

This article was downloaded by: [University of Leeds]

On: 08 December 2014, At: 11:34

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



The Journal of Sex Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hjsr20>

Book Reviews

Michael R. Stevenson Ph.D. ^a, Mary A. Koralewski Ph.D. ^b, Walter L. Williams Ph.D. ^c,
Mary E. Kite Ph.D. ^d, Holly Devor Ph.D. ^e, James D. Weinrich Ph.D. ^f, Timothy Perper
Ph.D. ^g & Martha Cornog ^g

^a Department of Psychological Sciences, Ball State University, Muncie, IN, 47306, USA

^b University of Houston-Clear Lake, Box 202, 2700 Bay Area Boulevard, Houston, TX,
77058

^c Program for the Study of Women and Men in Society, University of Southern California,
Los Angeles, CA, 90089-0036

^d Department of Psychological Science, Ball State University, Muncie, IN, 47306

^e Sociology Department, University of Victoria, Box 3050, Victoria, BC, Canada, V8W
3P5

^f Department of Psychiatry 0603-H, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA,
92093-0603

^g 717 Pemberton Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19147

Published online: 11 Jan 2010.

To cite this article: Michael R. Stevenson Ph.D., Mary A. Koralewski Ph.D., Walter L. Williams Ph.D., Mary E. Kite Ph.D., Holly Devor Ph.D., James D. Weinrich Ph.D., Timothy Perper Ph.D. & Martha Cornog (1993) Book Reviews, *The Journal of Sex Research*, 30:3, 283-296, DOI: [10.1080/00224499309551712](https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499309551712)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224499309551712>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Reviews

Individuals who wish to contribute reviews to *The Journal of Sex Research* are invited to send the Book Review Editor their vita and a description of the content areas in which they feel competent to provide evaluative reviews. Individuals who wish to have their materials considered for evaluation should instruct their publishers to send two copies of the material to the Book Review Editor. Because of space limitations, however, it is not possible to review all materials that are received. Send materials and vitae to

Michael R. Stevenson, Ph.D.
Department of Psychological Sciences
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306, USA

Book Reviews

Let's Stop Blaming Mothers!

Mothers of Incest Survivors: Another Side of the Story. By Janis Tyler Johnson. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992, 162 pages. Paper, \$9.95.

Reviewed by Mary A. Koralewski, Ph.D., University of Houston-Clear Lake, 2700 Bay Area Boulevard, Box 202, Houston, TX 77058.

The role of mothers in incest families is difficult to comprehend. Questions such as "how could she not know?" and "why didn't she do something?" reflect the cultural and historical convenience of blaming mothers instead of focusing on perpetrators. Further, these biases have prevented scholars from conducting empirical research about the roles of mothers.

In this impressive and important book, Janis Tyler Johnson described her interviews with mothers of incest survivors. Designed to challenge the assumptions held by researchers and mental health professionals and to fill a void in this literature, Johnson employed an ethnographic approach to understanding their lives. Writing in language that clinicians, researchers,

and laypeople can understand, the author examined how the mothers discovered the incest, how they responded to the discovery, and what explanations or meanings they gave for the incest event. She used detailed quotations from the mothers, interspersed with her well-reasoned interpretations, to provide a rich pastiche.

Johnson examined the narratives of six women whose daughters were sexually abused by either their biological father or stepfather. The mothers ranged in age from their late twenties to early sixties and varied a great deal in terms of how they were selected for the study (e.g., referred by a social worker or an attorney, or by reading a flier). Unfortunately, no information about their cultural, ethnic, or socioeconomic background was provided. Despite the range of demographics across the sample, each woman was economically dependent on her husband and reported that she had been victimized either physically or emotionally by her husband.

The author first described the mothers' discovery of and initial responses to the incest. Two mothers learned via outside authorities to whom their daughters purposely

reported the incest. One acknowledged it as a result of prodding and encouragement by her suspecting therapist. The others learned either by accidentally observing the incest or by being told by their daughters.

The mothers' initial reactions to the discovery were outlined in terms of belief/disbelief (cognitive) and denial/acceptance (emotional). All the mothers believed the incest really happened, regardless of how they learned about it. More importantly, although some responded initially with shock and immobilization while they deliberated their options, what may appear to others as denial or disbelief was not a permanent pattern.

Johnson next explored the mothers' behavioral responses following their initial shock. Most mothers took some form of protective action, although the outcomes varied greatly. For two mothers, no protective measures were needed, because the incest had already stopped, and they had already divorced. Others attempted to take action by confronting their husbands or reporting their suspicions to a physician or child welfare agency, but their actions were thwarted because the mothers were not believed. As a group, the mothers' protective

behavior spanned a wide range from reporting their suspicions to the authorities; seeking medical, mental health, and legal services; refusing to "bail out" their husbands; and seeking needed support from friends and other family members. If the incest was disclosed to someone outside the family, it was much more likely to stop than if the mother tried to resolve the situation privately. The state of the marriage and degree of social isolation were also related to the mothers' actions.

The mothers' explanations for why the incest occurred included sexual estrangement from their husbands, the perception of pathology in their husbands (e.g., alcoholism) and other stresses on the family system. The question of who was responsible, however, rested clearly on their husbands' shoulders. Although some mothers felt guilty about the pain their daughters suffered, none assumed responsibility for their husbands' behavior. Moreover, none of the mothers held their daughters responsible for the incest.

A major purpose of the book was to examine the assumptions held about the mothers in these families. Johnson reviewed the literature on the three major models about mothers' participation in the incest family—the collusive mother, the powerless mother, and the protective mother. The collusive mother, as seen from both psychoanalytic and family systems perspectives, is an active part of the system and aware of the incest. She abandons her duties as wife and mother and reverses roles with her daughter in terms of meeting the husband's/father's emotional and sexual needs. Recognizing the patriarchal structure of many incest families, the powerless mother perspective grew to encompass a helpless woman who, as a result of traditional gender-role socialization, fails to protect her daughter because she lacks the personal, economic, or

social resources necessary to prevent victimization, either for herself or her daughter. The third model, which is probably the least comprehensible, is the protective mother who has alternative resources outside the marriage to bolster her decision to confront the abuser and whose anger toward her husband is stronger than her dependence on him.

From a theoretical viewpoint, I am unsure what can be concluded about incest mothers as a result of this study. Johnson employed a very small and unrepresentative sample, making generalizations impossible. However, she concluded that "[h]opefully, we have put the 'collusive mother' to rest and we can concentrate on helping mothers and daughters to heal" (p. 128) and that "[p]rofessionals can . . . set aside the widely held assumptions about wives and mothers generally and incest-family mothers in particular" (p. 124). Unfortunately, her research design does not allow us to do that. Although I agree that the collusive mother model has been used in a harmful way to blame women, Johnson may have had a certain bias from the beginning in the direction of refuting the "collusive mother" model. Can any researcher be value free? No. Does any researcher not have an investment in the outcome of her or his study? Probably not. However, an ethnographic approach doesn't allow one to pit theoretical models against each other in the manner Johnson specified. To her credit, she acknowledged that "[t]he result is another portrait of mothers of incest survivors, a portrait somewhat different from the collusive and powerless mothers who have dominated the literature of incest for so long. The self-reports of only six mothers . . . cannot be generalized to other incest-family mothers" (p. x).

