

HOMOSEXUALITY

A POLITICAL
AND HISTORICAL
ANALYSIS



SDRC

C/O GCSS

2250 'B' ST

S.D. 92102

TO ORDER MORE COPIES SEND
US YOUR NAME & ADDRESS (or
Phone # if in San Diego).
DO NOT SEND CHECKS OR
MONEY ORDERS.

\$4.00

SAN DIEGO
RESEARCH GROUP

PREFACE

It is with great excitement, relief and anticipation that we proudly publish this pamphlet on homosexuality (in mid-1979). It was four years ago that the initial research was done. Two years ago, the paper in its entirety was finished except for this preface, the appendix at the end, and a small number of minor improvements throughout the paper. As much as we wanted the paper to come out sooner, we knew that even waiting a year or two, if it meant improving the quality of the presentation or its chances of gaining wide popular approval, would be worth it. Now, at last, its time has come.

We are excited because we ourselves have tried to find any holes in the analysis - and we couldn't. We have gone to some people who were very much opposed to it - and we are satisfied that their arguments do not hold up. We are excited because... when it's right - you know it!

We are relieved because the work of producing this paper, the doubts, hassles, strains, all this is over. The fears we had at one time that maybe this paper would never come out are gone.

But most important, we are filled with great anticipation. There is no doubt that this paper will stir up quite a controversy. If the controversy spreads from one border to the other, from one coast to the other; and beyond to other countries - so much the better. And with your help, it will! You see, dirt doesn't go away where the broom does not sweep. Incorrect ways of thinking don't go away or get defeated except when they are swept aside, struggled with and replaced by better more correct ideas. So, the more discussion the better; the more controversy the better. Those who have felt that this is the right position, that there is nothing inferior about homosexuality as compared to heterosexuality, must propagate this paper far and wide and fight for it hard. It can not and should not be the main topic of discussion generally among people. But it can no longer be a "non-topic"; or one only laughed at. It's time is now; before the Anita Bryants and Brigg's and other reactionary and fascist forces can do too much more damage; whip up too many more people to be frightened of something there is no reason to fear. Truly any further loss of the few democratic rights we still seem to have these days must be fought against. A loss of one leads to the loss of others. An attack on one is an attack on all.

So let the discussion spread far and wide! Don't let it stand in the way of people uniting on other issues when they can. Don't raise it when other things are on the agenda. But get it on the agenda when and where appropriate; and get it discussed. Fear not to struggle...we truly never got anything we didn't fight for...nothing...not one thing has been given to us without struggle!

The authors of this paper, together with the main collaborators in helping it reach its final form include: homosexuals and heterosexuals; men and women; blacks, whites and chicanos; workers, unemployed and students.

We are proud to include an appendix at the back of the paper which attempts to lay out a larger over-view of the history of human development (without too much repetition especially regarding developments in homosexuality and anti-homosexuality). It also lays out where we, the authors, believe the world is headed and how to get there the quickest and with the least losses in human lives and suffering. We added this appendix for those who want to know where "we are coming from"; or who want to learn more. But it certainly is not necessary to fully understand or agree with the total contents of the appendix, to be able to understand and/or agree with the body of the pamphlet.

THERE ARE 4 MAIN CRITICAL POINTS IN THIS PAPER:

- 1) The distinction between the popular, unscientific use of the word "natural" and the scientific, more precise usage. The opposite of "natural" is "social".
- 2) The origins of human homosexuality: that it arose simultaneously with heterosexuality, at the time humans first existed.
- 3) The origins of anti-homosexuality: it only developed some long time after man already existed; it is in fact a bad thing, something which is used to oppress some people and used to divide all of us while helping our enemies to stomp on us all.
- 4) The realization that human social relations don't have to be reproductive (produce children) in order to be productive (push society, workers and the poor forward).

After studying this paper, we believe the reader should be able to recognize these 4 Critical Points as true. Agreeing with these 4 main points, the reader should also then unite with our overall position on the question of homosexuality. The rest of the analysis and conclusions in the paper only deepen and develop the understanding of the question further.

We firmly believe that sexual orientation (which sex a person is more attracted to) does not determine, does not indicate anything about whether that person is progressive (for progress, pro-working class) or "reactionary" (for strengthening the power of the capitalists, anti-worker). Just as black big city politicians are not progressive or "friends" of blacks and other poor and working people; just as Betty Ford and other rich women are not progressive and "friends" or "sisters" of poor and working class women (and men); just as a white boss is no more progressive or "buddy" of white workers and non-white workers and poor; so too a rich homosexual is neither progressive nor "friend" of poor and working class homosexuals and heterosexuals. It is something else that determines or indicates whether a person is progressive or not; can be united with or not (and instead must be opposed). And that something else is their stand - what they say, and especially what they DO - that shows they are either for the few rich owners and rulers of society or for the poor and working masses in our millions.

The incorrect position - that homosexuality is always decadent or reactionary has two significant negative effects. The incorrect position:

- 1) Mistakes friends for enemies. There are homosexuals in the working class and among the oppressed nationalities. To incorrectly label people (in this case - all homosexuals) as degenerates is to risk turning friends into enemies.
- 2) Anti-homosexuality is directly related to male supremacy (ideas that men are better than women and deserve to be treated better) both as an aspect of it and as a support for it. Encouraging anti-homosexuality helps male chauvinism spread.

The position that is ultimately taken by the progressive forces in this country is NOT a settled question. Some may have temporarily made their minds up - one way or the other. But we believe all honest, well-meaning people can learn to recognize and correct their mistakes. The more dedicated they are to serving the people, and organizing us to stand up, at last, for what is rightfully ours - the more they have an interest in, a need to throw out all incorrect notions and to embrace all correct and progressive notions possible. Now is an excellent time to begin the struggle in earnest to get ourselves, our friends, a whole country in its majority; to throw out the old and bring in the new...to throw anti-homosexuality on the scrap heap of history.

UNITE ALL WHO CAN BE UNITED TO DEFEAT OUR COMMON ENEMY!

The French word for capitalist is bourgeoisie (pronounced bush-wa-zée with the sh pronounced like a z) we use this word in the pamphlet. Their word for workers is proletariat (pro-le-tair-è-it). The word "compradore" is of Spanish origin and means "bought off" - the comprador bourgeoisie in an under-developed country therefore is that section of the capitalists there who work for/are controlled by bigger foreign capitalists.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	p. i.
SECTION I INTRODUCTION	p. 1
SECTION II METHODOLOGY, CATEGORIZATION	p. 2
SECTION III ORIGINS OF HUMAN HOMOSEXUALITY	p. 6
SECTION IV ORIGINS OF ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY	p.13
SECTION V HOMOSEXUALITY AND ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY IN PRE-SOCIALIST SOCIETIES	p.25
SECTION VI SOCIALISM: HOMOSEXUALITY AND ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY	p.33
SECTION VII ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY: ARGUMENTS AND ANSWERS	p.36
TABLE I ANTHROPOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	p.44
TABLE II 350 SOCIETIES: CULTURAL LEVEL AND NOTES AND ATTITUDES ABOUT HOMOSEXUALITY	p.47
SUGGESTED FURTHER READINGS	p. 43
APPENDIX: A BROADER OVER-VIEW OF HISTORY AND OF THE PRESENT	p. 51

The authors of this paper began the investigations which are the basis for this paper because we disagreed with the anti-gay positions of the (majority of the) left. We were doubtful of the "facts" which were asserted... that homosexuality is the result of (bourgeois) decadence, or of class exploitation (having supposedly begun with the onset of slave society), or of male supremacy, etc. Even our limited knowledge was sufficient to make us believe that the assertions of those putting forward anti-gay positions were not based on sound investigation.

In fact, many of the anti-gay positions were based on arguments which were internally inconsistent, illogical, or in conflict with the scientific method. (See "Towards a Scientific Analysis of the Gay Question", Los Angeles Research Group, 1975).

However, we were convinced that pointing out the inadequacy of the investigations and analyses of the various anti-gay positions was not sufficient. Instead, we believed that it was necessary to counter the various unscientific positions with a thorough investigation and a scientific analysis of the question based on that investigation.

Since this scientific investigation had apparently not been done by any of the various groups and individuals putting forward positions on the gay question, we expected it to be a difficult task. However, we believed that the only way to move the understanding of this question forward was to follow the proper dialectical approach to a question of social science. Lenin, in The State, clearly tells us how this is to be done:

The most reliable thing in a question of social science, and one that is most necessary in order really to acquire the habit of approaching this question (correctly) and not allowing oneself to get lost in the mass of detail or in the immense variety of conflicting opinions--the most important thing in order to approach this question scientifically is not to forget the underlying historical connection, to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what principal stages this phenomenon passed through in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what the given thing has become today.

V.I. Lenin
(The State)

Regardless of the difficulty, a thorough investigation was called for. It is by applying dialectical and historical materialism that we are and will continue to be able to understand and change the world. Since most of the anti-gay positions were based on the assertions that homosexuality was "unnatural", the result of decadence, or the result of class society, the initial direction of our investigation was to determine how or when the phenomenon (homosexuality) arose in history.

Two weeks of research documented the existence of about one hundred primitive communal cultures in which homosexuality existed. This evidence was sufficient to put the assertions that homosexuality was the result of class society, (bourgeois) decadence, or male chauvinism on very shaky grounds. Furthermore, this evidence and the relative ease with which it was discovered re-affirmed our conviction that the anti-gay positions in this country were based on subjectivity rather than scientific analysis and investigation. Our commitment to making a thorough study of the question increased. We also realized that the scope of our investigation needed to be increased. In addition to understanding the historical development of homosexuality, the historical development and the material basis for anti-homosexuality also needed to be investigated and understood.

Although very little investigation was necessary to make it clear that the arguments about homosexuality being the result of class society, decadence, or male supremacy and male chauvinism were inaccurate, completing the research and analysis on which this paper is based took over 2 years of hard work. While it was a difficult and time-consuming task, it was also exciting and the basis for learning. The process of working

on this paper has been a lesson in dialectical development. At the beginning we basically knew that we disagreed with the positions on homosexuality which we heard and that in order to counter those positions we had to seek truth from facts. But, as Chairman Mao said, "'Facts' are all the things that exist objectively, 'truth' means their internal relations, that is the laws governing them, and 'to seek' means to study." (Mao Tse Tung Selected Works, Vol. III, p. 22)

In order to seek the truth, we found it necessary to do more than gather data about "primitive" cultures. We had to study the whole question of the movement of society from the lower stages of development to the higher. From our study of Engels, we realized that one way to begin making sense of the large amount of data which had been collected was to use the system of categories Engels lays out in Origins of the Family, Private Property, and the State.

Our study of Engels, and of the dialectical materialist method, also resulted in our developing some "theories" or expectations about what our data really meant. Our enthusiasm when the application of the categories created order and clarity in what had been a jumble of facts was great. We turned again to Engels' works on the development of society in order to understand why the interrelationships which we found existed. As the data we collected fell more and more into place, we became even more convinced that our original beliefs about homosexuality were correct.

Undoubtedly, further research will enable us or others to understand and explain this whole topic even more completely. However, we are firmly convinced that any further investigation will only strengthen and extend the analysis and conclusions we present here. Furthermore, we feel that the work presented here should be sufficient to change the world, or in this case, to change the position of the masses of people in this country and the movement on the question of homosexuality. For that reason, we are presenting the results of our efforts here.

We do not believe that the question of homosexuality is a burning question. However, the anti-homosexual positions in the movement have made it an important question. Coalitions have split over support of rights for homosexuals. Honest forces, who study hard, apply theory to their practice, use the method of criticism and self-criticism in their work, and seek to provide conscious leadership in the class struggle are excluded from membership by national organizations, often excluded from study. Other honest forces are faced with the choice of either abandoning those who they know are good revolutionaries or remaining themselves with them in small, local forms of organization. In addition, there are millions of homosexuals in this country--members of the working class (proletariat) and the oppressed nationalities--whose participation in the revolutionary struggle will depend to some major extent on the position on homosexuality.

We hope the movement will give this paper the serious study which we believe it deserves. The revolutionary effort and the working class are strengthened by discarding subjectivist thinking and applying the scientific method to all political questions.

At this point, we would like to acknowledge and thank the many friends whose interest comments, criticisms, assistance and support have been essential to the process of this paper.

SECTION 2: METHODOLOGY, CATEGORIZATION

The information on homosexuality* in this paper came from historical sources, anthropological sources, psychiatric and medical journals, and books and articles dealing with homosexuality.

References to transvestitism (wearing the clothes of the opposite sex) are also included in this material for several reasons. Research (our own and that of others)

*For the purpose of this paper, homosexuality and homosexual behavior are used interchangeably to refer to genital contact between persons of the same sex. In general, we do not use the term homosexual, because, to our knowledge, there is no generally agreed upon definition of that term. The most satisfactory definition would be an individual whose primary sexual orientation is towards those of the same sex. However, applying that definition requires a considerable amount of information about individuals which historical and anthropological sources (in particular) do not generally provide.

has shown that transvestitism and homosexuality are closely linked. Particularly among Native North American peoples, whenever there is a record of transvestitism and detailed information about the sexual practices of the people, we find that they did have homosexuality. Information that a group has transvestitism is a very good indication that they also have homosexuality. Therefore, we considered it worthwhile to include information on cultures when the only information we found was that they had transvestitism. However, in the charts we list the two phenomena separately. The second reason for including information about transvestitism is that it is useful in understanding the development of both homosexuality and anti-homosexuality, as we will show later.

The factual information was gathered by going through the various materials and recording any information on homosexuality among primitive peoples. Evidence of homosexuality was found in a vast number of societies, in virtually every area of the world, and in all levels of cultural development. It would be nice if we could present a chart of all the various cultures which existed at each stage of human development, the frequency of homosexuality in those various stages, and the level of anti-homosexuality. However, that is simply beyond the scope of possibility. Historians and anthropologists cannot even provide us with enough information to generate lists, much less detailed information on the sexual practices of all past cultures. However, we note that even without such a comprehensive catalogue Engels was able to analyze many aspects of human development. We feel that the several hundred cultures included in our research give us enough information to draw our conclusions.

It is equally impossible to provide an analysis of what percentage of cultures, for which there are records, had and did not have homosexuality. If, for example, we find a record of some group with no reference to sexual practices, then we can only say that the group exists (existed). The fact that the report does not mention homosexuality is neither proof that the group does not (did not) have homosexuality nor proof that it did have homosexuality.

Information on a culture is nothing more than what the person recording observed and chose to record. While this fact is important to remember whenever one is using written records for research on people, it is particularly important when dealing with sexual behavior. Sexual behavior is certainly high on any list of behaviors which an outsider might not get a chance to observe. Even the direct statement that a culture does not have homosexuality is, at most, only proof that the observer did not see any evidence of homosexuality. This point is underscored by Adolph F. Bandelier, in his "Documentary History of the Rio Grande Pueblos" 1536-1542" (reprinted in New Mexico Historical Review, Vol. 5, 1930). Bandelier documents the practice of homosexuality in the culture, both in general and with a particular example. He also notes that another history had incorrectly stated that homosexuality did not exist there.

