault>. Accessed 11 January 2010.
- <http://depts.washington.edu/keywords/wiki/index.php?title=Michel>. Accessed 10 January 2010.
- <http://forum.prisonplanet.com/index.php?topic=105636.0>. Accessed 10 February 2010.
- <http://www.skeptictank.org/gaygene.htm>. Accessed 10 February 2010.
- <http://www.narth.com/docs/istheregene.html>. Accessed 10 February 2010.
- <http://psychotherapy/papers.wordpress.com/2008/11/12/kirby1>. Accessed 10 February 2010.
- http://en.wikipilipinas.org/index.php?title=Homosexuality_in_the_Philippines. Accessed 26 January 2010.
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Critical_theory.htm. Accessed 01 January 2009.
- <http://www.marxist.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/fo.html>. Accessed 12 December 2009.

-
- www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/richardrotypostmoderntheory. Accessed 09 June 2009.
- <http://www.apahelpcenter.org/articles/article?id=31>. Accessed 23 December 2009.
- <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Biological+Exuberance:+Animal+Homosexuality+andNatural+Duniversity.a053877996>. Accessed 19 December 2009.
- http://drama.uwaterloo.ca/Gross%20Indecency/homosexuality_word.shtml. Accessed 9 December 2009.
- <http://web.archive.org/web/20071102101657/http://dev.hrc.org/issues/333.htm>. Accessed 12 December 2009.
- <http://www.apa.org/releases/therapeutic.html>. Accessed 14 December 2009.
- http://books.google.com/books?id=moFuFC_ap8C&dq=Sexual1%2BOrientation%2Band%2BPsychoanalysis:%C2AOSexual%2BScience%2Band%2BClinical%2BPractice. Accessed 14 December 2009.
- <http://www.labmeeting.com/paper/17688909/duffy-rusbult-1985-satisfaction-and-commitment-in-homosexual-and-heterosexual-relationships>. Accessed 18 December 2009.
- http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3852/is_199901/ai_n8845504/pg_7/?tag=content;coll. Accessed 18 December 2009.
- <http://www.soulforce.org/article/642>. Accessed 20 December 2009.
- <http://www.pinknews.co.uk/news/articles/2005-1496.html>. Accessed 20 December 2009.
- <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=yffzsKWvP6AC&oi=fnd&pg=PA138&ots=8RVKJpMsOh&sig=cV1xTjj9IsBYObvw7DLb4bd7fw#PPA138.M1>. Accessed 20 December 2009.
- <http://raul.cbs.dk/index.php/foucault-studies/article/view/2634>. Accessed 08 October 2009.
- <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/med/thorp.html>. Accessed 09 October 2009.
- www.home.ku.edu.tr/_dyukseker/notes-on-foucault.doc. Accessed 09 October 2009.
- http://www.ipce.info/ipceweb/Library/history_of_sexuality.htm. Accessed 09 October 2009.
- <http://www.scborromeo.org/ccc/p3s2c2a5.htm>. Accessed 27 August 2009.
- <http://www.uno.edu/-asoble/pages/PSINTRO.HTM>. Accessed 19 August 2009.
- <http://www1.umn.edu/ships/gender/phil'sex.htm>. Accessed 19 August 2009.