Despite the limitations on generalizability, if we are to prevent or even understand the phenomenon of sexual coercion, we must broaden

our vision and range of methods and not depend exclusively on the false security of the scientific method. Listening to mothers' voices as they tell their stories provides a useful means of learning about incest. This project provides another example of the struggle between scientific rigor and meaningfulness in research on human sexuality, which has been written about in previous issues of *The Journal of Sex Research* (e.g., Abramson, 1990; Tiefer, 1991). I agree with Tiefer (1991) that "[i]nstead of adhering, sheeplike, to a prestige hierarchy of methods, with experimental, controlled and quantitative methods at the top, and correlational, descriptive and qualitative methods at the bottom, we must accept the fact that different approaches produce different insights, that all 'facts' and other forms of understanding the world are limited by the circumstances of their production, and that methods are complimentary, not competing, even when their premises conflict" (p. 600).

I am also concerned with the ethical implications of possible dual-role relationships. The fuzzy distinction between the author's role as researcher/interviewer and caseworker/clinician is demonstrated in this statement: "one of the reasons the mothers I interviewed were willing to talk to me was their need to go over what had happened in their families in an attempt to make some sense out of it, to understand it, and to find some meaning in it" (p. 119). Their need was evident in the mothers' stated reasons for participating in the study: "Ann said that talking to me about the incest was an important part of her healing process . . . For Diane, the interview was an outlet to get rid of some of the hatred she felt toward her husband and what had happened" (pp. 125-126). Although we hope that research participants will benefit from taking part in research, in some ways Johnson may have been conducting clinical

work outside the context of a therapeutic relationship. Boundaries are extremely important in therapy, especially when sexual coercion, with its inherent boundary violations, is concerned.

Despite these limitations, Johnson's work offers several contributions to our understanding of the sexual abuse of children. First, although sweeping generalizations cannot be made on the basis of her small sample, the tapestry she wove does offer something other than a simplistic, mother-blaming context in which the incest event can be placed. She generated many interesting hypotheses to be followed up in future endeavors. Again, although the ethnographic approach has its limitations, it does provide a very creative way of understanding something that is not amenable to "rigorous" approaches.

References

- Abramson, P. R. (1990). Sexual science: Emerging discipline or oxymoron? *The Journal of Sex Research*, 27, 2, 147-166.
- Tiefer, L. (1991). New perspectives in sexology: From rigor (mortis) to richness. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 28, 4, 593-602.

Homosexuality in China

Passions of the Cut Sleeve: The Male Homosexual Tradition in China. By Bret Hinsch. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990. xvii + 232 pp. Cloth, \$24.95.

Reviewed by Walter L. Williams, Ph.D., University of Southern California, Program for the Study of Women and Men in Society, Los Angeles, CA 90089-0036.

Within the last two decades numerous studies have been done on homosexuality, yet the vast majority have been limited to the modern West. In the last few years, however, an increasingly impressive literature has begun to emerge on same-sex eroticism in other cul-

tures. By expanding the boundaries in seeing how different societies organize sexual variance, we can better understand the wide range of possibilities and can transcend the limited vision of the contemporary West. The ignorance of many Americans and Europeans about worldwide same-sex love is not only ethnocentric, but it deprives many individuals of realistic and respectable role models which might be adapted from other cultures.

Bret Hinsch's historical study of same-sex love in China, from the ancient Zhou dynasty until the end of the Qing dynasty in the early twentieth century, is a recent example of this new and exciting scholarship. Hinsch is properly conscious of the limitations of his sources, which are focused mostly on the emperors' courts and the upper class, but he inventively used court records on male prostitution, fiction, poetry, religious tracts, jokes, and philosophical treatises to learn about homosexuality among the common people in pre-modern China.

He sensibly incorporated both "essentialist" and "social constructionist" perspectives of sexuality into his analysis. Essentialists have argued that certain individuals have an inborn, or essential, aspect of their character that makes them gender nonconformist and/or homosexually oriented. On the other hand, social constructionists argue that all people have a pansexual potential, which societies shape, or construct, in wildly divergent ways. The constructionist perspective is useful for understanding socially approved forms of sexual and gender roles that a society encourages for the majority. In fact, researchers have shown that the majority of individuals do conform to whatever sexual style their culture tells them is proper, no matter how divergent those behaviors might be. Thus, Hinsch found that, before 1900, the dominant social construction for males in China was bisexual. Most

Chinese men did not see themselves as being divided into strict categories of "homosexuals" and "heterosexuals" but evidenced a relaxed erotic attraction to both sexes. Wealthy married men or unmarried scholars often had a boy (ranging in age from as young as 9 to as old as 25 years) as a concubine, or they patronized boy prostitutes. Chinese philosophers wrote that it was better for a boy to sell his body, as a favorite or a prostitute, than to languish in poverty. Prostitution/concubinage represented one of the few opportunities for lower class boys to raise their economic status and to support their parents comfortably. If a boy became a beloved of a wealthy older man, he was sometimes offered material wealth or political office when he matured. His patron/lover might even arrange a heterosexual marriage for him and serve as best man at his wedding. Individuals who enjoyed male-male sex were not seen as distinct personality types but merely partook of certain "passions." These passions were termed "passions of the cut sleeve," after the devotion shown by Emperor Ai (ruler 6 B.C.E.-1 C.E.), who cut the sleeve off his shirt rather than disturb the sleep of his beloved boy lover Dong Xian. Another term was "passion of the half-eaten peach," reflecting the consideration of Mizi Xia, the court favorite of the ruler Ling (534-493 B.C.E.), in giving a particularly delicious peach he had tasted to his beloved patron to eat.

On the other hand, certain Chinese men were recognized as being "enthusiasts of male love," and some kept lifelong male partners even if they were also married to a woman. More egalitarian male-male relationships also existed, in terms of fictive "elder brother/younger brother" couples. Still other males refused to marry heterosexually and took on a more androgynous role, becoming like a wife to a masculine man. In the royal courts, many males did not

marry, and they fit into court society as artists, servants, administrators, or favorites of the emperors. The social constructionist position does not account for why these individuals remained sexual non-conformists. In cases like these, Hinsch posited the essentialist view that they may have had inborn characteristics which oriented them toward homosexuality. Recent discoveries in the field of biology and genetics lend credence to this view.

Hinsch convincingly argued that historical examples of such male love "enthusiasts" and those with same-sex "passions" passed down through written records and oral traditions constituted a prominent Chinese homosexual tradition. These widely-known stories gave subsequent generations of homosexually-inclined males a sense of understanding of their feelings and desires. Moreover, this homosexual tradition not only acknowledged sexual attractions between males but also emphasized romantic love and devotion. In a society characterized by arranged marriages, in which the bride and groom often did not even know each other before their wedding day, romantic involvements were often likely to be with a same-sex friend.

This is an important book, but there are some weaknesses. The author should have given more acknowledgment and credit to the book by a Hong Kong gay writer, Xiaomingxiong, who published (1984) a history of homosexuality in China, written in Chinese but using many of the same sources. In his commentary, Hinsch surprisingly did not give much attention to eunuchs and why they were considered particularly attractive as sexual partners for the emperors. Were they also considered attractive for other men as well? More needs to be written on this subject.

Generally, Hinsch wrote clearly, but sometimes he can confuse readers by using terms such as "transgendered" and "transgenerational."