Although it would have been desirable to be able to present data on frequency or percent of cultures, it is obvious that such data cannot be gathered. However, the material presented here is all documented by our research. It is our position that the quantity of information presented here, with the wide variety of areas and cultural development represented, is adequate basis for the analysis presented. We certainly would agree that there are other pieces of information which would be useful, but we do not believe that the absence of information which is impossible to obtain makes the investigations any less valuable or valid.

Categorization

The first stage of the investigation uncovered over 300 societies, at various levels of cultural and technological development, from all areas of the world--North America, South America, Asia, Europe, Africa, the Pacific, and Australia--where homosexuality and transvestitism existed. In addition to the fact that these cultures had homosexuality, we had a large amount of cultural data about these societies. When the sources which documented the existence of homosexuality did not provide sufficient cultural information, encyclopedias and other reference sources were used.

In order to use all this raw data, it was necessary to categorize it. In The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Frederick Engels used a system of cul-

tural categories which he borrowed from Lewis Henry Morgan (In Ancient Society). These categories divide human societies on the basis of technological development into three broad categories: savagery, barbarism, and civilization. The first two categories are further sub-divided into: lower, middle, and upper stages--again on the basis of technological development. We used this category system for our analysis.

Although we used this system for categorizing all the cultures, we believe it is most useful up through the level of middle barbarism. Middle barbarism is the period in which Engels tells us class (slave) society began. Engels helped devise another set of divisions - to understand human history up thru the present: it is based on the class nature of the society: primitive communalism, slave society, feudal society, capitalist society, and socialist society. (For more explanation on this - see the Appendix). We believe that this division of human culture is excellent for understanding human history; especially when used in conjunction with the categories Engels adapted from Morgan. Primitive communalism covered such a long period of time; it is much more easily dealt with by having it broken down into smaller chunks (lower savagery, middle savagery, upper savagery, and lower barbarism). This is especially important because a number of important developments in human society occurred during that long period.

The system of categories is quite explicit about the cultural and technological development which existed at each stage. On the basis of the cultural and technical information we had about the various cultures, they were assigned to a category.

For a small percentage of the societies represented (in Table 1-back of pamphlet) we did not have sufficient cultural information to categorize the society.** These groups are therefore not included in the charts where societies are broken down by category.

It is a comment on the adequacy and consistency of the category system that there were only two cases where the society had characteristics which would fit more than one category. The conflict was resolved by assigning the society with which the cultural data was most consistent.

Table 1 in the back of the pamphlet shows the societies by category. The following is the breakdown of the categories. In addition to a synopsis of the technological characteristics of each level, we include a summary of the cultural characteristics which Engels describes for these various levels, as well as the attitude toward homosexuality.

1. LOWER SAVAGERY: These people had no artificial housing, they lived in their natural habitat. They ate fruits, nuts, roots, etc. The main accomplishment of this stage was speech. We do not yet have direct historical proof of this stage, but assume its existence as the first logical and necessary step away from animal conditions.

- Family-promiscuous, with a rising trend toward group marriage
- Tribal Authority-none
- Division of Labor-childbearing and breast feeding; all else shared
- Anti-homosexuality-none

2. MIDDLE SAVAGERY: This period begins with the use of fire and the catching of fish. Stone tools were developed. Some small game was added to the diet. The indigenous Australians and the recently discovered Tasaday are the only surviving middle savagery people that we know of today.

- Family-group marriage***
- Tribal Authority-beginnings of leaders, but no inherited authority
- Division of labor-again none except childbearing and breast feeding
- Anti-homosexuality- none

**There are at least two reasons why we were unable to find information on some societies. First, there are a number of primitive groups which became extinct so soon after contact with Europeans that little is known about them besides their names and any comments made by the explorers who recorded their names. Second, some groups have more than one name, and as a result tracking them down is difficult. For example, they might have their own native name, an English name and a Spanish name. As a result, there is also the possibility that there may be some slight duplication in

3. UPPER SAVAGERY: This period begins with the development of the bow and arrow. When this was accomplished hunting became a regular occupation. There was some settlement in villages. Basketry and dugout canoes came into being. Many North American, South American and Pacific peoples fall into this category.

Family- pairing family with the beginning of the gens unit and matriarchal lineage
 Authority of Tribal Chiefs- established leadership, little or no inherited power
 Division of Labor- men=hunting, women=gathering&the home; the primitive beginnings of a division between mental (leaders and priests) and manual (all others) labor
 Anti-homosexuality- small minority disapprove, no suppression

4. LOWER BARBARISM: The period of barbarism begins with the invention of pottery. Some lower barbaric peoples have small-scale gardening. Many North American and South American groups were in this stage of development.

Family- pairing marriage within a matrilineally structured gens system
 Authority of Tribal Chief- increased power and the beginnings of permanent and inherited authority
 Division of Labor- between men=hunting and "outside" activity, and women=the home. Between mental (chiefs and priests) and manual labor
 Anti-homosexuality- small minority of societies disapprove, no suppression

5. MIDDLE BARBARISM: This period is characterized by the domestication of animals, irrigation, large-scale agriculture, adobe dwellings, cattle breeding and the formation of large herds. These peoples were acquainted with the working up of metals, except iron. This period saw the increase of production to the point where a surplus was created for the first time.

Thus additional labor power became desirable and we see the introduction of slavery. Before this, there was no slavery as an economic institution. The "slaves" found in more primitive societies were almost always war captives. These people never became economically valuable as a class because these societies had not yet evolved to the point where labor created surplus value. War captives thus had had no economic function - they were either killed or integrated into the tribe through marriage or adoption. With the introduction of slavery, class society began.

Family- monogamous marriage based on male supremacy (mother-right is overthrown)
 Authority of Tribal Chiefs- tribal chiefs and priests become the ruling class
 Division of Labor- consolidation of the division between men and women; consolidation of the division between mental and manual labor with the introduction of slavery and the development of a ruling (slave-owning) class
 Anti-homosexuality- big increase in anti-homosexuality, suppression begins with the introduction of the death penalty.

6. UPPER BARBARISM: This period begins with the smelting of iron ore and the development of the plow. It became possible to cultivate very large areas of land, so there was a considerable increase in population.

Family- monogamous marriage based on male supremacy
 Authority- Inherited authority (and property) for ruling class (nobility)
 Division of Labor- more developed versions of the divisions in middle savagery, the division between town and country also becomes strong
 Anti-homosexuality- homosexuality continues to be disapproved of by a significant number of cultures (still not the majority though), some suppression

7. CIVILIZATION: This period is considered to begin with the development of an alphabet and written records. This category spans the periods of slave society, feudal society, capitalist society and socialist society. Homosexuality and anti-homosexual-

** (cont'd) in our information. However, we are certain that such duplication is minimal and is basically confined to the groups which are not categorized. Thus, there is no effect on our conclusions.

*** Group marriage does not necessarily mean that large groups of men and groups of women were engaged in basically promiscuous sexual activity. People in this period did "couple-off", did have pairing relationships. But, a potential mate had to belong to the right group and the ties were not like the marriage ties we have in today's family.

ity are widespread and already well-documented elsewhere. Therefore, though there are a small number of civilized peoples which have been included in the tables; the research did not actually focus on these societies.

Having categorized the raw data, the final task in our research was to analyze the information on homosexuality and anti-homosexuality in the context of the general development of human society. In this way, we were able to draw various conclusions about the relationship of homosexuality and , particularly, of anti-homosexuality to the other developments in human society. For this analysis we draw heavily on the understanding of human social development which Lenin and especially Engels provide. We have tried to use the dialectical and historical materialist method in making our conclusions. Dialectics is a method of examining things and processes that says that all things and processes are a unity of opposites - that to understand the thing, one must discover its two main aspects and then determine the way in which these two main opposites influence and struggle with each other so as to fully understand what the thing is and what it will become. For example, the two main and opposing aspects of Slave society were the slave owners and the slaves. To understand that period of history it is necessary to understand the relationship between these two (classes) and the struggle between them-having grasped this...one can see that inevitably slave society would cease to exist once the slaves -who had been the oppressed class - grew sufficiently in strength to be able to overthrow their oppressors, the slave-owners, the once dominant class/aspect. Dialectics enables us to dissect history, nature, and other phenomena, more and more clearly understand them; recognize what we can't change and learn how to change that which it is possible to change. Thus, it makes us more and more the masters of our own destiny the more we become capable of wielding this valuable analytical tool. (The opposite of dialectics is metaphysics.)

Materialism, the opposite of idealism, says that both man's environment and his ideas are important but, of the two, generally (though not always) material being is more important; material being determines consciousness. In other words by way of example, children born into rich capitalist families - like the Rockefellers - view the world a whole lot differently than do the children of workers. One set of children "learn" the easy, soft life; and don't learn what it is like to work and sweat out an existence facing a never ending hassle with bosses and bills. The other set of children learn the value of hard work, of leading a responsible existence, the value of mutual co-operation between large numbers of workers - as the best way to survive and flourish. These concrete experiences, these material realities in their lives thus play a key role in the systems of values and beliefs , the ideas of each class. You don't think "rich" and "poof" you are rich. You are rich and so you think rich. You are a worker and so you think like workers do. You are a small shop owner and you think like small shop owners do. (This applies generally; but individual differences exist

Historical materialism is the application of materialism, the materialist outlook in analyzing human history. It helps us see that history too developed primarily because of changes/advances in man's existence and that man's ideas generally followed those advances/changes...are a reflection (and not always a very accurate one) of things that already exist. For example, it was impossible for man to think about the world as it is today, with all the large scale manufacturing, during the period of history prior to the invention of the earliest machines. If you want to understand history, look first at what man did, how he produced what he needed to survive; not first at what some "great" thinkers in those days were saying.

SECTION 3: ORIGINS OF HUMAN HOMOSEXUALITY

The first question which must be answered in any scientific investigation on the question of homosexuality is: what is the origin of human homosexuality? When considering human sexuality--human sexual behavior--the common assumption has been that heterosexual behavior is normal or natural. Homosexual behavior is, therefore, considered to be some form of aberration which has developed. The discussion then centers around determining what caused this curious development--decadence, class rule, male supremacy and male chauvinism, etc.

Our research has uncovered over 180 pre-class societies where homosexuality existed. This fact absolutely disproves any assertion that homosexuality developed as a result of bourgeois/capitalist decadence, class society or male supremacy since all of those phenomena were absent in pre-class, primitive communal society. Obviously, if we are to understand the origins of human homosexuality, we must take as the beginning point for our investigation a time well before the development of class society.

The early development of humanity goes from animal to lower savagery (the transition stage to middle savagery). Engels points out that we have no direct information on humanity in the stage of lower savagery. He notes that, "although it may have lasted for many thousands of years, we have no direct evidence of its existence; but once we admit the descent of man from the animal kingdom, the acceptance of this transition stage is inevitable." (Origins, p. 24.)****

Although he lacked direct evidence concerning the stage of lower savagery, Engels makes a number of conclusions about humanity in the transition stage based on data from animals and from humanity's later periods. On the question of homosexuality, there are also some conclusions which can be drawn. But first, let us look at the data we have.

To deal scientifically with the question, however, we must not simply begin with the assumption that homosexuality is an unfortunate development. We must, instead, examine what are the origins of human sexuality. We turn first to the sub-human animal world. We do not normally ask where or how humans began breathing, eating or engaging in heterosexual activity because we accept that living organisms, at least mammals, engage in all these activities. Homosexual behavior has been observed in a wide variety of mammals: monkeys, dogs, bulls, rats, porcupines, guinea pigs, goats, horses, donkeys, elephants, hyenas, bats, mice, lions, rabbits, cats, raccoons, baboons, apes, and porpoises. (Churchill, pp. 60-61). Animal homosexual behavior has been observed in a wide variety of conditions including field observations in a natural habitat. Thus, animal homosexual behavior can not be considered a response to the "unnatural" conditions of laboratory confinement.

Homosexual behavior in animals does not appear to be merely a substitute for unavailable heterosexual behavior. Animals, particularly apes and monkeys, have been observed to engage in preferential homosexuality and to form lasting homosexual relationships. Nor can homosexuality be dismissed as the result of hormonal dominance over the behavior of lower animals which disappears as responses to the environment increase. Scientists tell us that as we move up the phylogenetic (evolutionary) scale animals become less tied to strict hormonal control over their behavior; factors like environment and social interaction become increasingly important. As we ascend that same phylogenetic or evolutionary scale, homosexual behavior becomes more frequent. Thus, as sexuality becomes less the slave of biological urges and more a social activity, animals are more likely to engage in homosexual activity.

Facts about homosexuality in animals strongly suggest that our simian (ape) ancestors engaged in homosexual behavior. Admittedly, these observations have been made by contemporary scientists and not on the basis of relics from primeval time. Thus, it is theoretically possible that homosexuality among animals developed in the interim since the time of man's ascent from the animal kingdom. But, lacking any explanation for why this development should have occurred, we must conclude that our simian ancestors did engage in homosexual behavior. Furthermore, the fact that animals in remote natural settings engage in homosexuality indicates that the existence of homosexuality, like heterosexual behavior, is a phenomenon which develops in the course of nature.

Now let us turn to the period of middle savagery, the first period of human existence for which direct evidence can be found. We have information on only a small number of groups, at this low level of development. Most of human society progressed beyond this primitive level long before extensive observations of such cultures could be made and recorded. However, the information on middle savagery which we do have goes far beyond simply establishing that homosexuality is found in this stage.

****All references here to Engels, Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State are from the Progress Publishers, 1972 edition. This book should be read cover to cover.

Among the eleven Middle Savagery groups in our research we find widespread homosexuality. In these societies homosexuality was in no way an isolated or unusual phenomenon. We find no record of any group in the Middle Savagery category which disapproved of homosexuality or made any attempt to suppress it. The only restrictions we find on homosexual behavior were the taboos and restrictions which were also applied to heterosexual behavior. For example, Westermarck reported that the people found around Kimberly, Australia have widespread homosexuality. The taboos which apply to homosexual pairings or marriages are the same as those which apply to heterosexual pairings or marriages.*5

It is also interesting to note that among the Middle Savagery groups we find no record of transvestitism. During all later stages of human society we find record of it. As we noted in the Methodology section, transvestitism is, to some large extent, a co-phenomenon with homosexuality. Often one partner in a homosexual relationship cross-dresses (transvestitism). The absence of any disapproval of homosexuality and the absence of transvestitism strongly indicates that, for the people of Middle Savagery, the question of gender did not determine the appropriateness or acceptability of sexual relations or of individual unions. The concept of heterosexuality vs. homosexuality was probably as incomprehensible to these people as the other restrictions and taboos which social convention has since established.

At this point we can turn to the period of lower savagery, the transition stage, and begin to draw some conclusions. The animal data makes it clear that homosexual behavior is, in the scientific sense, natural. That is, homosexual behavior, like heterosexual behavior, exists independent of the struggle for obtaining and producing the means of subsistence.*6 The animal data also strongly supports the conclusion that our simian ancestors engaged in homosexual behavior. The evidence from the level of Middle Savagery tells us that, at that point in human history, homosexuality was common and accepted.

We now turn to the transition stage with the question:

IS IT MORE REASONABLE TO CONCLUDE THAT HOMOSEXUALITY HAS ALWAYS BEEN A PART OF HUMAN SEXUALITY/SEXUAL BEHAVIOR OR THAT HOMOSEXUALITY DEVELOPED AS SOME SORT OF DEVIATION?

To aid us in drawing conclusions about the transition stage of Lower Savagery, we turn to Engels' analysis and conclusions concerning that period in human development. Engels tells us in Origins and in "The Role of Labor in the Transition from Ape to Man" that the transition from ape to man required increased social interaction:

...it is obviously impossible to seek the derivation of man, the most social of all animals from non-gregarious immediate ancestors. The mastery over nature, which begins with the development of the hand, with labour, widened man's horizon at every new advance....On the other hand, the development of labour necessarily helped to bring the members of society closer together by multiplying cases of

*5 One common misconception of primitive communal society is that sexual behavior during the entire period consisted of indiscriminate, promiscuous sexual behavior relations. Engels describes four relationships. The promiscuous period, group marriage, the pairing family, and the monogamous family. The promiscuous period he assigns to the transition stage of lower savagery. However, even in the promiscuous period, Engels notes that individual pairings, of a temporary or limited duration were probably the rule. (Origins, p.37) By the period of middle savagery, group marriage existed. In group marriage groups of women were married to groups of men. However, individual unions or "marriages" often existed. These marriages are not synonymous with marriages under the monogamous family. But, they existed. One aspect of the group marriage relationship was that individual unions must be between persons from groups which were married.

*6 Marx distinguished two relationships in human behavior, natural and social. Social he defines as being a part of the struggle for production. Natural, by contrast, is that which exists or came into existence separate from the struggle for production. All conscious relationships are a part of the social realm, since, "Where there exists a relationship, it exists for me: the animal does not enter into 'relations' with anything, it does not enter into any relation at all." (p. 51, German Ideology). Marx

mutual support, joint activity, and by making clear the advantage of this joint activity to each individual. (Engels "Part Played by Labor in Transition... p282-283 in Dialectics of Nature, International Publishers, 1940 edition).

This increased social interaction required the breakdown of even the restrictions on social interaction which existed among the animals. Engels explains:

For evolution out of the animal stage, for the accomplishment of the greatest advance known to nature, an additional element was needed: the replacement of the individual's inadequate power of defence by the united strength and joint effort of the hordes... mutual toleration among the adult males, freedom from jealousy, was however, the first condition for the building of those large and enduring groups in the midst of which alone the transition from animal to man could be achieved. And indeed, what do we find as the oldest, most primitive form of the family, of which undeniable evidence can be found in history, and which even today can be studied here and there? Group marriage, the form in which whole groups of men and whole groups of women belong to one another, and which leaves but little scope for jealousy. Since, however, the forms of group marriage known to us are accompanied by such peculiarly complicated conditions that they necessarily point to earlier, simpler forms of sexual relations, and thus, in the last analysis, to a period of promiscuous intercourse corresponding to the period of transition from animality to humanity... What, then, does promiscuous sexual intercourse mean? That the restrictions in force at present or in earlier times did not exist. Promiscuity, that is, the absence of barriers to sexual intercourse set up by custom.

(Engels, Origins, pp35-36. Emphasis added)

If one agrees with Engels that the transition period (Lower Savagery) required the breakdown of barriers to social interaction and was characterized by the absence of restrictions established by custom on sexual relations, then the conclusion that human sexuality has always included homosexuality becomes inescapable. Those who would argue that homosexuality has not always been a part of human sexuality must (1) generate an explanation for why homosexuality would disappear during the transition stage--in direct violation of the general developmental trend, and (2) explain why homosexuality would turn around and re-appear in Middle Savagery when social barriers to sexual behavior were developing.

Since we find no material basis for generating either of these two explanations we are forced to conclude that:

HOMOSEXUAL BEHAVIOR DEVELOPED IN THE COURSE OF NATURE AS A PART OF SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND HAS BEEN A PART OF HUMAN SEXUAL BEHAVIOR SINCE THE BEGINNING OF HUMANITY!

At this point there may be those who will object to our conclusion on the grounds that we are contradicting Engels. We find no evidence that either Marx or Engels-- or for that matter any of the great teachers since--made any scientific comments on homosexuality. There are some brief comments on homosexuality, almost always derogatory. However, examination of those comments makes it obvious that the comments were not based on scientific investigation. For example, Engels says in Origins that, "the degradation of the women recoiled on the men themselves and degraded them too, until they sank into the perversion of boylove." In other translations of this passage the word boylove is replaced by the word sodomy. "Degrading both themselves and their gods by the myth of Ganymede." (Origins, p. 65.)

Careful examination of this quotation shows Engels is saying that homosexuality and homosexual religious myths developed as a result of the overthrow or degradation of women. Engels, in Origins, clearly shows that the downfall of women was accom- also notes that a given phenomenon can have a dual character, being both natural and social. Both heterosexual and homosexual behavior must be considered natural, for both existed or developed independent of the struggle for production. And, among humans, both heterosexual and homosexual relations must be considered social.

plished in, and was the result of; the period when private property developed and class society began.

Yet, we have found at least 182 societies where homosexuality existed which, according to the scientific criteria laid down by Engels, are pre-class societies. A number of societies which Engels himself specifically stated were pre-class societies (the various North Western American Indians) had both homosexuality and homosexual religious myths. We must conclude that either (1) the major conclusions Engels drew on the basis of his scientific investigations of the development of society and classes are incorrect--and all those societies which his scientific criteria label as pre-class societies are actually class societies (because they had homosexuality), or (2) we must conclude that Engels did not investigate the question of homosexuality and that his brief comments must be viewed as casual, unscientific remarks. We conclude that Engels did not investigate the question. (We must remember too that he had quite a bit less information and reports on primitive groups than we do, nowadays, almost 100 years after his death.)

Actually, in terms of the scientific analysis of human development which he laid out, our conclusions on the question of homosexuality and anti-homosexuality are in no way in conflict with Engels. In fact, our analysis is based on his analysis and conclusions.

Let us summarize the conclusions about the origins of homosexuality which our investigation has made possible:

- 1) The existence of homosexuality in over 180 pre-class, primitive communal societies. This conclusion is obvious. Any other conclusion would mean that homosexuality developed before the phenomenon which supposedly caused its development.
- 2) The existence of homosexuality in animals demonstrates that homosexual behavior--like heterosexual behavior--is "natural" in the scientific sense of the word. That is, both forms of sexuality developed in the course of nature, independent of the struggle for production. The assertion that homosexuality is "unnatural" is itself unscientific. (Actually, the assertion that anything is "unnatural" is also un-Marxist since, as we noted above, for Marx the opposite of natural is social, not "unnatural".)
- 3) Our examination of the development of society makes it clear that human homosexuality has always been an aspect (or one of the two forms) of human sexuality.
- 4) The evidence from the stage of Middle Savagery shows that anti-homosexuality, that is, disapproval of or opposition to homosexuality, has not always existed.

HOMOSEXUALITY IN RELIGIOUS MYTH AND RITUAL

The material already presented is sufficient to make the conclusions listed above. There is, however, one other area of investigation which we will present. That is, homosexuality in the religious myths and rituals of primitive communal societies. This information is valuable for three reasons. One, except in times of revolutionary upheaval (which was not a characteristic of the primitive communal period), the religious myths and practices of a society tend to change slowly. Thus, the existence of a particular phenomenon, in this case homosexuality, in the religious myths and rituals of a society indicates that the phenomenon has existed in the culture for a long time. Two, the presence of a phenomenon in the religious myth and ritual of a society is an indication that the phenomenon has at least a measure of acceptability in the culture. Third, the prevalence of homosexuality in the religious myths and rituals of a large number of primitive communal societies is further indication that Engels' comments on homosexuality were not based on scientific investigation. The homosexual religious myths and practices of cultures where the downfall of women had not yet taken place could not be related to the downfall of women.

We have evidence of homosexuality in the religious myths and rituals of primitive communal societies all over the world. (See Table, back of pamphlet). Most of our information is about the indigenous peoples of North America. (The large amount of information on North American cultures is largely due to two factors. One, consider-

able anthropological work has been done among North American Indians. Thus, extensive information on their religions, myths, and rituals is available. Two, the research presented in this paper was done in Southern California libraries. Both national and cultural biases are often reflected in the collections of relatively obscure historical and anthropological sources. By that, we mean that a San Diego, California library is more likely to have in its archives the California Historical Society's journal than the German Historical Society's journal.) However, we do have sufficient information to conclude that the presence of homosexuality in the religion, mythology, and ritual of primitive communal societies was common. Primitive peoples had both heterosexual and homosexual religious myths and rituals.

Homosexuality in the mythology and ritual of primitive communal society is not a single phenomenon. There are a number of aspects. First, there are myths in which homosexuality plays a role. For example, the Shish¹, the Assiniboine¹, the Fox¹, the Nahane², and the Nootka³ all have legends involving lesbianism. The gods of the Ngajus practice homosexuality.⁴ While the Ojibwa have a myth about "Wiscikedjak who dresses like a woman, marries, and has anal intercourse with his husband."⁵ This Ojibwa myth indicates the link between homosexuality and transvestitism in primitive communal cultures. In New Guinea there is a myth explaining the origin of sodomy and its connection with male puberty rites. (Layard)

Many of the religious myths which concern homosexuality are technically about hermaphrodites, persons who possess characteristics of both sexes. However, the same cultures either called homosexuals hermaphrodites⁶ or used homosexual transvestites in the rituals associated with these myths. Thus, we conclude that the hermaphrodite myths can be classes as homosexual myths. These myths include the origin myths of the Calamari and the Tolu⁷, and the Navaho myths about the inventor of pottery, the gourd dipper, the hairbrush, stirring sticks, and the water jar. The mythical Navaho hermaphrodite was also the first person to die, thus beginning human existence.⁸

There are three ways in which the homosexuality relates to religious myths or ritual behavior. One is that the ceremonies around some gods included ritual homosexuality. This was true, for example, of the "Mother" or "Great Goddess" who, under various names was worshipped throught the Eastern Mediterranean and Mesopotanian areas.⁹ The worship of this "Mother Goddess" involved homosexual and often heterosexual rites.¹⁰ Ceremonial homosexuality was also practiced by the Pueblos (Hrdicker), and in the puberty ceremonies of many groups including the Karika (Hays), the Kiwai (Landtman), the Marind-Amin (Ruitenbeek), the Iatmul (Bateson), the Tchambali (Hays), the Aranda (Roheim), and the Nambutji (Reheim).

The second relationship of homosexuality to the ritual or religion of primitive communal societies is the hermaphrodite or transvestite--also called shamans or berdaches. In some cases the relationship of these people to the religion or ritual was through the religious myths by which their existence was explained. In other cases, the relationship to the rituals or religions of these cultures was that these transvestites--the shamans and berdaches--were "wise-men", medicine men, etc. of the culture. (See Table).

Sexual relations with these "holy men" was often considered to be a source of power or strength. An interesting ritual which was documented among the Sioux, Sac, and Fox Indians (Catlin) was an annual celebration held by the tribal berdache and attended by all the men of the tribe who had made love with him.

An entire paper could easily be written about the transvestite "holy men" of primitive peoples and the homosexual practices associated with them. Table 1 gives those

1. See A. Ellis in our bibliography

2. See Honigman

3. See Drucker

4. See Cory

5. See Hoch

6. It is amusing to read some of the early explorers accounts about how common the normally rare phenomenon of hermaphroditism were in some primitive societies.

7. See de Alba

8. See Reichard

9. See Karleen (p. 163)

10. The homosexual rites around this mother goddess are in conflict with the notion that homosexuality in religious ritual and myth resulted from the downfall of women. After the establishment of the patriarchy the central god figure was almost always male. Thus, the homosexual myths and rituals around a woman godhead must pre-date the downfall of women.

interested a good start on investigating this interesting phenomenon. For our purposes it is sufficient to note that homosexuality was often integrally involved in the religions and rituals of primitive communal cultures through the role of these transvestites.

The third link between homosexuality and the religious practices of primitive communal cultures was homosexual temple prostitutes. Such prostitutes were found in ancient Peru (Cory and Cieza de Leon), in Canaan (Cory), in Babylonia (Lewison), and among the Sumerians and Hebrews (Hastings, 170). This phenomenon is found only in the highest stages of primitive communalism, for it is only in its last stages that we find established temples and the developed priesthood which go with such temples. It should be noted that, generally, where there was homosexual prostitution there was also heterosexual prostitution. These temple prostitutes were usually connected to some particular religious myth or some particular god. Of the three connections between homosexual behavior and the religious practices of primitive cultures, this is probably the least important for understanding homosexuality or anti-homosexuality due to the late stage of development at which temples and temple prostitutes appear.

The evidence on homosexuality in the religion, myth, and ritual of primitive communal societies leads to the following conclusions:

- 1) Homosexuality is closely connected with the religions, myths, and rituals of many primitive communal societies.
- 2) The role of homosexuality in these religions, myths, and rituals indicates a favorable rather than an unfavorable attitude towards homosexuality by primitive communal peoples.
- 3) The assertion that homosexual religious myths or religious practices are the result of the downfall of women or the establishment of class society is completely disproved by the actual facts.

These conclusions support the four main conclusions about the origins of homosexuality which we put forward before:

- 1) Homosexuality did not develop as a result of class society or the downfall of women.
- 2) Homosexuality develops in the course of nature--it is natural (in the precise, scientific sense).
- 3) Human homosexuality has always been a part of human society.
- 4) Anti-homosexuality has not always existed.

The starting points for this section of our analysis are that:

- 1) Homosexual behavior has always been a part of human sexual behavior;
- 2) Anti-homosexuality did not always exist, but is a social phenomenon which developed in the course of human society.

Those two conclusions, or theses, are essentially summations of the facts presented in Section III, Origins of Human Homosexuality.

To those who view homosexuality as an "unnatural" perversion, the question of when, how or why anti-homosexuality developed never arises. Those people view homosexuality as bad, and assume that anti-homosexuality is a "natural" or proletarian response to this "unnatural" perversion. Instead of providing a dialectical and historical materialist analysis, this view blindly accepts the dominant view of homosexuality which exists in this culture and interprets or explains history on the assumption that the attitudes of contemporary society always existed.

Anti-homosexuality is a social phenomenon. That is, it arose not out of the course of nature, but out of human social interaction. Saying that anti-homosexuality is a social phenomenon does not provide an automatic answer to the question of whether or not anti-homosexuality is "good" or "bad", proletarian or non-proletarian. Racism, national chauvinism, male supremacy, and revolution are all social phenomena. But the proletariat's attitude towards these social phenomena is not the same. To determine the proletariat's position towards anti-homosexuality, we must do as Lenin advised and analyse when and how it arose in history and what changes it has gone through in order to determine what it has become today.