For man-boy relationships, the term "intergenerational" is more widely used, but in some cases Hinsch's references cited lovers who were not that many years apart in age. "Transgendered" is not good to use, because it posits a Western dual gender system in which the only recognized genders are "men" and "women." Hinsch seemed confused about the idea of alternative genders, misinterpreting my book *The Spirit and the Flesh* (1986) by labeling the berdache as "a man who would dress as a woman and take on a female identity" (p. 12). This is wrong on several counts. Among American Indians and many other societies with berdache roles, a gender nonconformist, although he was biologically male, was not considered to be "a man." Neither did a berdache "take on a female identity." Instead, he held a berdache identity, which was distinct from the roles and identities of both men and women. Also, berdaches usually did not "dress as a woman," but wore a mixture of men's and women's clothing. The androgyny of berdaches, their differentness from both men and women, was what was important in this gender-mixing alternative gender role. Because Hinsch so fundamentally misunderstands the berdache role, I am distrustful of his interpretation of the Chinese sources relating to androgynous males. He consistently referred to them as "adopting female identity" (for example, see p. 126). My reading suggests that many of these androgynous males saw themselves not as "females" but as a distinct gender that is similar to a berdache. Given Hinsch's unquestioning acceptance of the Western dual gender system, we cannot know for sure how such relationships operated.

There are other frustrations with this book. An appendix on lesbianism in China is tantalizingly brief, leaving the reader yearning to know more. Hinsch was correct to

note that there are few written documents on sex between women, for several reasons: (1) Chinese females, from childhood into old age, did not have much freedom of movement to connect with other women beyond their local area; (2) few Chinese women were educated, and thus could not write down their experiences and feelings to communicate with others like literate men were doing; (3) Western visitors to China were almost all male, and they wrote little about affairs between women; and (4) any women who did have intimate relationships with other females would not be likely to share these intimacies with men. We can only guess about what might have occurred privately between a lady and her female servant, between female concubines in a harem, between a wife and her female in-laws, between female relatives, or among all-female occupational groupings like nuns and prostitutes. We desperately need more women researchers (preferably lesbian identified) to interview elderly women and gather what remains of these private memories, before such knowledge is lost.

Still, Hinsch did cite instances where relationships developed between concubines and where a man's wife convinced him to take her female lover as his concubine or servant, so that the three of them could comfortably live together within the family structure. But he did not adequately expound upon the scholarship on the marriage-resistance movement and the "Golden Orchid Associations" of female-female marriages in southern China (Sankar, 1985). How these woman-woman marriages worked within the Confucian kinship system, and especially with the adoption of female children by such couples, has enormous implications regarding female homosexuality as an effective means of population control.

What is most needed now is a history of both male and female

homosexuality among twentieth century Chinese. Although Hinsch ended his text with the fall of the Qing dynasty, his Epilogue provides a movingly written and powerful critique of contemporary Chinese homophobia. He concluded that the easy acceptance of same-sex love began to change in China with the coming of the Manchu rulers, who reacted against the opulent libertine lifestyle of traditional Chinese civilization. But what really revolutionized Chinese sexual attitudes, Hinsch argued, was the impact of Europeans. By the early 1900s, Chinese "progressives" had become so impressed with Western science and technology that they slavishly adopted a mystical faith in the superiority of all things Western. Sexual variance was suppressed in favor of Christian notions that the only purpose of sex was reproduction. Because Western medical and psychological sciences in the early 1900s saw homosexuality as "pathological," China's traditional patterns of acceptance of same-sex love disappeared.

Progressive scholars (in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, as well as in the People's Republic) deleted references to homosexuality in new translations of Chinese classical literature. They simplified the writing style, meaning that most literate Chinese could no longer read the classics in their original uncensored form. Thus, modern Chinese have been cut off from an important part of their heritage. It is a great irony, Hinsch wrote, that some contemporary Chinese stigmatize homosexuality as "a decadent practice" only brought into China from the West. They are ignorant that what really was brought into China from the West was an intolerance for same-sex love.

Given China's current concern for restricting population growth, it would make sense for the government to encourage lesbian and gay couples to pair up and adopt homeless children. Yet, such is the con-

tinuing impact of Western prejudice that many contemporary Chinese feel it necessary for everyone to marry heterosexually. They ignore the benefits to society that would occur if same-sex marriages were legalized. This book, together with a similar book on Japan (Watanabe & Iwata, 1989), may help to bring about a more accurate awareness among East Asian peoples that hatred of same-sex eroticism is a prejudice that is alien to their rich cultural heritage.

References

- Sankar, A. P. (1985). Sisters and brothers, lovers and enemies: Marriage resistance in southern Kwangtung. *Journal of Homosexuality, 11*, 69-81.
- Watanabe, T., & Iwata, J. (1989). *The love of the Samurai: A thousand years of Japanese homosexuality*. Trans. D. R. Roberts. London: Gay Men's Press.
- Williams, W. L. (1986). *The spirit and the flesh: Sexual diversity in American Indian culture*. Boston: Beacon.
- Xiaomingxiong. (1984). *Zhongguo tongxingai shilu*. Hong Kong: Pink Triangle Press.

Of Baiters, Bashers, and Bigots: Conceptualizing Anti-gay and Anti-Lesbian Violence

Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men. Edited by Gregory M. Herek and Kevin T. Berrill. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1992, 310 pages. Cloth, \$38.95; Paper, \$18.95.

Reviewed by Mary E. Kite, Ph.D., Ball State University, Department of Psychological Science, Muncie, IN 47306.

Even those enlightened about the form and frequency of anti-gay and anti-lesbian violence will be disturbed by the documentation of its extent provided in Gregory Herek and Kevin Berrill's edited volume, *Hate Crimes: Confronting Violence against Lesbians and Gay Men*. Some chapters in the volume appeared as a special issue of the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* (1990, Volume 5); however, revi-

sions and additions make its examination worthwhile even for those familiar with that earlier publication. The content, which the editors describe as an "activist-academic collaboration," provides more than an empirical summary of the topic; it also offers theoretical explanations for the problem, evidence that activism can be successful, and discussions of how mental health professionals, law enforcement personnel, or concerned citizens can work to assist victims and prevent future violence. By successfully blending tragedy and optimism, the editors offer a highly readable story about *people*, and this theme is evident throughout the text. Even the most skeptical readers should realize that the described "hate crimes" happen to their friends, relatives, co-workers, and neighbors and that the climate of fear surrounding lesbians and gays is unconscionable. Appropriately, this reality is described without creating "victims" or pointing fingers; the book, instead, focuses on raising awareness and changing the status quo. Such a balance is exemplified in the chapter on the mental health consequences of victimization (Garnets, Herek, & Levy, Chapter 13); while recognizing the very real psychological reactions to hate-based crime, the authors focus on facilitating active coping. Similarly, the chapters on activism (e.g., Wertheimer, Chapter 14) outline problems with the current system but emphasize improvement through increased reporting and new services. Throughout the book, authors also poignantly link the victimization of gay males and lesbians to the underlying, societal-based message that the gay lifestyle is unacceptable and that violence is due punishment for homosexual behavior.

The text is interdisciplinary; although largely sociological/psychological, activists, journalists, physicians, and survivors are also represented. Chapters are short and varied, which is advantageous

for those wanting a brief overview on a specific topic. However, the brevity and sheer number of chapters also make the book seem disjointed and, at times, redundant. The empirical chapters (e.g., Dean, Wu, & Martin, Chapter 2; Hunter, Chapter 4), for example, are sufficiently summarized in Berrill's overview (Chapter 1), and some readers may fail to find the expanded coverage of those data useful. Similarly, the community-based activism chapter (Wertheimer, Chapter 14) might have been integrated with the chapter on strategies for activism on university and college campuses (Berrill, Chapter 16).