To analyse the development of anti-homosexuality, we must begin by looking at when it developed. The following table provides a great deal of information about the development of anti-homosexuality. *

<u>CATEGORY</u>	<u>ATTITUDE</u>	<u># OF SOCIETIES</u>	<u>CHARACTERISTICS & DEVELOPMENTS</u>
1. MIDDLE SAV.	100% approval	11	fire and stone tools, group marriage, no inherited authority, no division of labor beyond childbearing
2. UP. SAVAGERY	14% disapproval	55	bow and arrow, hunting becomes an occupation, pairing family, established leadership but no inherited authority
3. LOWER BARBARISM	14% disapproval	49	pottery invented, pairing marriage in a matrilinear gens, division of labor between men and women in hunting, & between mental and manual labor
4. MID. BARBARISM**	31% disapproval	45	domestication of animals and large scale agriculture, metal work, SURPLUS DEVELOPS, MONOGAMOUS MARRIAGE, SLAVERY DEVELOPS=CLASS SOCIETY
**THE DEATH PENALTY FOR HOMOSEXUALITY APPEARS IN MIDDLE BARBARISM			
5. UP. BARBARISM	28% disapproval	18	iron working and the plow, monogamous marriage, class society
6. CIVILIZATION	55% disapproval		written language, class society

*1 In examining the development of anti-homosexuality we distinguish between two aspects of anti-homosexuality: disapproval and suppression. There are many cultures which are said to "disapprove" of homosexuality and yet had homosexual marriages and religious rites. For example, the Alor "disapproved" of homosexuality yet do not punish it in any way and allow homosexual marriages. The Trobrianders "disapproved" of homosexuality but did not punish it in any way. The Pomo "disapproved" of homosexuality although it was very common. The Nahane "disapproved" of homosexuality and transvestitism, yet they consciously raised some girls as boys. These girls grew up to be homosexual transvestites. Here the Nahane supposedly "disapproved" of homosexuality and at the same time consciously encouraged it. We take the development of the death penalty as the most significant dividing line between disapproval and suppression. Once the death penalty develops, it is clear that disapproval has given way to suppression - homosexuality is not merely being discouraged or viewed as less desirable than heterosexuality.

In the period of Upper Savagery, disapproval towards homosexuality begins. Previous to this stage in human development, there is NO evidence that any disapproval or discouragement of homosexuality existed. The number of cultures which disapproved of homosexuality at this level is relatively small and remains small at the level of lower barbarism.

At the level of Middle Barbarism, two changes occur. There is a large increase in the number of societies which disapproved of homosexuality, although the disapproval is not a universal or even majority phenomenon. Furthermore, for the first time in human history, the death penalty for homosexuality appears.

We basically have before us the facts about when anti-homosexuality developed. These facts are necessary, but by themselves they do not answer the question of how the phenomenon of anti-homosexuality arose in history. To answer the question we must analyse those facts in the context of the developments which human society was going through in those periods.

Because the analysis is complex, and because the subjective attitudes on the question of homosexuality are strong, we will first summarize the conclusions which can be drawn at this point on the basis of the facts presented. These conclusions are not questions of analysis or interpretation, but the logical summation of the facts which we have presented:

- 1) Before the period of Upper Savagery, there is NO evidence that homosexuality was subject to any disapproval or discouragement.
- 2) The development of anti-homosexuality was NOT a necessary step for the development of human society.

The first conclusion has already been discussed at length. However, some comments concerning the second conclusion are necessary. There are some people, who, when they discover that facts do not support their subjective, prejudicial view of 'homosexuality-as-a-perversion which developed out of class society', retreat to the position that anti-homosexuality was a necessary step in human development. This equally subjective argument is also proven false by the facts. The development of private property and of classes were necessary steps in human development. If anti-homosexuality were necessary for this development, then ALL societies which reached that level of development would have exhibited anti-homosexuality. The facts make it clear that this was not the case. We firmly believe that there are material reasons why anti-homosexuality developed. But an understanding of the material basis for anti-homosexuality can not be replaced by the neat sophism that it was a necessary step in human development.

THE MATERIAL BASIS FOR ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY: HOW AND WHY

During the entire period of primitive communalism, human history was progressing towards the development of class society. The development of private property was at the center of this development. Private property grows out of the possibility and existence of surplus. With the development of class society, we have not only private personal property, but also private ownership of the means of production. We also have two other important and related developments: the domination of men over women and the domination of some men over other people (slavery).

The primitive communal era was not one of revolutionary upheaval, but rather a process of quantitative changes - some large and some almost imperceptible - which culminated in the development of class society. Primitive man did not go directly from the animal world to class society in one giant leap. Numerous quantitative changes in the technological level and the social structure had to occur. The development of primitive agriculture and animal husbandry, essential to the production of surplus, was the culmination of a long list of advances. Similarly, the domination of men over women, the development of class distinctions, and the establishment of slavery had their foundations laid in the social developments of the primitive communal era: the development of the division of labor between men and women, the division between mental and manual labor, and the divisions between social groupings that led to war captives.

The quantitative changes which led to the development of class society were not even and uniform. The changes and developments in the social structure followed from the changes and developments in the material realm, the technological developments. And, within certain limits, these developments were uniform. The development of classes does not pre-date the development of surplus, which in turn can not pre-date the development of some level of agriculture or animal husbandry. However, there was some unevenness. Two primitive groups might have had roughly the same technological level yet the development of the contradiction between mental and manual labor might have been different - one group having elected tribal leaders while in the other the leadership was already hereditary.

Marx and Engels have referred to the first division of labor as that between men and women in childbearing. Certainly this is true. Men or males of any species have never borne offspring. This division is not a division which developed only in human society but exists equally in the animal world. In fact, under the conditions of primitive communalism, the economic role of reproduction is fundamentally different from the economic role of reproduction once the possibility of surplus exists. Before the possibility of surplus exists, an increase in the population results in a roughly equivalent increase in the socially necessary labor required for the subsistence of that population. Reproduction, although necessary for the continuation of the species, does not play any role in the activity for gaining the means of subsistence.

The first division between the activity of men and women in obtaining the means of subsistence occurs at the level of Upper Savagery. *2 At that point, the bow and arrow is developed and hunting becomes a regular occupation. Engels points out (p.24) that before the bow and arrow hunting was an unreliable source of food. Gathering roots and other edible foodstuffs was a significant, if not the primary, means of gaining food. Women engaged in this gathering activity. And, given the difficulty of obtaining food, it is likely that the men also engaged in this activity. Thus, before the development of the bow and arrow, the role of men and women in obtaining food was probably similar in form and certainly similar in importance.

*2 There has been some disagreement, even between those who in general agree with the analysis presented in this paper, as to whether it is correct to characterize the division between men and women which occurred at the level of Upper Savagery as the first division of labor. The controversy revolves around various statements by Marx and Engels, the question of what was meant by those statements and to what level of development they were referring. Essentially the question is whether the development was the beginning of the sexual division of labor or a consolidation of the sexual division of labor. We have not developed this controversy in the body of the paper because it has no bearing on the conclusions. The biological differences between men and women were not sufficient to cause the development of anti-homosexuality. Only when differences between the occupations of men and women developed was the groundwork laid for anti-homosexuality. In fact, as we have suggested, disapproval of homosexuality quite likely did not occur until those different occupations were also valued differently by the society, thus creating some material advantage for one sex (the men) to establishing barriers which makes the question of gender essential to the evaluation of behavior.

With the development of the bow and arrow, the situation changed. Hunting became a reliable source of food and an occupation instead of an occasional activity. Men became the hunters while women's occupation became the activity around the home. ("Home" must be thought of rather loosely since many groups at this level of development were still nomadic or semi-nomadic.) The development of the bow and arrow thus gives rise to the first division in the economic activity of men and women.*A

This division in the economic activity does not automatically create a difference in the value of the activity. The work of men and women was equally necessary to the life of the society. Nonetheless, a difference existed; there was -for the first time - a distinction between "men's work" and "women's work". This distinction creates the material basis for evaluating behavior on the basis of the sex of the individual involved.*B

We believe that it is no accident that anti-homosexuality first appears at the level of Upper Savagery, the period of human development in which the first major division in the occupations of men and women developed. This division between the economic activity of men and women creates the possibility, the framework, for evaluating behavior as appropriate or inappropriate - good or bad - on the basis of the sex of the individual involved. The concepts of heterosexuality and homosexuality require that behavior be evaluated on the basis of the sex of the individuals involved. We conclude from this that the material basis for the possibility of anti-homosexuality was not childbearing or biology, but a division in the economic activity of men and women.

There are two related facts which support this conclusion. First, it was at this same stage in development - Upper Savagery - where transvestitism first appeared. (See Table in the back). Transvestitism is the act of dressing in the clothing appropriate for the opposite sex. As we have noted before, it is a common co-phenomenon with homosexuality. The fact that we find the first evidence of transvestitism at the level of Upper Savagery supports the conclusion that it was as a result of the division in the economic activity of men and women that the concept of sex-appropriate behavior first develops. The logic is simple. Unless and until behavior is evaluated on the basis of an individual's sex, there is no reason (perhaps no possibility) for dressing like the opposite sex.

The line of reasoning is further supported by the fact that in many primitive cultures, when two persons of the same sex engaged in sexual relations or were married, it was only the partner who acted in the manner appropriate for the opposite sex who was considered, by the culture, to be homosexual.

To reiterate:

1) We conclude that the material basis for the possibility of anti-homosexuality developed historically not out of the division between men and women in reproduction; but rather out of the division between men and women in the production (or in this case, the obtaining) of the means of subsistence.

*A Some people may suggest that this analysis is in conflict with the statement by Engels that, "Gaining a livelihood had always been the business of the man; he produced and owned the means therefor." (p.158, Progress Publishers ed.) However, a closer reading of "Origins" will show that the quotation above is from a section entitled "Barbarism and Civilization." In the second paragraph of that section, Engels traces briefly the development of society and the social unit (the gens) up to the lower stage of barbarism. He notes that, "With this stage /lower barbarism, ed./ then, we shall begin our investigation." (p.154) We, in no way, disagree with Engels; by the stage of lower barbarism, gaining the livelihood is the business of the men. They do produce and own the tools - for example, the bows and arrows - necessary for this activity.

*B The division between "men's work" and "women's work" which developed at the level of Upper Savagery is not the same as what is often called "sex-roles". The term, sex-roles, at least when we use it, refers to an aspect of male supremacist ideology which not only distinguishes between the activity of men and women, but also between the value of that activity, and consequently, distinguishes between the characteristics and worth of men and women as people.

We have constantly stressed in the discussion above that the division between "men's work" and "women's work" created the possibility for anti-homosexuality as opposed to saying that it was that division which created anti-homosexuality. There are two important reasons and implications of that distinction.

First, when we talk about the creating of the possibility for anti-homosexuality, it is important to remember that it is social being that creates consciousness, not consciousness that creates being. What we are saying is that the concept of anti-homosexuality would have been incomprehensible to an individual at the level of Middle Savagery, we argue, because the material basis for those concepts did not yet exist.

(Certainly, no Marxist will need to be convinced that previous to the development of classes, the concept of class struggle would have been incomprehensible; for we are in agreement that it is the existence of classes which provides the material basis for the activity and the concept of class struggle.) However, on the question of homosexuality there is not universal agreement. Turning to the facts, we find:

- 1) Homosexuality existed in human society at the period of Middle Savagery, and based on our analysis, we must conclude that homosexuality has always been a part of human sexuality.
- 2) Anti-homosexuality did not exist at the level of Middle Savagery, and, in fact, the general acceptance of homosexuality is supported by the prevalence of homosexuality in the religious myths and practices of primitive people.
- 3) In the period of Upper Savagery the division between the activity of men and women in obtaining the means of subsistence developed.
- 4) At the same period we find the first evidence of anti-homosexuality and the first evidence of transvestitism.

On the basis of the facts above, we conclude that the material basis for the reality and the concept of anti-homosexuality is the division between men and women in the activity to produce (or obtain) the means of subsistence.

There are others who argue that the material basis for anti-homosexuality is the biological differences between men and women. Because women bear children and men do not, anti-homosexuality develops- they reason. This position is essentially the natural/unnatural argument with those words deleted. We reject this position for essentially the same reasons we reject the natural/unnatural argument...

- 1) If basic biology were the cause of anti-homosexuality why did homosexuality develop in the first place?
- 2) If anti-homosexuality were the result of biological differences between men and women, why didn't it begin to appear before Upper Savagery? Those biological differences certainly existed, and we do not believe our primitive ancestors were so stupid as to have been unaware of the biological functions and differences.
- 3) If anti-homosexuality were the result of biological differences, why did it develop unevenly, why only in a few cultures at first, why did suppression only appear with class society? Certainly the development of basic biology was not uneven in different cultures, and certainly the development of class society did not change basic biology.

The second significance or implication of saying that the division in the economic activity of men and women created the material basis for the possibility of anti-homosexuality; instead of saying that it created anti-homosexuality, is the distinction between possibility and necessity. Where there are classes, there is class struggle. Where there is oppression, there is resistance. These statements are true, for the existence of classes and oppression creates not only an abstract possibility for struggle but a necessity. There are differences between the interests of classes and between the interests of oppressors and oppressed which made struggle necessary and inevitable. Can the same be said for the division between the economic activity of men and women and anti-homosexuality? Obviously, the answer is no. Anti-homoc-

sexuality was not a universal phenomenon even after class society was established. Certainly, the division in the economic activity between men and women did not therefore make anti-homosexuality necessary.

Before we begin analyzing the reasons for the development of and continuation of anti-homosexuality, it is worthwhile to be clear on one thing which was not the reason for its development. The existence of homosexuality was not, in and of itself, the cause for the development of anti-homosexuality. If anti-homosexuality were simply a response to the existence of homosexuality, it would have existed for as long as homosexuality existed, and it did not.

We must also note that our task is not only to investigate why anti-homosexuality originally developed, but also why it has continued to exist.

Returning to the question of why anti-homosexuality first developed, we must admit that we can not provide any definite answers. We have already noted that the division between the economic activity of men and women provided the material basis for the possibility of anti-homosexuality. We also noted that the mere fact that a division in the economic activity of men and women existed did not mean that men's work and women's work were valued differently. Finally, we noted that the number of groups at this level of development which actually disapproved of homosexuality was small. We suggest therefore that the existence of anti-homosexuality at this level of development was the result of local conditions. These local conditions likely included uneven development in the relations between men and women.

As we noted before, the quantitative developments in human society during the primitive communal era were uneven. Thus, in some groups the differentiation in the value placed on men's work and the value placed on women's work may have begun earlier than in others. This is completely consistent with the fact that the role of tribal chiefs and the question of inherited versus chosen tribal leaders was not uniform for cultures even at the same level of development. Basically, what we are saying is that the reasons for the development of anti-homosexuality in Upper Savagery and Lower Barbarism is, quite likely, the uneven - in this case, the accelerated - development of the various contradictions which laid the foundation for class society. This position does not conflict with either logic or Engels. Within the constraints of the category system we (and Morgan and Engels) use, there is room for some variation in technological and social development. In particular, for example, the overthrow of mother-right and the domination of men over women was the culmination of a series of quantitative changes in the relative value assigned to men's and women's contributions to society. As Engels says, "Thus, as wealth increased, it, on the one hand, gave the man a more important status in the family than the woman, and, on the other hand, created a stimulus to utilize this strengthened position in order to overthrow the traditional order of inheritance in favor of his children." (p.56, emphasis ours).

In fact, the list of conditions which could have caused an unevenness in the value of men's work and women's work includes more than the increase in wealth or the beginnings of surplus. The significance of both hunting and warfare to a society would have had an impact on the relative value of men's work in the culture. In addition to developments in the contradiction between men and women, once the material conditions for the possibility of anti-homosexuality exist, other local conditions could have caused the development of anti-homosexuality. These conditions could have included the unpopularity of a particular homosexual, religious conflicts, the interest of a heterosexual tribal leader in a homosexual of the opposite sex, and others.

Obviously, our position that uneven, accelerated, developments in the various contradictions which laid the foundation for class society were the main cause of the development of a small amount of anti-homosexuality in pre-class cultures is only acceptable if it can be shown that the development of those contradictions does provide a material basis, an advantage, for anti-homosexuality. Thus, we must turn to the period of Middle Barbarism to examine both the developments in anti-homosexuality and the overall development of society.

Anti-homosexuality went through what we consider to be a qualitative change at the level of Middle Barbarism. The percentage of societies which disapproved of homosexuality doubled. More importantly, the death penalty for homosexuality appears for the first time in human history. There are some who have asserted that homosexuality began with class society. It is ironic that, instead, it was the suppression of homosexuality that began with class society.

It is an undeniable fact that anti-homosexuality increased and that the suppression of homosexuality in the form of the death penalty appeared at the level of Middle Barbarism, the period when class society developed. Before we examine the changes in anti-homosexuality in the context of the overall social development, it may be useful to review the facts and analysis which have been presented and to examine the main positions on the question of anti-homosexuality.

It has already been proven in section 3, the Origins of Homosexuality, that homosexuality is neither "unnatural" nor a "perversion". It is, instead, one of the forms which human sexuality has always taken. Anti-homosexuality, on the contrary, has not always been present in human society. The disapproval of homosexuality began first to appear at the level of Upper Savagery. The percentage of cultures which disapproved of homosexuality increased and the death penalty (suppression) appeared with the onset of class society in Middle Barbarism. These facts are sufficient to make the position that anti-homosexuality is a natural, inevitable, or necessary reaction to homosexuality absolutely untenable. The assertion that homosexuality is unnatural or that anti-homosexuality is natural, necessary or inevitable response to homosexuality may fit nicely with the subjective view of homosexuality prevalent in bourgeois society, but it is a view which is completely unsupportable when the question is analysed scientifically.*C

The views that anti-homosexuality is the natural, necessary, or inevitable response of the masses to an evil of class society are both thoroughly demolished by the facts. There remain two positions or views on how and why anti-homosexuality developed which we will examine further. Our position is that the foundations of anti-homosexuality is the domination of men over women, that it was the process and service of this domination that anti-homosexuality developed. Furthermore, that anti-homosexuality has been perpetuated and strengthened by and because of both male supremacy and additional advantages which anti-homosexuality creates for the ruling class in all pre-socialist societies.

The other position is that anti-homosexuality is a response to the unproductive nature of homosexuality. This position is rarely given full development by those who put it forward. However, we assume their reasoning would (does) approximate the following: "homosexuality is unproductive and therefore must be opposed by all classes which are concerned with a society's productivity.*D

*C (Perhaps the most common position or justification for accepting the continuation of anti-homosexuality, at least for Marxist forces, has been the position that homosexuality is the result of class society, and it is a perversion which should be eliminated in the process of eliminating class society. This position is in total contradiction with the facts. No person who is materialist, much less a dialectical materialist, can put forward the position that homosexuality resulted or arose from class society after viewing the evidence presented in this paper. Thus, the position that anti-homosexuality developed as a response of the masses to homosexuality - a negative aspect of class society - is also completely unacceptable to a materialist. The facts which are presented in this paper raise what is almost the opposite question - is anti-homosexuality the result of class society and a perversion which should be eliminated in the process of elimination of class society?)

*D It is interesting and important to note that the "unproductive" argument was rarely put forward in this country until recently. The more com-

In comparing the two positions it is clear that these proponents of anti-homosexuality are conceding a point which we will, nonetheless, demonstrate in the following analysis- that anti-homosexuality was (and is) in the interests of the ruling class in all pre-socialist societies. The crux of the difference, at this point, is whether anti-homosexuality is based on the domination of men over women and the corresponding ideology of male supremacism or is anti-homosexuality based in the "unproductivity" of sexual relations between two persons of the same sex.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLASS SOCIETY

Obviously, the most significant development in the period of Middle Barbarism was the development of class society. But, as we have noted before, this was not an isolated development. Class society could not develop without private property. And, the development of private property, especially private ownership of the means of production, was a result of the developments of primitive agriculture and primitive animal husbandry which made surplus possible. These developments influenced and were in turn influenced by the domination of men over women, the domination of mental over manual labor, and the domination of some men over other people (the development of slavery).

We turn again to Engels' description of the impact which private property and private wealth had on the relations between men and women;

"Thus, as wealth increased, it, on the one hand, gave the man a more important status in the family (and the society-ed.) than the woman, and on the other hand, created a stimulus to utilize this strengthened position in order to overthrow the traditional order of inheritance in favor of his children. (p56)

As a result of his increased wealth, the man not only gained in influence but, in fact, gained domination over women; "The overthrow of mother right was the world-historic defeat of the female sex. The man seized the reins in the house also, the woman was degraded, enthralled, the slave of man's lust, a mere instrument for breeding children" (p.57). Man's control over the wealth which enabled him to seize power was the result of the division which existed between men and women. The maintenance of this division of labor, was, on the one hand, made possible by the supreme position which his control over the wealth created, and, on the other hand, necessary to ensure the continuance of that supreme position. Engels describes the role of that division of labor quite explicitly;

"Gaining a livelihood had always been the business of the man; /see earlier footnote, this section, on page 16. -ed./ he produced and owned the means therefor. The herds were the new means of gaining a livelihood, and their original domestication and subsequent tending was his work. Hence, he owned the cattle, and the commodities

*D mon argument for anti-homosexuality was the class society argument. However, as the facts about the origins of human homosexuality have become increasingly well known, that argument has been dropped and replaced by the productive/unproductive argument. Objectively, the productive/unproductive argument is a new shinier version of the natural/unnatural argument. Heterosexuality was assumed to be natural because it was the means for producing off-spring while homosexuality was assumed unnatural because it did not. The content of the argument is essentially unchanged although the form and the justification for the argument are somewhat different. We will deal with this "new" argument more fully in the main body of the paper. However, this process is worth noting because it suggests subjectivity on the part of the forces supporting anti-homosexuality. It suggests that there is more interest in finding some justification for anti-homosexuality than there is in finding the truth. We do not doubt that after this paper is published there will be newer, more sophisticated versions of the arguments shown here to be unscientific.

It is our hope that everyone will struggle against any subjective tendency to simply adopt these new arguments instead of evaluating them scientifically.

and slaves obtained in exchange for them. All the surplus now resulting from production fell to the man; the woman shared in consuming it, but she had no share in owning it. The "savage" warrior and hunter had been content to occupy second place in the house and give the precedence to the woman. The "gentler" shephard, presuming upon his wealth, pushed forward to first place and forced the woman into second place. And she could not complain. Division of labour in the family had regulated the distribution of property between man and wife. This division of labour remained unchanged, and yet it now put the former domestic relationship topsy-turvy simply because the division of labour outside the family had changed. The very cause that had formerly made the woman supreme in the house, namely, her being confined to domestic work, now assured supremacy in the house for the man; the woman's housework lost its significance compared with the man's work in obtaining a livelihood; the latter was everything, the former an insignificant contribution." (emphasis ours)

It is obvious that, by this point in human history, a material advantage existed for the man in the position that the acceptability or determination of an individual's behavior was dictated by the sex of that individual.

Along with the overthrow of women, as Engels explains, monogamous marriage became the rule, at least for women. Man, having won the right to pass his property to his heirs, now demanded strict fidelity of his wife to insure that his heirs were, in fact, his off-spring. Furthermore, with private property, this new patriarchal family developed into an important economic unit. Property, the means of production and the surplus generated by production, no longer belonged to the society as a whole, but to individual men. This property and the power of wealth passed from these individual men to their prodgeny. Private property and the patriarchal family provide the material basis for male supremacist ideology. Private property is the root of male supremacy; the domination of men over women and the economic role of the family unit are the soil in which it grows.

Male supremacy is not simply a division of labor between men and women. It is a whole system of ideas which define different characteristics for these two different creatures: men and women. It is a system of ideas which values men more highly than women. And obviously, it is a system of ideas which has as its cornerstone the view that who an individual is, and how or what a person should do are determined by the sex of that individual. Additionally, male supremacist ideology views the domination of men over women as a voluntary relationship which is based on "natural" differences.

It should be evident why we view the domination of men over women and the ruling class ideology of male supremacy as the foundation of anti-homosexuality. Male supremacist ideology defines two distinct creatures - men and women - and says that these two different creatures have different characteristics, different roles and thus behave differently. The existence of couples where both members are of the same sex is in conflict with male supremacist ideology. Either one member of the couple must engage in behavior which is characteristic of the opposite sex or both persons must engage in behavior which is a combination of the two sex roles. Either way, this is in direct conflict with the system of views which says that men and women are different creatures whose different roles are determined by "nature".

Male supremacist ideology requires that homosexuality be viewed as not-normal. This is not quite the same thing as saying that male supremacy requires anti-homosexuality. What male supremacy requires is that homosexuality be viewed as "different", as something in which the bulk of the population does not "by nature" engage. This "difference" can be expressed in the form of a negative view: that homosexuality is a perversion, a bad thing, a sickness, a "crime against nature". Or it can be expressed in the form of a positive view: homosexuality is special, the act of the chosen, a mark of the gods. History shows us that both views, negative and positive, were held by the people of those periods. But male supremacist ideology can not allow homosexuality to be viewed as a normal form of human sexuality, and thus comparable to heterosexuality; Heterosexuality must be the normal or "natural" form and homosexuality must be a deviation.

As we have noted before, there are those who argue that anti-homosexuality was a natural, inevitable, or necessary step in human development. That argument, in the face of conflicting evidence, is sometimes mutated to the position that anti-homosexuality was a progressive and therefore positive development. As we have noted before, anti-homosexuality was not a necessary step for human development. However, as we have now explained, the view that homosexuality is "different" was a necessary part of male supremacist ideology. To the extent that male supremacy was a progressive step in human development, the view that homosexuality is "different" was also a progressive step. By that same reasoning the domination of men over women was a progressive step. What we must remember is that we are not speaking in any moral absolutes. Because we say that a thing - slavery, the domination of men over women, the conquest of the Southwest by the U.S. capitalists, or the view that homosexuality is a deviation from what is normal - was progressive or even necessary ECONOMICALLY, does not mean that we approve of it or endorse it politically.

WHY ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY?

Why, if male supremacy only required that homosexuality be viewed as a deviation, did anti-homosexuality develop? We believe that there are two reasons. First, anti-homosexuality is the stronger, less threatening (to male supremacy), form of "different". Not only are those persons who deviate from the "natural" roles of men and women different, but also they are bad. The view that "homosexuality is special" - the positive form/view - probably developed (even though it was more threatening to male supremacy) because homosexuality was so common and accepted in primitive communal cultures. This second view of homosexuality did allow for the consolidation of male supremacy and male domination but without the new ruling class being put in direct conflict with the old customs and religious practices (which very much included homosexuality). Since the move from primitive communalism to class society was, on the whole, established through small quantitative change rather than revolutionary uprising, it is not unreasonable to suggest that, in this area as well, the changes were often made in small rather than sweeping steps. The second reason why we believe that anti-homosexuality developed, and in fact won out (over the "homosexuality is special" view); is that, as we said before, although male supremacy was the primary basis for the development of anti-homosexuality, there were additional benefits of anti-homosexuality to the new ruling class.

Engels (Origins, p.55) points to the period of Middle Barbarism as the period in which slavery developed. Slavery resulted from the introduction of cattle breeding, metal work, and agriculture which made it possible for human labor to produce a surplus. Human labor could produce more than what was needed to meet the cost of maintenance of the laborer. Human labor power, thus, acquired exchange value. Slavery became not only economically feasible, but also economically advantageous. War captives were no longer treated as part of the tribe, but instead were part of the new slave class. The nature of human reproduction was no longer simply for perpetuation of the species. Reproduction at that point increased the wealth which the society could generate.

The change in human reproduction was of particular importance concerning the slave population, the new laboring class. Engels notes of the slaves that, "they could be bred like the cattle itself." (p.55) Reproduction of the slaves, like the breeding of cattle, resulted in a direct increase in the wealth of the slave owner. Anti-homosexuality promotes a high level of reproduction and is thus useful to the slave owning ruling class. Anti-homosexuality promotes reproduction among the heterosexual population as well as encouraging reproduction by homosexual women. The idea that to be heterosexual is good and natural in general promotes reproduction. The specific moral and legal sanctions against homosexuality can be directed not only at those engaging in homosexual behavior, but also at any women not reproducing with adequate frequency (from the slave owners point of view.) The option for a woman to choose not to bear children is eliminated not only by direct force from the slave owner, but also by a general view that reproduction is the normal function of the female half of the species.

We will stop here for a moment and examine what has been presented because we are at the crux of the two main positions on the question of why anti-homosexuality developed. Our position is that the primary reason for the development of anti-homosexuality was the domination of men over women and the ideology of male supremacy. We view the question of reproduction as a secondary benefit to the ruling class of anti-homosexuality, but not its primary cause. The other position is that anti-homosexuality is a direct response to the unproductive nature of homosexual relations. Both sides must agree that anti-homosexuality was of benefit to the slave owning class. The difference is over the question of -was this the primary or principle cause for anti-homosexuality.

We too made the error, in the past, of over-emphasizing the role of reproduction in the development of anti-homosexuality when we first began examining the question. However, a closer examination of the question makes it clear why the question of reproduction/production could not have been the principle root of anti-homosexuality. First, if the principal cause of anti-homosexuality had been the question of reproduction, particularly reproduction of slaves, then anti-homosexuality would have been developed primarily as opposition to female homosexuality. Just as cattle breeding does not require that all bulls engage in sexual intercourse, slave breeding does not require that all male slaves engage in sexual intercourse. The prohibition against homosexuality needed only to be against female homosexuality. Yet, this is certainly not the case. There is no indication that anti-homosexuality developed as a prohibition only of female homosexuality. Furthermore, the dominion of men over women and of slave owners over slaves would have made the development of an additional control, like anti-homosexuality, virtually unneeded. Why did the death penalty appear, certainly less extreme methods would have been adequate to achieve female reproduction without destroying the slave owners' property (which killing homosexual slaves would do)? Placing the question of reproduction as the principal reason for the development of anti-homosexuality has a certain logical appeal; but such a position can not explain the facts. Only when we recognize the relationship of anti-homosexuality to the domination of men over women can we understand the reasons why anti-homosexuality developed in the way it did.