Integration issues arise in other areas as well. At times, for instance, chapter authors take very different positions on the issues, but do not acknowledge or reconcile the others' perspectives. Ehrlich (Chapter 6), for example, argues that adolescents probably do not comprise the majority of perpetrators; Harry (Chapter 7) makes the opposite point. Yet neither addresses the other's claim. Similarly, Berk, Boyd, and Hamner (Chapter 8) offer a well-reasoned, conceptual critique of the extant research but, unfortunately, their criticisms are not well integrated into the rest of the text. Hence, it is difficult to evaluate the impact of their concerns on the interpretation of the data provided in other chapters. By and large, the reader is left to integrate much of the material; again, the sheer number of chapters and positions makes this task difficult, and a more comprehensive summary chapter would have been a welcome directive.

The editors' objective of raising awareness is best met through the inclusion of powerful, first person narratives about victimization. Most compelling are the survivors' stories, interspersed throughout the text, that recount personal victimization with hair-raising, page-turning prose. Also chilling are journalist Michael Collins' (Chapter 12) writings about his interactions

with a gang of "gay bashers" that provide a glimpse into the mentality of those who regularly victimize others and feel justified in doing so. Many other chapters include personal accounts, and these stories echo as readers examine the empirical and theoretical chapters offered elsewhere in the book. Overall, the book succeeds more as an activist than an academic text. The theoretical chapters do provide a nice description of the societal roots to hate crimes and the psychological mechanisms driving the perpetrators; Herek's chapters (5 & 9) on these issues are particularly worth reading. Even so, the ideas are not always well supported by empirical evidence, and those familiar with the research area will no doubt lament the relative paucity of research citations.

The weakest chapters are those presenting empirical data. Some of these deficiencies are more understandable than others; the difficulties in obtaining a representative sample cannot reasonably be overcome, for example, and the available data do represent diverse, if not randomly selected populations. Yet other weaknesses, such as presenting largely preliminary data (e.g., von Schulthess, Chapter 3, and to a lesser extent Dean, Wu, & Martin, Chapter 2) or presenting two case samples to represent a population of 500 (Hunter, Chapter 4) are less understandable, no matter how time consuming the analytic process.

To be fair, the authors and editors are careful to note the limitations of the available data, and in other chapters they discuss methodological issues in detail (e.g., Berk et al., Chapter 8; Herek & Berrill, Chapter 17). Moreover, any criticisms must be considered in light of the editors' intent to reach a wide and varied audience; a book of this kind can never be all things to all people, and expecting that it should is unrealistic. Furthermore, as noted in Herek and Berrill's chap-

ter, it is problematic and undesirable to reduce the topic to a "numbers game"—that individuals face violence merely because of their race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or disability is unacceptable. The issues raised certainly generalize to violence against other groups; hence, the book offers insight into the more global issues of interpersonal violence. Some may fault the book for not more clearly linking anti-gay violence to other hate crimes, but that was not the editors' objective, and the ties are made easily enough without adding more to the text.

When viewed as an introduction to the problem for a general audience and as an impetus for future research, then, the academic credentials of the book are more convincing. Indeed, as the Honorable John Conyers stated in the foreword: "It is a most thorough and thoughtful book, one that should be read by all Americans who wish to understand the specific dimensions of anti-gay violence and the general problem of hate crimes in our society" (p. xv). Anyone who reads the book will be profoundly affected by it and will come away with a better understanding of what it means to live in fear because others abhor a fundamental characteristic of oneself. Moreover, those wishing to enlighten others will find the book an excellent pedagogical tool. Perhaps, in the end, the success of the text will depend on whether its readers join those already teaching about violence, researching its extent and causes, assisting its victims, and advocating its elimination or, at least, an end to its sanctioning by American and other societies.

Cross Dressing Then and Now

Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender.

By Vern L. Bullough and Bonnie Bullough. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993, 383 pages. Cloth, \$51.95; Paper, \$16.95.

Reviewed by Holly Devor, Ph.D., University of Victoria, Sociology Department, Box 3050, Victoria, BC, Canada V8W 3P5.

The Bulloughs undertook a timely and an admirable task in writing *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender*. Their stated objectives are to "acquaint [the general public] with what cross-dressing is all about," help individual cross dressers and their families to "better understand themselves," and educate professionals sufficiently that they might make "wise decisions" when they are called upon to intervene in particular situations (p. xi). Clearly, their agenda was ambitious.

The book is divided into two main sections. The first section, "Cultural and Historical Background," begins with an overview of cross dressing rituals and customs found in a variety of non-Western and Native North American cultures. This introduction is followed by chapters devoted to examples of cross dressing from the cultural sources claimed by today's Western Christian societies: ancient Hebrew, Greek, and Roman civilizations; medieval Christian Europe; Western European literature and theater; and historical records of actual cross dressers of the 16th through early 20th centuries.

In the second section of the book, *Modern Perspectives*, the authors examine the issue from a number of different angles. The chapters in this section include discussions of the development of the medical model; 20th century female and male impersonation stage shows in both heterosexual and homosexual cultural contexts; transsexualism; the development of cross dressers'

social and advocacy groups; an overview of current theoretical explanations of cross-gendered behaviour, including the authors' own theoretical model; and suggestions for therapeutic approaches to cross dressing.

I found the first section of the book to be by far the stronger of the two. In it, the Bulloughs present a highly readable and comprehensive account of the historical record of cross dressing among European and American females and males. Although among upper class Europeans from the medieval period to 19th century, occasional cross dressing often seemed to have been simply a matter of curiosity and adventure, the case is made in several chapters that more persistent and seriously undertaken cross dressing has historically been engaged in for different reasons by females and males, and that only in more recent times has it come to be culturally associated with homosexuality or lesbianism.

The authors argue that, historically, females have cross dressed largely to gain access to economic independence and freedom to travel, and to control more fully the directions of their lives. Cross dressing women of earlier centuries thus mostly came from the lower classes, i.e., those women who socially had the least to lose and the most to gain by attempting to live their lives as men. Literature and theater of the same periods also echoed these themes.

Males, the authors suggest, had other motives for cross dressing. The Bulloughs provided many examples of upper-class men who cross dressed to illustrate their proposition that, for most males, cross dressing constituted a loss of social status which would usually be indulged in only for sexual titillation. Males cross dressed to enjoy homosexual encounters or for access to women-only spaces for sexual purposes. Upper-class males, they argue, could engage in such

pastimes with relative impunity because of the prophylactic effects of their gender and their class.

The Bulloughs generally agree with other scholars that the 19th century was a time of retrenchment of, and resistance to, codification of gender ideals. The 19th century also marked the beginnings of modern homosexual identities and the identification of homosexuality with the practice of men dressing as women to attract male sexual partners. By implication, it was also in the 19th century that heterosexual identities were first delineated as such. The authors further suggest that many heterosexual men of all classes found the new masculinity too restrictive and turned to cross dressing as a way to alleviate some of their role strain.

Women cross dressers of the 19th century were similar to those of earlier centuries in that many of those who left an historical record had cross dressed to gain access to greater freedoms. The theater of the day also often had cross dressing, or "breeches," roles for women which played out similar themes for the voyeuristic enjoyment of audiences.

The second section of the Bulloughs' book is focused on more recent cross dressing and on theoretical and therapeutic frameworks for understanding and dealing with cross dressing. Again, I found the historical accounts to be the strongest portions. The Bulloughs clearly trace some highlights of the development of the medical model and of the current male, heterosexual, cross dressers' advocacy and social community.