Anti-homosexuality developed out of the domination of men over women and the ideology of male supremacy. It also provided the additional advantage to the ruling class of encouraging a high level of reproduction. There was one other significant secondary advantage of anti-homosexuality to the new ruling class. Anti-homosexuality was of assistance in developing larger social units. Because most people have been relatively ignorant of the existence and role of homosexuality in primitive communal society, this aspect of anti-homosexuality has received little attention or understanding.

The more primitive levels of technological development which characterized human society under primitive communalism were accompanied by more primitive and smaller social units. An entire society often was composed of a single gens (clan). Even where larger confederations of tribal or gens units existed, each group had some particular religious practices or at least ancestral gods which were not common to the confederation. As technological developments made larger social units possible, there was undoubtedly conflict with the older but smaller social units. For the new social units to develop, it was necessary to replace the old social units. Those things which undermined the culture of the older social units aided the process of replacing the clan society with a larger social unit under the control of the new state. As we have pointed out before, homosexuality played a role in the religious myths and practices of many pre-class societies. Anti-homosexuality was of benefit to the new ruling class because disapproval and suppression of homosexuality undermined religions and cultures where homosexuality played a significant part in the religious myths and rituals.

Many people point to ancient Greece as supposed proof that homosexuality is a result of class society and decadence. Ironically, the Greek example is more likely just the opposite. In section III, Origins of Homosexuality, we noted homosexual religious practices and myths were common to the whole mediteranian area, pre-dating the rise of the Athenian state. A close reading of some of the ancient (pre-Athenian state) Greek historians will also provide the interested reader with evidence of homosexuality.

Engels tells us that the Greek gens or tribal groups were particularly strong and well-developed. The Greek nobility date not from the rise of the state, but from the gens or tribal period (p.103). The religious and moral influence of the gens far outlived the existence of the gens as the basic social unit;

"...the organs of gentile constitution were eliminated from public affairs. They sunk to the position of private associations and religious societies. But their moral influence, the traditional conceptions and views of the old gentile period, survived for a long time and expired only gradually. (p.116 Origins).

To a considerable extent, the Greek nobility, even under the new Greek state, represented the old gentes and tribes. Greek history makes it clear that the Greek nobility was often in conflict with the more autocratic rulers, a conflict between the old gentile order and the new state order. The nobility was, in fact, a part of the decaying gentile order. Thus, it is reasonable to assume and expect that some of their defense and perpetration of the old order had a decadent character. Such was undoubtedly the case with some of the forms which homosexuality (and heterosexuality) took among the Greek nobility. We do not doubt that the sexual practices, both heterosexual and homosexual, of decaying cultures have and take on decadent aspects and forms. But this is entirely different from the prevalent assertion that it was homosexuality itself which arose out of decadence. The fact that it was the principal representatives of the old, pre-class, order who were, at least, among the defenders of homosexuality, is evidence that homosexuality was a part of the pre-class order, not evidence that homosexuality arose with class society. Furthermore, since the data already presented in this paper proves that homosexuality pre-dates class society, we can only conclude that homosexuality among the Greeks, even the Greek nobility, was the result of the strength and durability of the pre-class religions and cultural traditions and not the result of class society.

From all of this, we conclude that the primary reason for the development of anti-homosexuality was the domination of men over women which began with a sexual division of labor and the ideology of male supremacy which is a ruling class ideology. Anti-homosexuality triumphed over the view of "homosexuality as special" because:

- 1) the negative view of homosexuality was more consistent and supportive of male supremacy, and
- 2) because anti-homosexuality provided additional advantages to the new ruling class. These additional advantages were a) the support for a high level of human reproduction, and b) the aid which anti-homosexuality provides in breaking down the older, pre-class, cultures and social units. When we examined the other three common explanations for why anti-homosexuality developed, we found that they either could not explain the facts about the development of anti-homosexuality or they were in direct contradiction with those facts.

SECTION 5

Homosexuality and Anti-Homosexuality
in Pre-socialist Societies

Following the proper method of examining a question of social science, we have examined in detail the origins of both homosexuality and anti-homosexuality. Our task is, however, not completed. We must also examine the changes that have occurred through the development of society in order to arrive at the correct position. The facts and our analysis make it obvious that we are dealing with two separate questions. Opposition to homosexuality, anti-homosexuality, is not simply the dialectical opposite of homosexuality. It is instead a social attitude, a part of ideology, which arose for certain reasons and has provided certain benefits to the ruling class. Thus, we will deal with the development or changes in the two phenomena separately.

Changes in Homosexuality Since Primitive Communalism

The natural aspect of human sexuality, genital contact between two individuals--whether of the same or opposite sex--remains essentially the same for humanity today as it was for our ancient ancestors. In fact, it was probably essentially the same for them as it was for their ancestors, the apes. It is the form and content of the relationships, the social aspect, which changes with the changes in humanity's social order.

There are some changes in human sexual relations which we will outline which are a part of the development of human society from lower to higher forms. In particular, as society has progressed from slave society thru feudalism to capitalist society there has been a change in the possibility for the masses to form relationships on the basis of mutual love and respect. Under slavery, individual slaves were relatively unfree in their choice of partners. Even if two slaves joined together on the basis of mutual love and respect, they had no control over their masters who could separate them at will. Furthermore, the slave owners could require sexual behavior from the slaves for the pleasure of the master and his friends or for the purpose of breeding. Under feudalism, the serfs had more freedom of choice. However, the inequality between men and women limited the possibility of free and equal choice. Additionally, the feudal lords also had considerable control over his subjects. Under capitalism, the freedom of choice is greater since the masses are not tied to any particular capitalist. And, as capitalism, particularly in its rising (pre-monopoly or imperialist) phase, involves women in the productive life of the society, it also increases the extent to which women have a "free and equal" choice in selecting a partner. This does not mean that under capitalism "free and equal" relationships have become the rule, but as society has progressed there have been material changes which have increased the possibility for "free and equal" sexual relationships. We believe that these changes apply equally to heterosexual and homosexual relationships. There is no basis for suggesting that this process of increasing control and choice in the selection of sexual partners applied only to the choice of a partner of the opposite sex.

Although we will not discuss in detail the changes in each society which are internal to the rise and fall of the society, it is important to deal with the question of decadence. We will discuss decadence not as much from the perspective of any individual society or economic form as from the perspective of a general phenomenon. Slave, feudal, and capitalist society have all had their rising and declining stages.

It is often asserted that homosexuality is decadent. In connection with that assertion, the statement is made that homosexuality increases in periods of decadence. There is a certain unclarity as to whether the people who put this forward are arguing that because homosexuality is decadent it increases or that because homosexuality increases it is decadent. We suspect that the unclarity is because the argument is completely circular. It has already been adequately demonstrated that homosexuality did not arise out of decadence. Thus, the only possible argument is that homosexuality has become decadent in the course of human development, as evidenced by the increase of homosexuality during periods of decadence.

During periods of decay, some members of a society turn to escape and distraction.

This is encouraged by the ruling class in a desperate attempt to continue their own rule. The masses are encouraged to seek escape in drugs, mysticism, self-examination, recreation and sex. Furthermore, the increasing pressures of society can make it more difficult for people to maintain their personal relationships. All of this is generally accepted by those who analyse history with the dialectical materialist method. And all of this applies equally to heterosexual and homosexual relationships. Those who would attempt to prove that homosexuality is decadent deal with the question of sexual behavior and relationships under decaying social conditions in a non-scientific, non-dialectical, one-sided manner.

Certainly there is an increase in the U.S. today of heterosexual activity. (Or at least the same sort of perceptual evidence, which causes people to conclude that homosexual activity has increased, exists with respect to heterosexual activity as well). There is more heterosexual intercourse, more pornography (heterosexual), more prostitution (heterosexual), more nude bars and floor shows catering to heterosexual men, etc., etc., etc., than there was fifty years ago. Does this mean that we should conclude that heterosexuality is decadent? We think not.

Yet, if we followed the reasoning of those who call homosexuality decadent, we would be forced to conclude that heterosexuality is decadent. Why have the forces who conclude that homosexuality is shown to be decadent by the fact that it "increases during periods of social decay" never put forward the logically consistent and parallel argument with respect to heterosexuality? We suspect that it is because those forces distinguish between heterosexuality and the decadent or exploitative forms of heterosexuality, but make no such distinction with respect to homosexuality. Yet, we have shown that both homosexuality and heterosexuality are aspects of "natural" human sexuality. We suggest that human sexuality is not inherently decadent. But, under conditions of social decay, human sexuality like many other human behaviors, can be expressed in decadent forms. An increase in the visibility of homosexuality or even an actual increase in homosexual activity could only be viewed as an indication that homosexuality is decadent if it could also be shown that heterosexual activity does not increase and does not get expressed in decadent forms.

While we are dealing with the question of decadence, we should also deal with the related assertion that the ruling class in the U.S. today is encouraging homosexuality because homosexuality is a part of decadent culture. We do not doubt or question that the ruling class is encouraging decadent expressions of human sexuality like promiscuity, pronography, and prostitution. This action by the ruling class must undoubtedly have an impact on human sexual behavior, both homosexual and heterosexual. Furthermore, the ruling class is encouraging sexual "experimentation", a nice way of saying promiscuity. This does include a certain "liberalism" towards homosexuality. But, this new "liberalism" must be viewed in the context of the general effort to encourage attention on sex.

At the same time, we must also deal with the aspect of the ruling class's activity which relates particularly to homosexuality. There are millions of homosexuals in this country, and those millions have, following the lead of other oppressed groups, become increasingly vocal and militant in their demands for democratic rights. This is a fact of which the ruling class is well aware. The new "liberalism" of the bourgeoisie towards homosexuality must be placed in the context of this growing militance on the one hand, and the various bourgeois schemes for the glorification of the family and the traditional woman's role on the other. Those bourgeois schemes are evident in such things as the "Total Woman" movement and good old God-fearing Jimmy Carter encouraging us to get married and raise good God-fearing families. With respect to homosexuals the bourgeoisie is using dual tactics. They make certain "concessions" to confuse or placate the masses of homosexuals, while at the same time laying the foundations for a fascist reaction. Anti-homosexuality is based on male supremacy. By adopting a "liberalism" towards homosexuality while at the same time strengthening male supremacy, the bourgeoisie is obviously laying the groundwork for a fascist reaction which will include the brutal suppression of homosexuals. For example, the movement in Dade County, Florida which was led by Anita Bryant sought and succeeded in repealing all the democratic rights for homosexuals and imposed new restrictions which did not exist before. The question before the conscious element becomes: do we deal with these dual

tactics of the bourgeoisie by putting forward anti-homosexuality, or by exposing the inadequacy of reforms under capitalism, exposing the foundations of male supremacy, and showing the need for revolution and socialism?

Finally, lest anyone be confused, let's realize just how small the concessions to homosexuals have been. In some states, California for example, homosexuality in private is no longer against the law. Homosexuality is sometimes mentioned on TV, and occasionally the references in the media are not totally pejorative. Some of the harassment against homosexuals has been somewhat reduced. But, in many ways the persecution continues. In a decision by an appellate court in San Francisco they upheld a lower court's ruling that a company may fire an individual for being a homosexual. The company is not required to demonstrate that the homosexuality in any way interferes with the individual's ability to perform his or her job. The mere fact that an individual is a homosexual is grounds for being fired. It also remains routine for any homosexual to be ruled an unfit parent (and lose custody of her or his children--sometimes even visitation rights) simply on the basis of the parent's sexual orientation. Thus, the new "liberalism" towards homosexuality means that one will not be arrested for sexual acts between two adults in private (and don't forget that law also applies to heterosexual acts), but one can still lose one's job or one's children because of those private acts. Talk about sham reforms!!!

Changes in Anti-Homosexuality Since Primitive Communalism

The immediate question before us, the decision which progressive forces must make, is whether or not to continue and develop the opposition to and suppression of homosexuality. In Section Four, "Origins of Anti-homosexuality," we demonstrated the fact that anti-homosexuality is a social phenomenon. On the basis of the facts and our analysis, we concluded that:

- 1) The primary cause of the development of anti-homosexuality was the domination of men over women and the development of male supremacy.
- 2) Anti-homosexuality triumphed over the view of homosexuality as not normal but not necessarily bad, in part because of additional benefits of anti-homosexuality to the ruling class.
- 3) Those additional benefits were: the support which anti-homosexuality provides for encouraging reproduction, and the usefulness of anti-homosexuality in breaking down old cultures and religions.

Once anti-homosexuality was accepted by the masses, and to the extent which anti-homosexuality replaced the formerly favorable or neutral attitude of the masses towards homosexuality, anti-homosexuality provided an additional benefit to the ruling class. Anti-homosexuality became a tool to divide the masses. Just as racism or national chauvinism and male supremacy serve as tools to divide the races and the men and women among the oppressed classes, so too anti-homosexuality serves to divide the heterosexuals and homosexuals among the oppressed classes. Furthermore, anti-homosexuality creates false ideas about who are friends and who are enemies. Just as women are encouraged to view all men as the enemy or as "the problem, the cause of the problems women face"; just as women are encouraged to view all women, regardless of their class (no matter how filthy rich) as "sisters"; anti-homosexuality encourages homosexuals to view "straight" society as the enemy and all homosexuals, regardless of class (even if he might be the head of the FBI which continually harasses homosexuals and all oppressed groups) as friends. Heterosexuals are encouraged to view all homosexuals as bad, sick or perverted. Meanwhile attention is turned away from the real source of all of our major problems - the ruling class and their system. Thus, once anti-homosexuality gained some measure of acceptance among the masses, there were three benefits of anti-homosexuality to the ruling class in addition to its role as an aspect of and support for male supremacy.

The principle basis for the development of anti-homosexuality was that it is an aspect of and support for male supremacy. The view that men and women are different creatures with naturally different characteristics, the view that man's domination over woman is a voluntary state entered into because of their different natures, and the view that woman's only role in life is to keep house and bear children are all in

direct conflict with the acceptance of homosexuality. These aspects of male supremacy have not changed as society has developed up through capitalism. With the development of class society the family became a basic economic unit of society. Engels describes the individual family as the basic economic unit of capitalist society. Although the acceptance of homosexuality is not in conflict with the existence of a family, (there were family units in many of the pre-class societies where homosexuality was accepted-See Section III and Table at back of pamphlet), the acceptance of homosexuality is in conflict with the economic functions of the family under capitalism which makes the principle reason for marriage the safeguarding and passing on of private property. This is a quantitative change which strengthens the foundation for male supremacy and anti-homosexuality. There are other quantitative changes which probably have some impact on male supremacy and anti-homosexuality, including the increasing introduction of women into the productive life of the society. But, male supremacy is a basic aspect of bourgeois ideology and will remain so. There is no indication that there have been or could be any qualitative changes in male supremacy under capitalist rule which would eliminate the role of anti-homosexuality as an aspect of and support for male supremacy.

With respect to the secondary benefits of anti-homosexuality to the ruling class, the situation is, at least theoretically different. These secondary benefits are, unlike male supremacy, not basic parts of the ruling class ideology. At the same time, these secondary benefits are also not the primary foundation for anti-homosexuality. Thus, it will require some examination to determine whether or not these secondary benefits continue to exist and to determine their relative importance.

Support for a high level of reproduction was one of the additional benefits of anti-homosexuality to the slave-owning class. In this area there have been quantitative but not qualitative changes as society has progressed up through capitalism. For the slave owning class, reproduction by the slaves was a direct addition to the wealth of the ruling class. Under feudal rule the individual serfs are still tied to the feudal lord, thus reproduction by the serfs directly affects the number of subjects available to work for the feudal lord. But the serf is not a piece of property in the same way as the slave. Under capitalist rule the individual wage worker is not tied at all to the individual capitalist. The capitalist is not concerned with the reproduction of any particular worker, but in the reproduction of the working class as a whole. While the general historical trend is away from concern by the ruling class with the reproduction of any particular member of the oppressed masses, this has a quantitative rather than qualitative effect on anti-homosexuality. The role or value of anti-homosexuality in supporting reproduction has always been, we believe, more a matter of pressure on the masses than pressure on any particular individual. The principle value of anti-homosexuality, with respect to reproduction, has been supporting the view that it is unnatural for women not to be having children. This is not qualitatively changed by the change in the concern of the ruling class from concern over the reproduction of particular individuals to concern for the reproduction of the class. There is quantitative change. On the one hand, because the ruling class is no longer concerned with particular individuals, there is an increased need and use for general social attitudes to "keep the masses in line". On the other hand, because the concern is only with the reproduction of an adequate work force, it is no disadvantage to the ruling class to relax the vehemence of anti-homosexuality, particularly under conditions of high and increasing unemployment.

The use of anti-homosexuality as a tool to break down older religions and cultures was another benefit to the ruling class. Obviously, this benefit is greatest when the ruling class is attempting to establish domination over some other society. The development and use of anti-homosexuality as a means of destroying other cultures deserves some discussion because this is another area where the assertions by many of the forces who support anti-homosexuality are in direct conflict with the facts.

An assertion by some proponents of anti-homosexuality is that homosexuality is the result of "imperialism". The facts presented in Section III and Table 1 make it very clear that homosexuality is not the result of imperialism since imperialism refers to the last stage of capitalism and didn't develop until this century. We have documented the existence of homosexuality in every area of the world which pre-dates the existence of capitalism, or even class society. But let us give these proponents of anti-homo-

sexuality the benefit of the doubt and examine the charge that it is the conquering colonialists and imperialists who have spread homosexuality.

We have already discussed the role of anti-homosexuality in breaking down the primitive, pre-class cultures at the beginning of class society. Our discussion was somewhat limited. We were able to point to the widespread existence of homosexuality among primitive peoples and to the common involvement of homosexuality in their myths and rituals. We were also able to note the necessity of breaking down the older social units in order to establish the new slave-owning class societies. What we lacked was the direct evidence of anti-homosexuality being used in that process. The step from primitive communalism to slave society is not well recorded for any culture, thus the absence of direct evidence is to be expected.

The colonialization of the "New World" by the Europeans is much more thoroughly documented. The evidence presented in this paper establishes the widespread existence of homosexuality among the primitive peoples of the "New World", and establishes the role of homosexuality in the myths and rituals of these people. History demonstrates that the objectives and practice of the Europeans was to subjugate the indigenous peoples and destroy their cultures. Since the situations are parallel, the extent to which the use of anti-homosexuality by the European colonialists can be documented provides support for our conclusion that anti-homosexuality was also used by the rising slave-owning class.

European explorers and missionaries documented their own attitudes towards homosexuality at the same time as they recorded the widespread existence of it among the native population. From the records of these explorers and missionaries we find such remarks as: "nefarious practices",¹"abominable vice,"²"the execrable,unnatural abuse of their bodies",³"an excess so criminal that it seems forbidden to speak its name",⁴ the abominable sin of pederasty"⁵, "the bestial wicked sin"⁶, "the odious practice was formerly so prevalent that the residence of one of these monsters in a house was considered fortunate"⁷, "...such an abomination that the laudable delicacy of our language will not admit it to be mentioned"⁸, "that unnatural damnation"⁹, "these loathsome semblances of humanity, whom to call beastly were a slander upon beasts"¹⁰, "buggers, one unto another, whereby we may conjecture that that heinous and abominable wickedness raigneth among them"¹¹, "the depravity prevalent among the young boys in the Atonga tribe of a character not even to be expressed in obscure Latin"¹², "that detestable filthiness"¹³, "unaccountable and disgusting customs...I should wish that it might be extinguished before it be more fully recorded"¹⁴.

We could go on at length quoting these " quaint " references to homosexuality. However, the point should, by now, be made. Homosexuality was common among the people of the Western Hemisphere before the Europeans arrived. And, the European conquerors did not take a neutral stance toward homosexuality, they were solidly opposed to it and, "wished that it might be extinguished before it might be more fully recorded."

With respect to native homosexuality, the invaders did not content themselves with wishing that it might be extinguished. The following record of a speech by Cortes is of interest because it demonstrates that the prohibition against homosexuality was a part of the conscious actions of the European conquerors:

Then Cortes began to make a speech to them, saying that our Lord and King, whose vassals we were, had very great power and held beneath his sway many great princes and Caciques, and that he had sent us to those countries to give them warning, and command them not to worship Idols, not sacrifice human beings, or eat their flesh, or practice sodomy or other uncleanness....

In addition to making speeches, the Spanish missionaries and soldiers took more direct action against homosexuality. For example, the following account records the death of a Peruvian berdache at the hands of the Conquistadores around 1530: "The last which was taken and which fought most courageously, was a man in the habite of a woman, which confessed that from a childe he had gotten his living by that filthiness, for which I caused him to be burned."¹⁶ It is documented that the Spanish killed homosexuals in Peru¹⁷, Mexico¹⁸, Louisiana¹⁹, and the Antilles²⁰. It seems justified to conclude that the practice of murdering homosexuals was common for the Spanish conquerors.

Lest any suggest that the attack on homosexuality was limited to the period of military conquest, the following account is of interest:

...in the S. Antonio Mission we were able to discover something, for informing the priests, that in one of the houses of the neophytes two gentiles had entered, one in their natural dress, and the other in the dress of a woman, they called him by the name of joya (they say they are called that in their native tongue). Then the missionary priest went with an official and a soldier to the house punishing them, although not with the deserved punishment, and confronted them with the act so enormous, and the gentile answered that that joya was his woman (wife).²¹

The account above indicated that the suppression of homosexuality was a united effort on the part of the missionaries, officials, and military units of the Spanish forces. There is more documentation. We know that among the Quecha people, the Christian missionaries punished homosexuality more promptly than worshipping "pagan" gods.²² It is recorded that the traditional forms of homosexuality were eliminated among the Aymara due to the combined efforts of the Church and the local mestozos.²³ The efforts of the Europeans to eliminate homosexuality was not limited to the Spanish and continued long after the initial period of conquest. There is even a record of a U.S. Indian agent trying to force the Crow berdaches to wear men's clothing.²⁴

Spreading of anti-homosexuality among the indigenous peoples of the "New World" did more than disrupt the pattern of their sexual relationships, although that in itself would have been an aid in cultural colonialism. Among the indigenous cultures of the "New World", particularly North America, the berdaches and shamans were integral parts of the social and religious order. These people were also, almost always, homosexual transvestites.²⁵ The adoption of anti-homosexuality by the peoples of these native cultures was, on the one hand, a measure of Western European cultural colonialism and, on the other hand, a powerful weapon for furthering that cultural colonialism by undermining the culture and religion of the native people. The adoption of anti-homosexuality and the corresponding disappearance of the traditional berdaches is documented for peoples all over the world including: the Zuni²⁶, the Souix²⁷, the Ogolala²⁸, the Flathead²⁹, the Navaho³⁰, the Dyak³¹, the Cuna³², the Araucanians³³, the Tupi³⁴, the Mohave³⁵, the Mapuche-Killiche³⁶, the Kamiu³⁷, the Mochica³⁸ and the Azande³⁹. This does not mean that homosexuality disappeared in any of these cultures. The existence of anti-homosexuality since the onset of class society has not been sufficient to wipe out homosexuality. But it does mean that homosexual was no longer sanctioned by the cultures, could no longer be an open and accepted part of the social behavior of the various people.

On the basis of the evidence we draw several conclusions. First, far from introducing homosexuality, the European colonialists consciously and actively suppressed homosexuality and encouraged anti-homosexuality. Second, that the furtherance of anti-homosexuality among the native people of the "New World" and the destruction of the traditional forms of homosexuality served the cultural colonialism of the European invaders.

What then of the charge that it is the imperialists who have spread homosexuality around the world? What of the often cited examples of homosexual prostitution in such places as Havana and Shanghai during the period of imperialist domination? Here again it is important to pay attention to historical development in order not to become lost in the confusion of various conflicting facts. As far as we know, the result of anti-homosexuality has never been the elimination of homosexuality. This is consistent with the nature of homosexuality as one of the two natural aspects of human sexuality. Homosexual behavior and homosexual relationships in colonized countries have become subject to the same pressures as homosexual behavior and relationships in colonial and imperialist powers. Under imperialism, the decaying stage of capitalism, human sexuality does have some decadent aspects like prostitution. The existence of homosexual prostitutes around hotels which cater to imperialist agents is no more evidence that imperialism is responsible for homosexuality or that homosexuality is decadent than the existence of heterosexual prostitutes in those same places is evidence that imperialism is responsible for heterosexuality or that heterosexuality is decadent.

What is proven is that exploitative human relations, in this case prostitution, flourish under the conditions of imperialist decay. On the other hand, although the existence of prostitutes does not indicate that homosexuality is decadent, it does indicate that the role of anti-homosexuality as a tool for cultural colonialism and imperialism has undergone at least a quantitative change. Under imperialism the concern of the imperialists is more with buying off a compradore class than with "converting" the entire population. And, in general, by the current era there exists within most third world countries a stratum of the population that has become "westernized". Thus, the value of anti-homosexuality as a tool for breaking down older cultures is largely ended.

To the extent that the general population of the colonial and imperialist powers believed themselves to be morally and culturally superior to the native peoples, it was easier for the ruling class to gain support for its cultural colonialism.

We conclude that anti-homosexuality played an important role for the colonialists and imperialists in conquering the world; that it has now largely played its role, and the negative view of homosexuality has been spread throughout much of the world.

We now turn to the third benefit of anti-homosexuality to the ruling class, anti-homosexuality as a tool to divide the oppressed masses. This aspect of or support for anti-homosexuality is particularly subject to quantitative changes. Divisions among the masses are always of benefit to a ruling minority. This is especially true in periods of decay and revolutionary upheaval. For example, to understand the maneuverings of the U.S. ruling class today it is important to understand the inter-play between the "liberal" bourgeoisie and the reactionary bourgeoisie. Sham reforms are used in an attempt to mis-lead and divide the progressive forces while at the same time sham reforms are used to fan the reactionary sentiments of sectors of the petty-bourgeoisie (small shop owners, lower level managers, etc.) and some sectors of the oppressed classes. An example of this kind of sham reform, these kind of dual tactics is "forced busing". While we are definitely for voluntary busing because we are for voluntary integration of the races and nationalities - we see that the forced busing plans do not bring about voluntary integration, are always accompanied by large and school-district-wide cut-backs - thus reducing the quality of education all our children get, often end up being unworkable because of the too-long rides the kids have to endure (as much as an hour one-way in some cities). And worst of all, forced busing plans have precipitated racial and national fights and antagonisms. This is particularly important these days because the system is falling apart and more and more of us know it - the ruling class knows it too - and so turns to, is forced to turn to new slick tricks that look like reforms, while really being ways to divide and conquer us.

The ERA (Equal Rights Amendment) is a similar example. Legally, any "rights" that could be granted by the ERA are already law - as part of previous civil rights legislation; so why is the ERA being pushed so much these last few years? Because it turns people's attention away from the fact that the laws don't work (because they were never intended to by our rulers who got their politicians to write them); now they've got many people working overtime trying to pass new laws - this time the ERA - when what the ERA says is already on the books, and more importantly, the ERA will not stop the capitalist corporations from discriminating against women anymore than existing law. The ERA won't stop all the other forms of discrimination against women and other forms of inequality they face; but it will stop us from organizing ourselves into a movement that will get us some results - if we spend our time trying to get it passed!

From our analysis it is clear that anti-homosexuality can not be destroyed until and unless private property (that is, private ownership of the means of production) and the domination of men over women are abolished since these are the foundation for male supremacy of which it is an aspect or part.

The conclusions about anti-homosexuality in the pre-socialist epochs: 1) it is ideologically an aspect of male supremacy. 2) It has served the ruling minorities by encouraging a high level of reproduction, as an aid in colonialism, and as a tool to divide the masses. 3) Essentially these advantages have remained as useful tools for them up through capitalism and its last stage, imperialism. 4) They will continue to be used against us, and anti-homosexuality will continue to exist as long as private ownership of the means of production exists - as long as capitalism exists.

Section 5, part II

- ¹Bolton.
- ²Heizer.
- ³Heizer.
- ⁴Heizer.
- ⁵Tosser.
- ⁶de Viliagra.
- ⁷Ellis (I).
- ⁸Ellis.
- ⁹Cory (I).
- ¹⁰Bancroft (II).
- ¹¹Levy (II).
- ¹²Johnson (II).
- ¹³Cory (III).
- ¹⁴Catlin.
- ¹⁵Diaz (95).
- ¹⁶Cory (36r). This statement is of particular interest for it is often said that the term faggot for male homosexuals developed from the common European custom of using male homosexuals as fuel for burning witches and other heretics. The fact that burning was the punishment settled on by this conquistador supports this explanation.
- ¹⁷Mercer (168).
- ¹⁸Mercer (168).
- ¹⁹Green (f).
- ²⁰Green (f).
- ²¹Bancroft (159).
- ²²Kubler (f).
- ²³Tschopik (II).
- ²⁴Simms (f).
- ²⁵The fact that some of the best documented accounts of both homosexuality and anti-homosexuality with respect to "primitive peoples" involve homosexual transvestites should not be interpreted to mean that all or even most homosexuals are or were transvestites or that all or even most transvestites are homosexuals. It is impossible at this point to determine the relative percentages in either direction for cultures which have been destroyed. It is, however, clear that in contemporary U S society the majority of homosexuals are not transvestites.
- ²⁶Parsons.
- ²⁷Landes.
- ²⁸Lurie.
- ²⁹Tunney-High.
- ³⁰Reichard.
- ³¹Haddon and Start, also Perham.
- ³²Stout.
- ³³Titiev.
- ³⁴Cory.
- ³⁵Karleen (163).
- ³⁶Cooper.
- ³⁷Gifford.
- ³⁸Gillin (I).
- ³⁹Larkleen.

SECTION 6 - SOCIALISM: HOMOSEXUALITY AND ANTI-HOMOSEXUALITY

We are now ready to deal with the questions of homosexuality and anti-homosexuality under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Essentially the question is, should the proletariat, through its party and dictatorship continue anti-homosexuality or should it allow or sanction homosexuality? What we must determine is 1) what changes in the existing foundation for anti-homosexuality occur with the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and 2) is there anything about homosexuality which creates any new basis for anti-homosexuality under socialism?