One of their main points in this second segment of the book seems to be that the DSM-III-R has unnecessarily stigmatized male heterosexuals who cross dress and that cross dressing should be removed as a diagnostic category from the DSM-III-R. Although I agree with these sentiments, I found the logic of some arguments presented in the

closing chapters less than compelling.

The authors seem to be taking a two-pronged political approach to this question. To start with, they take exception to the DSM-III-R's definition of "Transvestic Fetishism" on several accounts: (a) homosexual cross dressers are excluded, (b) transsexuals are excluded, (c) women are excluded, and (d) non-fetishistic cross dressers are excluded (pp. 220-221). In so doing, they seem to imply that all of these people should equally be considered to be cross dressers. I will take up these points one by one.

First, I was disturbed by the use of what I perceive to be a common ruse employed by many stigmatized members of society, that is, to claim that everyone does "it," and thus "it" should be considered normative and acceptable. Although I have little trouble (under most circumstances) with the conclusions drawn by the Bulloughs, I was troubled by certain statements and inferences that they make in support of this project. For instance, they state that homosexual cross dressers "are probably the largest group of cross dressers" (p. 292) but provide no supporting evidence for this statement. In fact, most of the content of the book would seem to imply otherwise.

Second, the inclusion of a chapter on transsexualism, combined with the criticism that transsexuals are excluded from the DSM-III-R definition of transvestism, suggests that the Bulloughs believe that transsexuals should be considered to be transvestites. This is contrary to the lived reality of transsexuals. The meaning given to behaviours by social actors is an important and a relevant issue here. Transsexuals cross dress for very different reasons than do transvestites. A denial of the distinctive qualities of transsexualism is also contrary to the catch-all definition of cross dressing offered by the Bulloughs themselves:

It ranges from simply wearing one or two items of clothing to a full-scale burlesque, from a comic impersonation to a serious attempt to *pass* as the opposite gender, from an occasional desire to experiment with gender identity to attempting to live *most* of one's life as a member of the opposite sex. (p. vii) [emphasis added]

Transsexuals cross dress as part of a process leading to as complete and permanent a transformation of sex and gender as their will and medical technology can effect. Transsexuals *pass into* rather than *pass as* the other gender.

Third, the Bulloughs argue convincingly, in the beginning chapters, that females have historically cross dressed to escape from the extreme strictures of their gender roles. But, when it comes to a treatment of contemporary times, they are particularly hard pressed to find examples of present-day women who cross dress. Although I will not make the erroneous claim that women do not cross dress today, the Bulloughs have taken slim evidence and pushed it past its usefulness. They cite only four cases of women who identified themselves as cross dressers. That would have been sufficient to make their point, but they unfortunately go on to include 15 gender-blending women who explicitly did *not* identify themselves as cross dressers and 1 female-to-gay-male transsexual among their evidence for present-day female cross dressing. In my research, I have found a few women who call themselves cross dressers, and I have been informed by Sandy Bernstein, a well-known female cross dresser activist, that such women in North America number only in tens rather than in tens of thousands, as do their cross dressing brothers. Rather than try to find cross dressing women where there are almost none, the Bulloughs should have followed their own logic to explain why there are so few today when there were once so many. Women cross dressed

to find freedom or because they truly felt themselves to be men. Today, the former are better able to find their freedom as women; the latter are transsexuals. Those few women who identify themselves as transvestites do so because they, more or less, fit the male heterosexual model—one sign of the increasing fluidity of gender in today's culture.

Fourth, the DSM-III-R has singled out fetishistic transvestism for definition. I wholeheartedly agree with the Bulloughs' contention that there is no reason to limit a discussion of transvestism to only those persons who cross dress for fetishistic reasons. I equally support their suggestion that there need not be anything pathological about cross dressing per se.

Although I agree with what I read as the Bulloughs' political goals, I had a number of difficulties with the strategies they employed in their theoretical analysis. It is neither fair nor necessary for cross dressers to gain respectability by hiding behind unsubstantiated claims about other sexual minorities and about women. It is time that male heterosexual cross dressers be allowed simply to *be*, free of stigma when they cause no undue hardship to others. This goal would be better pursued by political coalition building with women and sexual minorities than by press-ganging them into service of an otherwise admirable goal.

The Bulloughs have also argued that cross dressing is ubiquitous; that it is partially the result of "a genetic predisposition and physiological factors" (p. 333) and partly the result of socializing influences. They therefore conclude that it should not be stigmatized as an illness at all unless the desire to cross dress becomes an obsessive-compulsive disorder which interferes with one's lifestyle or relationships. Although I also agree with their conclusions, I found their rationale disquieting.

In a subsection titled "Genesis of Transvestism," they offer two models, based on these suppositions, for the development of cross dressing in men and in women. The first model is about "the development of a male transvestite identity"; the second model describes "the process by which the cross-gendered woman develops" (pp. 333-334). Both models require readers to assume the same biological predisposing factors—which have been widely argued but not yet demonstrated empirically.

The male model is intended to describe a modern psychological phenomenon. This model, which has a great amount of data behind it, describes the development of an *identity* which looks remarkably like the sexual script put forward by Virginia Prince, the founder of the transvestite "club movement" whom the Bulloughs credit with having produced the template for the DSM-III-R's definition. Oddly, there were no homosexuals or transsexuals to be seen in the model despite the Bulloughs' prior claim that both should be included under the rubric of cross dresser.

The female model describes the development of a *kind of woman*. It has very little current data to support it, yet its sweep is wider even than that of the male model. It claims both historical and modern relevance. It claims to describe something akin to an essence. Again in contradiction to the Bulloughs' previous arguments, the women in this model are all either homosexual or bisexual, but not transsexual or heterosexual.

I would have preferred to see more consistency with the available data as well as a more even handed treatment of males and females. I was left wondering why male cross dressers were described in terms of their identities whereas females were dealt with in a more essentialistic way. Identities can, and do, change. The characterization of female cross dressers as "cross-gen-

dered" women seems to be a categorization of quite a different order of magnitude than an identity. This differential in the purported explanatory strength of the two models seems unwarranted by the data offered in their support.

Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender by Vern and Bonnie Bullough is a book which was in some ways long overdue, in other ways premature. The greatest strength of the work lies in the scope of its historical perspective on Western Christian attitudes toward cross dressing among both men and women. In this regard, it provides an extremely valuable resource. Its greatest weakness lies in its overly ambitious treatment of present-day female cross dressers, gays, lesbians, and transsexuals. Bearing these criticisms in mind, I would highly recommend *Cross Dressing, Sex and Gender* as an important book for anyone wishing to understand how North American society has arrived at our present state of affairs in relation to cross dressing.

Therapy Terminable and Interminable: "Non-gay Homosexuals" Come Out of the Closet

Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality: A New Clinical Approach. By Joseph Nicolosi. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc., 1991, 355 + xviii pages. Hardcover, \$40.00.

Reviewed by James D. Weinrich, Ph.D., University of California, San Diego, Department of Psychiatry 0603-H, La Jolla, CA 92093-0603.

This is a precedent-setting book, but probably not in ways that the author would appreciate. It sets a milestone in the history of sexual orientation self-acceptance; after homosexuals and bisexuals, the latest out of the closet are "non-gay homosexuals"—Nicolosi's term for

men who are homosexually responsive but who reject the cultural assumptions of the gay world. As the latest in a long list of books which offer therapy to men who wish to change a homosexual orientation to heterosexual, it sets another precedent in that the author is apparently the first to admit that this change is not possible. It is important to understand why the "prochange" school has finally admitted this fact and why they believe that therapy is advisable nevertheless.

The first six chapters of the book ("Striving for Gender Identity") ground Nicolosi's *reparative therapy* program in the history of mental health views of homosexuality and set out his main theoretical point: male homosexuality emerges from a disturbance of the father-son bond in childhood. Although Nicolosi believes that only one type of homosexuality is caused in this way, it is the type that he believes is amenable to his treatment. He also criticizes other therapeutic approaches to homosexuality, including gay-affirmative psychotherapy and earlier "change" therapies. Absent from the book is a discussion of any effect Nicolosi's religious beliefs may have had on his convictions; he dedicated the book to the priest founding the homosexual ministry "Courage" and is the founder and clinical director of the Thomas Aquinas Psychological Clinic.

Nicolosi believes that the underlying homosexual attractions felt by non-gay homosexuals rarely, if ever, disappear. Thus, reparative therapy is aimed at reducing their salience, encouraging heterosexual contacts, and eventual marriage and children, with celibacy the supported option for those who do not find their heterosexual attraction reaching levels that would allow sexual contacts with women.

In Chapter 3, Nicolosi makes his most important statement about change (p. 22):

In his final work, "Analysis: Terminable and Interminable," Freud concluded that analysis is essentially a lifetime process. This is true in the treatment of homosexuality, which—like many other therapeutic issues such as alcoholism or self-esteem problems—requires an ongoing growth process. Yet while there are no shortcuts to personal growth, how long it takes to reach a goal is not as important as the choice of direction. A sense of progress toward a committed value is what is important. The non-gay homosexual is on the road to unifying his sexuality with his masculine identity. That he can look back over the past months and see a realization of some of the goals to which he has committed—this is what gives hope.

Sometimes the change his patients obtain is less than impressive (pp. 165-166):

Usually some homosexual feelings will persist or recur during certain times in the life cycle. Therefore, rather than "cure," we refer to the goal of "change." . . . As one married ex-gay man described it: "For many years I thought I was gay. I finally realized I was not a homosexual, but really a heterosexual man with a homosexual problem." . . . "Now those homosexual fantasies are more like a gnat buzzing around my ear." Another man explained: "A problem that used to have a capital 'H' now has a small 'h.'"

Nicolosi deserves credit for acknowledging that his theory is not applicable to all homosexual patients (e.g., those lacking gender identity deficit: pp. 22, 95), although he nevertheless claims to have some insights about the nature of homosexuality (detailed below) which apply to all homosexual men.

The next seven chapters ("Related Problems") situate Nicolosi's approach within the context of related topics: childhood problems, relations with other family members, physiogenetic factors, personality, love relationships, sexuality, and gay liberation. In Chapter 7 ("Problems Emerging in Childhood"), he claims that the roots of

homosexuality in boyhood emanate from *defensive detachment* from other boys and from fathers. This concept (credited to Mary Moberly) is indeed germane for some gay men, but Nicolosi jumps to the conclusion that this shows that homosexuality is pathological. If a boy has a defensive detachment from a father who is physically or verbally abusive, it would not surprise many psychotherapists to find that the boy, having been starved for appropriate male affection, has grown into a gay man who has eroticized older men—men who will love them in the way they needed their father to do, with the addition of sex. But if a boy has a mother who is physically or verbally abusive, it would not surprise therapists if such boys grew into heterosexual men who are attracted to older women—women who will similarly love them in both ways. Even if someone regards these outcomes as abnormal, what is the rationale for concluding that one man has a healthy sexual orientation and the other has an unhealthy one? Both arise from the same fundamental mechanism.

Chapter 9 ("Physiogenetic Factors") is particularly weak, weighing in at less than four pages of text. Here as in several chapters, Nicolosi reviews an area of research and discusses prevalent controversies, but cites only papers which support his point of view or cites them in a way which radically distorts their meaning. Michael Ross, Anke Ehrhardt, Heino Meyer-Bahlburg, John Money, and Thomas Forde Hoult may all be surprised to see their views cited here on Nicolosi's side.

In at least one case, Nicolosi must (or ought to) have known about a study which directly contravenes his assertion that "physiology has no significant influence" on sexual orientation (p. 90). He does not cite the Kallmann (1952 a, b) or Heston and Shields (1968) twin studies, preferring to quote the

book by Arno Karlen published more than 20 years ago. True, he wrote before the publication of the recent twin studies by Bailey and Pillard (1991; Bailey, Pillard, Neale, & Agyei, 1993). But the predecessor of these twin studies (whose subjects were non-twin brothers and sisters—Pillard & Weinrich, 1986) *was* available. This paper is not mentioned in the main text and is conspicuously absent in this chapter. Curiously, it *is* listed in Nicolosi's bibliography (p. 333).

In spite of his exclusion of evidence on a genetic basis of sexual orientation, Nicolosi takes pains to head off the argument that if something is genetically caused, then it is unchangeable. He points out that alcoholism has been shown to have a genetic basis and accurately notes that this does not make it impossible to resist with appropriate therapy. The obvious rebuttal is not given—that alcoholism is reprehensible because it typically hurts people, whereas homosexual behavior need be no more or less likely to hurt people than heterosexual behavior is.

Chapter 11 ("Homosexual Love Relationships") exposes Nicolosi's penchant for stereotyping. He seems to be able to see only negative aspects of gay relationships (pp. 109-110):

Two men can never take in each other, in the full and open way. Not only is there a natural anatomical unsuitability, but an inherent psychological insufficiency as well. . . . Gay couplings are characteristically brief and very volatile, with much fighting, arguing, making-up again, and continual disappointments. . . . Research . . . reveals that [homosexual relationships] almost never possess the mature elements of quiet consistency, trust, mutual dependency, and sexual fidelity characteristic of highly functioning heterosexual marriages.

Nicolosi is describing patterns of emotional immaturity, not homosexuality *per se*. Denial is more likely to be used by the emotionally immature. Given that coming out is

a process of renouncing denial, it is easy to understand why Nicolosi perceives such patterns, because he is treating clients with a fundamental homosexual orientation who want support as they continue to deny the importance of their orientation to their lives. But anyone with mature gay friends knows how biased Nicolosi's sample is.

This comes out repeatedly in this chapter. Nicolosi states that "the most volatile domestic relationships I have worked with have been those of male couples. There are typically complaints of intense ambivalence, violent conflicts, and sometimes physical injuries" (p. 118). This astonishing statement may be true in its literal sense that these are the most volatile relationships Nicolosi has seen—but how representative a group does he see? How many homosexuals? (The dust jacket says "over 100.") How many heterosexuals? How many in daily life, outside of therapy? Similarly bizarre statements abound: "I have never heard of a homosexual man having a physical altercation with his father" (p. 46), "Almost without exception, homosexual clients report an increase in preoccupying sexual fantasies when they have experienced a disappointment. They feel most out of control and likely to act out sexually when they are feeling weak, lonely, and generally down about themselves" (p. 103), "I do not believe that any man can ever be truly at peace in living out a homosexual orientation" (p. 149), and "Sarcasm is a common weapon with which homosexual men diminish both others and themselves" (p. 212). This ignorance is not bliss; it results in Nicolosi not offering his patients an option they deserve to have accurately described.

Nicolosi is close to a truth when he discusses the erotic interests of gay men who had poor fathering, but even here he stereotypes (p. 116):

Anna Freud describes cases in which the search for the "strong man" as a sexual partner represented a striving toward one's own lost masculinity. Secondary masculine sex attributes (hair, strength, roughness) were used as determinants of sexual object-choice because they represented what the patient himself lacked. . . . The heterosexual, on the other hand, is not as psychologically dependent upon finding the feminine ideal for gratification, since he has no unconscious need to fulfill a deficit in original gender.

Does this imply that heterosexual men are often attracted not only to feminine women but also to masculine ones (with hair, strength, and roughness)? Does this imply that *Playboy* centerfolds (the feminine ideal) are less important in the heterosexual world than *Honcho* is in the gay world? Although this chapter is one of the few of the genre which do *not* ritually describe the homosexual world as one which narcissistically overemphasizes youth and femininity (although Nicolosi gets around to this stereotype in the next chapter, pp. 128-129, without realizing that he thus contradicts himself), I doubt that most gay men will be grateful for this forbearance (and please pardon my sarcasm).

Nicolosi is more interested in therapy than in scholarship—a perfectly acceptable preference—and this is evident throughout the book. There are numerous errors pertaining to the bibliography (misdated references, missing references, "Stuppe 1982" on p. 134 but "Suppe 1981" on p. 145) or pertaining to details of gay life (the Stonewall Club instead of the Stonewall Inn, p. 131). This interest is also evident in his curriculum vitae. Although the dust jacket states that Nicolosi "is the author of numerous professional articles," these consist (according to his curriculum vitae) of seven items on a variety of sexual and nonsexual topics published in *The California Psychologist* (1), *The Priest* (1), *The Tidings* (2); the offi-

cial organ of the Diocese of Los Angeles and San Diego), *The Alberta Report* (1), and *Human Development* (2), none of which turned up in a search of three computerized academic databases. That search did turn up one additional publication by a J. Nicolosi (1991): a letter to the editor of *Educational Leadership* criticizing programs for gay students. He is also working on a second book, to be published in September 1993. His featured radio and television appearances outnumber his publications by a ratio of 4.9 to 1.

Chapters 14 through 20 ("Psychotherapy") are clearly the ones in which Nicolosi has his heart. He describes the masculinity-focused theme of the therapy, how patients are encouraged to form male friendships and taught how to identify and develop their own masculine strengths—so that they won't have to seek them erotically from other men. Individual and group psychotherapy are illustrated with session excerpts.

Although these transcripts reveal that Nicolosi is helping his clients come to terms with some important issues from their childhoods, several passages are disturbing. For example, in one session therapist and client discussed what kinds of friends are good ones for non-gay homosexuals to seek (p. 292):

Client: How about [seeking] a friend with the same [homosexual] problem?

Therapist: There's the possibility of it becoming sexual.

Client: That's the risk you take.

Therapist: But why go to that risky population?

Client: Why does the alcoholic join up with other alcoholics?

Note how this client brought up one of Nicolosi's favorite analogies (homosexuality and alcoholism) and turned it in his favor. At this point, the client changed the subject, and the therapist followed his lead.

In reparative therapy, Nicolosi believes that it is essential for a man to serve as the primary therapist, because the client needs a mature, masculine, heterosexual figure with whom to identify and (initially, at least) to react against (p. 179). The therapist acts also as mentor (p. 185), modeling an appropriate, nonsexual male friendship, which is eventually transferred to men outside of therapy. My jaw dropped as I read that Nicolosi considers heterosexual men to whom the client is sexually attracted to be the friendships with the highest "reparative value"—the heterosexuality ensuring that no sexual contact will take place (p. 199). He also recommends sports to his clients, encouraging one to continue his golf, swimming, and tennis (p. 235), apparently unaware that these are perhaps the three sports which gay men enjoy the most. And he recommends that clients join a heterosexual gym "where there are no distractions" (p. 193), apparently unaware of the sexiness many gay men ascribe to heterosexual athletes.

One of the most disturbing aspects of this book is that Nicolosi never critically evaluates the heterosexual pathway his clients desire so much. To be fair, let me note that the problems which heterosexuals face are not the focus of the book, so he could perhaps be forgiven for not examining their lives and problems with as critical an eye as he has turned to gay life. But his view of heterosexual partnerships is just as stereotypically rosy as his view of homosexuals is dark. He makes passing reference to the problems that married people can encounter, but does not discuss how those problems might be faced in the context of a successfully treated client. When his success stories get married and have kids, for all we know, they just live happily ever after; I wonder how well he is preparing his clients for the reality of a wife and children.

This rosy view of heterosexuality comes out especially clearly when he opines that the differences between men and women are good things—for example, that women's domesticity helps keep men's rampaging promiscuity in check. He implicitly assumes that heterosexual couplings will produce the most happiness. Although Nicolosi is hardly the first to assume that Man and Woman were designed for each other's happiness, whether this is true in any sense of the word, "designed" is an open question. Models in modern evolutionary biology typically do not assume this, for example, and suggest that husbands and wives will be perpetually at each other's throats in certain circumstances (Diamond, 1993)—a view closer to Thurber (and the coadaptation of predator and prey) than to Masters and Johnson. I do not insist that the biologists are right and Nicolosi is wrong; I simply wish to point out that the assumptions Nicolosi makes are open to question. They short-change heterosexuals by failing to affirm the complexity of their lives and lead me to wonder if Nicolosi knows any more about heterosexuality than he does about homosexuality. We do learn from the preface that Nicolosi is married (p. xiv). I close with an excerpt from the group therapy transcripts, in which several clients express doubt over the progress of their therapy (pp. 304-305):

Marco: I always feel angry at this condition. Like I thought, "Godammit, this six months of therapy investment." I know I get really angry at the struggle when there seems to be no end to it, like it's happening again, happening again. There is no end to this thing.

Darin: I can relate to that. It's the homosexuality, the worrying about it—sometimes even the not wanting to get rid of it! I mean, the excitement of when you see a guy, the whole fantasy—all of that, as undesirable as it is—there is still an exciting energy

there. . . . There's excitement, there's a nice drama there that I don't want to let die. If I succeed in therapy, that excitement is going to go. . . . [A]nother thing that I'm afraid of—how long are we going to be doing this? . . . Okay, I know that I'm making progress. I see it, but I think, in three or four years am I still going to be struggling like this?

The therapist did not answer this question directly (remember, he believes that progress is often the best that can be hoped for), but changed the subject and told the clients that they have a choice between feeling sorry for themselves or taking the chance to "be real" with the men they meet—to tell male friends how they really feel, what's really going on in their lives. I agree that such men should choose honesty and being real. The essence of our disagreement is this: Nicolosi believes that this choice will reduce homosexual feelings, and I beg to differ.

References

- Bailey, J. M., & Pillard, R. C. (1991). A genetic study of male sexual orientation. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 48*, 1089-1096.
- Bailey, J. M., Pillard, R. C., Neale, M. C., & Agyei, Y. A. D. (1993). Heritable factors influence sexual orientation in women. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 50*, 217-223.
- Diamond, J. (1993, May). What are men good for? *Natural History, 102*(5), 24, 26-29.
- Heston, L. L., & Shields, J. (1968). Homosexuality in twins: A family study and a registry study. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 18*, 149-160.
- Kallmann, F. J. (1952a). Comparative twin study on the genetic aspects of male homosexuality. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 115*, 283-298.
- Kallmann, F. J. (1952b). Twin and sibship study of overt male homosexuality. *American Journal of Human Genetics, 4*, 136-146.
- Karlen, A. (1971). *Sexuality and homosexuality: A new view* (1st ed.). New York: W. W. Norton.
- Masters, W. H., & Johnson, V. E. (1979). *Homosexuality in perspective*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Nicolosi, J. (1991). Programs for gay students criticized. *Educational Leadership, 49*(2), 91.

Pillard, R. C., & Weinrich, J. D. (1986). Evidence of familial nature of male homosexuality. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 43, 808-812.

Sexual Fantasy

Bad Habits. By John C. Burnham. New York: New York University Press, 1993, 385 pages. Illus. Hardcover, \$35.00.

Reviewed by Timothy Perper, Ph.D., and Martha Cornog, 717 Pemberton Street, Philadelphia, PA 19147.

Bad Habits is a very difficult book to review. Might it be a not too well disguised effort to import an essentially fascistic interpretation and morality into areas of sexuality, drinking, drug taking, gambling, swearing—the “bad habits” of the book’s title? Or might it be a narrow and idiosyncratic (if conservative) view of what has gone wrong with American morality over the past century? Perhaps it is both; perhaps it is neither, with Burnham himself unsure of what he feels about people who drink, gamble, sexually misbehave (his word), and generally cavort in ways our Victorian ancestors found repellent and dangerous.

He says that the impetus to the book was a question from his four children: If we all know it’s wrong to drink, smoke, take drugs, misbehave sexually, gamble, and swear, then why do people do such things? Burnham, an historian, writes an historical analysis of what he perceives to be an answer—the answer?—to their question. Throughout the book, he outlines a “constellation” of events (he eschews the word “conspiracy” for his historical modeling) based on the bad habits of lower order (*sic*) Victorian criminals and poor people who drank, gambled, consorted with prostitutes (or cohabited mischievously), and represented a substratum of anti-morality at the margins of society. Their habits became the money-making arena of a large (if unnamed) body of corpo-

rate greed- and power-driven men who, during the twentieth century, created huge industries to supply these bad habits and, among other things, created immense, culture-dominating advertising campaigns to promote the sale of cigarettes, liquor, sex, and gambling.

Because he only rarely provides names, dates, and places of these supposed changes, it is difficult to tell if he believes, for example, that when “Seagram distillery interests effectively took control of the Du Pont corporation” (p. 294), this piece of 1980s robber baron capitalism was the handiwork of drinkers and boozers who wanted to spread dismay and destruction by converting what had begun as a gunpowder maker into a force serving Demon Rum. One responds by saying, “Huh? Did I miss something?”

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that he perceives smoking, drinking, gambling, taking drugs, swearing (as in saying, “Frankly, my dear, I don’t give a damn,” in *Gone with the Wind*, cited on p. 219), and misbehaving sexually as *profound social evils* (he calls them “minor vices,” an unfair assessment of his own evaluation) that have—somehow—the capacity to wreck America. Moral repair, he concludes, needs laws both symbolic and coercive (pp. 294-297). However, concerning these changes, one can echo Clark Gable: Frankly, we don’t give much of a damn, either. We feel that the atomic bomb, starvation looming over Africa, newly emerged plagues like HIV, and several other matters have higher significance. But Burnham does not—or so it seems.

Here we reach a genuinely puzzling crux of this book. The minor vices—if vices they be—that he pillories are just that: minor entertainments, supported in capitalist America by a large money-making infrastructure, just as automobile makers make money when people buy cars. Can it really be that Burnham considers drinking, swearing, gambling, and having

pleasurable sex so *very* important? Or, given the history of moral regulation in recent years, is he merely using these “minor” vices as a rallying point for creating a genuinely repressive social model of what America should be? In pre-Nazi Germany, it was standard Nazi propaganda to accuse generalized Others (in particular, Jews) of destroying the *moral* fabric of the nation, e.g., by accusing them of sexual crimes (see Haeberle, 1982, 1983). Burnham does not mention Jews—in fact, he hardly ever names anyone as the source of these evils—but because he does *not* identify the moral enemy, his book lets readers fill in the blanks in any way they want: to visualize, for example, a conspiracy of homosexuals devoted to destroying America, and against whom we need laws.

There is a nasty undertaste to Burnham’s work. He creates a sort of Fabergé Easter egg with tiny tableaux inside of women smoking, boys masturbating, men drinking and seduced by prostitutes, and gambling dens (one illustration shows a number of prone Orientals in an opium den, ca. 1890-1910, followed on the next page by Allen Ginsburg waving his hands around at a Be-In in 1967). If one peers more closely into the Easter egg Burnham has made, one can imagine even tinier little fences of barbed wire and pink triangles . . .

Let us examine his argument about sexuality in a bit more detail. “Eventually,” he writes on page 171, “the mass media found it profitable in a number of ways to exploit ideas about misbehaving sexually, nudging American attitudes and standards towards a model that had origins in stereotyped small-time pornography and prostitution—a model that, in the twentieth century, reformers sometimes endorsed.” In the chapter on sexuality, he attempts to document the assertion that modern sexual reformers try to legitimate and make money on sexual misconduct, morally the equivalent of

prostitution based on Victorian bordellos, with heavy input from bohemians, primitives, reformers like Havelock Ellis, T. H. Van de Velde, and, of course, Kinsey. "What Kinsey, the middle-class WASP did, in effect, was to offer a rationalization for acting on the code that parochial lower-order or under-world people—like 'Maurice'—had been insisting must be universal and better—plus undermining any resistances to engaging in—and advocating as well as joking about—extended and diverse love play" (p. 189). "Maurice" was a World War II soldier who had sex with "fifty or sixty different persons" and who also "had taken to drink" (pp. 188-193). Greed-motivated entrepreneurs, like Hefner and other alleged pornographers, entered the picture, as did sex therapists, who were the "direct descendants (if not the same personnel, including Kinsey) of the sexual liberals" (Note 79, p. 353). A foul pedigree indeed, eh?

The stew thickens when we read that as long ago as 1969 at least one journalist had noted "the connec-

tion between heterosexual 'perversions' and homosexual advocates" (Note 81, p. 353). It is all falling apart, and that Tool of Satan Kinsey is one of Their Agents.

Is this stuff all heavily agenda-ed right-wing rhetoric, historical naiveté, malicious confusion, or what? Frankly, we do not know. Burnham has assembled a respectable, if incomplete, scholarly apparatus to support his positions, but it remains unconvincing (except, one supposes, to the already converted). The book's greatest weakness is not Burnham's agenda, whatever it really is, but his single-minded dependence on one and only one idea, that somehow Victorian lower-class immorality seized control of America, befuddling the public and befouling the moral waters through corporate greed, advertisers, and duped advocates of sexual reform.

Throughout, we never hear people like "Maurice" speak for themselves. Everywhere, Burnham speaks for the people whose moralities he wishes to reshape and reform. We are told what is good for us and are reminded that we already know

what is right: Only a few laws to enforce our own moral sense are needed. *Sed quis custodiet ipsos Custodes*: Who guards the guardians? Who says that Burnham, or his allies, will create a world that is anything even remotely "better" than what we already have?

There is neither forgiveness nor tolerance in this book. Burnham does not allow "Maurice" to speak because Burnham's is the voice of moral certainty, for whom matters are simple. No shades of gray enter this work, only the black evil of Victorian criminals surfacing, like the returning repressions of the unconscious, to trouble the otherwise calm moral estate of people like Burnham. We are, in the last analysis, reading sexual fantasy in *Bad Habits*.

References

- Haerberle, E. J. (1982). The Jewish contribution to the development of sexology. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 18, 305-323.
- Haerberle, E. J. (1983). *The birth of sexology: A brief history in documents*. Washington, DC: World Association for Sexology.