Obviously, this section represents the culmination of the analysis presented in this paper. There are a number of important conclusions which we believe are justified based on the facts and analysis presented in this paper. The most important of those conclusions are:

- 1) Homosexuality is, and always has been, a part of human sexual behavior. It is both natural and social. This also means that homosexuality is not the result of decadence, class rule, or the domination of men over women.
- 2) Anti-homosexuality is a social phenomenon which arose out of and in the process of the domination of men over women. Ideologically, anti-homosexuality is an aspect of male supremacy.
- 3) In addition to being both a support for and an aspect of male supremacy, anti-homosexuality has served the ruling class as a support for a high level of reproduction, as an aid in cultural colonialism, and as a weapon to divide and confuse the oppressed masses.

We consider these conclusions to be proven by the facts and analysis already presented. We will not attempt to further prove them here, but rather will follow the analysis already begun to its conclusion.

Anti-homosexuality has been of benefit to the ruling class from the time class society began up through the moribund stage of capitalism. With the transition from capitalism to socialism we believe that there is a qualitative change. The things which made anti-homosexuality in the interests of the previous ruling classes do not make anti-homosexuality in the interests of the proletarian rule.

The proletariat has no interest in continuing the oppression of women. In fact, the proletariat is interested in the full liberation of women and in the total destruction of male supremacy. Engels notes that one of the essential conditions for the emancipation of women is, "that the quality possessed by the individual family of being the economic unit of society must be abolished". (Origins, p.74) The domination of men over women, the family as the basic economic unit of society, the view that men and women are different creatures with different characteristics, and the view that the purpose of marriage (or stable intimate relations between two persons) is to insure the inheritance of private property are all opposed by the proletariat. In socialist society, male supremacy is reactionary. Anti-homosexuality as an aspect of or support for male supremacy can be viewed as nothing but reactionary. The principle reason for the development of anti-homosexuality becomes reactionary under the rule of the working class.

Does the question of reproduction support anti-homosexuality?

Basically the argument is that, homosexuality is reactionary because it is unproductive. They argue that the working class must approve only of those sexual relationships which are productive. Since homosexual relationships do not produce offspring, the proletariat and its rule must oppose homosexuality. This argument sounds good, but it contains a fundamental flaw of logic.

Analyzing the logic of the argument, we find it contains three premises and a conclusion. The first premise is that reproduction is an aspect of production. The premise is certainly true. The second premise is that the proletariat only approves of relationships which are productive. This is also true, the proletariat is concerned with the building of socialism and the destruction of the remnants of bourgeois society. Certainly the proletariat only approves of those

social relationships which are productive towards that end. The third premise is that homosexual relationships do not produce offspring. This premise is not entirely true, as we will discuss later. However, it is certainly true that homosexual behavior does not produce offspring. The conclusion is that homosexual behavior is, therefore, unproductive and must be opposed by the proletariat. The flaw in logic is that this conclusion does not follow from the premises. The crucial premise in the argument is omitted. This premise is: only those social relations which are reproductive are productive. This crucial and unstated premise, in fact, constitutes a direct conflict with the first premise in the argument. Reproduction is changed from one form of production into the only form of production. It is this unstated premise which is false. Reproduction is not the only form of production, it is only one form of production. For a social relationship to be productive it need not involve procreation.

At this point the proponents of anti-homosexuality may object that we are being unfair. Their argument, it seems, has not one unstated premise but two. The second missing premise is that the only purpose or function of sexual behavior is reproduction/procreation. If this new premise sounds familiar, it should. It is the position of the Roman Catholic Church. And, it is a position which requires not only anti-homosexuality but also a ban on birth control and abortion. It is true that this new premise would clear up the problems with the internal logic. The problem is that the premise is entirely unsubstantiated and entirely false. We have already demonstrated that human sexuality has always consisted of both heterosexual and homosexual behavior. If the only purpose or function of sexual behavior was procreation, why has human sexual behavior always included homosexual behavior? This "new" premise is nothing more than the old homosexuality-is-unnatural argument dressed up in new clothes. We have shown that there is no foundation for the position that homosexuality is unnatural. Furthermore, this "new" premise completely ignores the fact that for humans as opposed to animals, all relationships have a social as well as a natural aspect. Human beings do not form relationships simply in order to procreate. For the proletariat those social relationships should serve to strengthen and support our efforts to build socialism and destroy capitalism. We have already shown that homosexual behavior and relationships are part of human sexual behavior and are not inherently unnatural, decadent, or in any way unproletarian. Therefore, we believe that there is no justification for the position that homosexual relationships can not serve to strengthen and support the efforts of those involved to build socialism and destroy the remnants of capitalism. Thus, we also conclude that the fact that homosexual behavior is not reproductive is not justification for anti-homosexuality on the part of the working class. We believe that the proletariat has no need for this aspect of anti-homosexuality. The ruling classes in all pre-socialist societies were exploiting classes, they were interested in expropriating the social wealth for their private desires not in the interest and well-being of the masses. In order to gain the compliance of the masses, such exploiting classes were forced to rely on manipulation and force. The rule of the working class is based on the interests and well-being of the masses. The proletariat and its rule gains the co-operation of the masses by education, force is only used on enemies of the people and only then as a last resort. If a socialist country has a need of an increased birth rate, then the proletarian response is to educate the people to the need; and the masses would respond by having more children. Thus, the proletariat has no need of anti-homosexuality as a means to manipulate procreation from the masses.

It is at this point that the final weapon in the arsenal of those who oppose homosexuality is brought out. Since homosexuals, they argue, can not bear offspring, they threaten the ability of the proletariat to reproduce the work force and place an unfair burden on heterosexuals. If homosexuality was allowed to flourish the society might cease to exist. Before dealing with this argument let us first note that we really wonder if those putting the argument forward honestly believe that, given a free choice, so many people would choose homosexual relationships that it would actually represent a problem for society or a burden on those who choose to have children. Despite the fact that homosexuality has existed throughout human history, we know of no society which has ceased to exist or even had its existence threatened by

homosexuality. But, although we consider this last-straw argument to be nothing more than a straw man, it is also important to note that this argument is not based in reality.

As we noted before, it is not true that homosexuals can not and do not procreate. Sexual orientation and reproduction are not inseparably linked. There are many homosexuals in the U.S. today who are parents. In fact the battle against the ruling by bourgeois courts that homosexuals are automatically unfit parents has been a major fight of the "Gay Rights" Movement. Furthermore, for homosexuals to be parents does not require divorce or promiscuity. We must recognize the advances of science and technology, one of the three sources of human development. Advances in scientific technology make sexual intercourse unnecessary to procreation. Artificial insemination is a reality, not science fiction. In order to bear children it is not necessary to be heterosexual, it is only necessary to be female. Homosexual women are just as capable of bearing children as heterosexual women. We do not believe that building socialism, in principle, requires that all women have babies. Thus, we expect that in socialist society under normal conditions, some women will choose to have children and some women will choose not to, regardless of their sexual orientation. However, in times of crisis, if the socialist society is in need of an increased birthrate there is no reason why homosexual women would be any less willing or able to respond to that need out of their proletarian commitment to building socialism.

Having examined the question of reproduction we must conclude that it provides no foundation for anti-homosexuality under the rule of the proletariat. The fact that homosexual behavior does not lead to reproduction does not make it more inherently bad or unproductive. The proletariat does not need to manipulate the masses into bearing children. And, technological advances have separated reproduction from sexual orientation. Thus, this secondary support of, or foundation for, anti-homosexuality does not exist under socialism.

Anti-homosexuality was also of benefit to the ruling class in pre-socialist societies because it was an aspect of and justification for cultural colonialism. We have already noted that the historical role of anti-homosexuality in this area has already been exhausted. Nonetheless, we should point out that proletarian internationalism has no use for cultural colonialism or cultural imperialism. Proletarian internationalism is based on thorough respect for the history and culture of all nationalities. Thus, the proletariat needs no tools for cultural imperialism. This role of anti-homosexuality has no place under the rule of the working class.

The final benefit of anti-homosexuality to the ruling class is the role of anti-homosexuality as a tool to divide and confuse the masses. The proletariat derives no benefit from divisions for the sake of division. Almost all divisions are of benefit to a ruling class minority which oppresses and exploits the majority. To the proletariat only those divisions between the people and the enemy are of "value". Lines of demarcation must be clearly drawn between the people and the enemy, between those things which serve the people and those things that serve the enemy. Divisions among the people must be developed in a non-antagonistic manner in order to develop unity. Only if the contradiction between heterosexuality and homosexuality could be shown to be a division between the people and the enemy, only then would the proletariat be justified in continuing anti-homosexuality. Our analysis of the origins and development of homosexuality and anti-homosexuality has shown that:

- 1) Homosexuality is and always has been a part of human sexuality. There is no foundation for the position that homosexuality is decadent, bourgeois, or reactionary.
- 2) Ideologically, anti-homosexuality is an aspect of and support for male supremacy.
- 3) None of the benefits of anti-homosexuality to the ruling class of pre-socialist societies are benefits to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The development of male supremacist ideology may have been progressive from an economic sense in the period of the rise of class society. But in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution male supremacy is thoroughly bourgeois and thoroughly reactionary. We must conclude that it is not homosexuality but rather anti-homosexuality against which the working class must draw firm lines of demarcation.

Although forces in this country have, in general, consistently taken an anti-homosexual line, there has been little or no consistency in the justification or argumentation for anti-homosexuality. We have become familiar with over twenty-five "arguments." All these various arguments can be broken down into three basic positions:

- I. Homosexuality is unnatural. This is the most common form of the anti-homosexual line, but it gets expressed in many different forms.
- A. Homosexuality is unnatural. This is the bare form of the argument.
 - B. Homosexuality is decadence. We consider this to be a variation on the "unnatural" argument because it starts from the unstated premise that homosexuality is "unnatural" and therefore must be the result of or an indication of something. In this argument decadence is that something.
 - C. Homosexuality is petty-bourgeois (or petty-bourgeois individualism). Again this argument is a variation of the unnatural argument because again it starts from the unstated premise that homosexuality is "unnatural."
 - D. Homosexuals are security risks. Again a variation of the unnatural argument.
- II. Homosexuality is natural (animal and unproductive) as opposed to social (human and productive). This is the "second generation" justification for anti-homosexuality. Once the fact that homosexuality pre-dates class society became somewhat known, this position developed.
- A. Homosexuality is natural (animal) as opposed to social (human). This is the "theoretical" form of the argument. (This argument may attempt to get over by appeals to the theoretical works of Marx and Engels, particularly the 1844 Manuscripts and The German Ideology.)
 - B. Homosexuality is unproductive because homosexuals do not bear children. This is the "practical" form of the argument.
- III. Homosexuality is too unimportant to talk about. This position is often the final position put forward when things get sticky. The most interesting thing about this argument is that it is put forward by organizations which also exclude homosexuals from membership and publicly put forward anti-homosexuality.

In the main body of this paper we have shown the basic positions underlying anti-homosexuality to be incorrect. However, in the interest of exposing the forms these incorrect views take and in the interest of arming honest forces with the ability to defeat these incorrect views, we will deal with the specific forms these arguments take.

I. Homosexuality is unnatural.

A. Homosexuality is unnatural. The bare form of this argument has been dealt with at length in this paper and we don't want to duplicate it here. The essential points to remember are that 1) "unnatural" is not a scientific term, the opposite of natural is social, and 2) homosexuality is and always has been both a natural (in the scientific sense) and a social (in the scientific sense) part of human sexuality.

The additional arguments for this bare form of the unnatural argument are:

1. We know homosexuality is unnatural because animals don't do it. This position is simply factually incorrect. The facts are that animals do engage in homosexual behavior both in natural habitat and in captivity. (See Section Three).
2. We know homosexuality is unnatural because primitive humanity didn't have any homosexuality. Again, the argument is in conflict with the facts (See Section Three and Table I).

B. Homosexuality is the result of decadence. Again, this argument has been dealt with at length in the body of the paper. And again this argument is inconsistent with the facts.

Other variations on this argument are:

1. Homosexuality is bourgeois and/or bourgeois decadence. If this argument weren't so common, it would almost be funny. "Bourgeois" isn't simply a term to be tacked onto anything one doesn't like. It means something. The bourgeoisie did not arise until capitalism, therefore you cannot have bourgeois ANYTHING until the point in history when capitalism developed. At best these people could say that homosexuality is a ruling class behavior or a consequence of class society which has been adopted or perpetuated by the bourgeoisie. However, we have demonstrated that homosexuality pre-dated class society (see Section Three). We have also shown that it is anti-homosexuality that is a part of ruling class ideology.
 2. Homosexuality is the result of class society. Again, this is a position which we have spent a great deal of time exposing as incorrect. It simply does not fit the facts (see Section Three and Table I). Anti-homosexuality is the result of class society, not homosexuality.
 3. Homosexuality is the result of imperialism. Same arguments as the above. Homosexuality clearly pre-dated imperialism.
 4. Engels said that homosexuality was the result of class society. In Section Three we speak directly to this question. Briefly, we know of no evidence that Engels, or any of the other great teachers made any scientific investigation of the question of homosexuality. We have used Engels' methodology and relied on his scientific conclusions in dealing with the facts presented in this paper, facts which we do not believe Engels had access to. We have found record of homosexuality in some of the very cultures which Engels himself labeled as pre-class societies. Thus, despite a few casual comments by Engels, we conclude that homosexuality was not the result of class society.
 5. Homosexuality disappears under socialism, so obviously it is the result of decadence and bourgeois (ruling class) ideology. Homosexuality has always been a part or form of human sexuality. We believe that it always will be. Homosexuality can be and has been discouraged and suppressed. Homosexuality can also be hidden. For example, we know of factories people holding anti-homosexual lines have reported that there were NO homosexuals, yet we personally know that homosexuals do work there. Just because the public evidence of homosexuality disappears, that doesn't mean that homosexuality has disappeared.
 6. Homosexuality increases in times of social decay. Again this position has been dealt with in the body of the paper. The key thing to remember is that heterosexuality also increases in those same periods, and that heterosexual activity is encouraged by the bourgeoisie in times of social decay.
 7. Homosexuals are not materially oppressed, there is no material basis for the oppression of homosexuality. The argument sounds and is confusing. Basically it is used as a justification not taking up the fight against the oppression of homosexuals because "there is no oppression". The statement flies in the face of historical fact and contemporary reality. Homosexuals have been and still are jailed and murdered, subjected to police harassment and brutality, attacked by fascist gangs, threatened, fired, denied housing and jobs, and subjected to a wide variety of "medical treatment" including incarceration and electro-shock "therapy." Furthermore, we have demonstrated very thoroughly in this paper that the material basis for anti-homosexuality is the relationship of anti-homosexuality to male supremacy and other benefits.
- C. Homosexuality is petty-bourgeois (or individualism). In the bare form this argument deserves the same response as the argument that homosexuality is bourgeois. The petty-bourgeoisie also arose at a particular point in history. And, this argument

is completely in conflict with the facts. Homosexuality arose before class society. Homosexuality has always been a part of human sexuality. Would these people have us believe that our primitive ancestors were acting out of petty-bourgeois individualism?

The additional arguments around this position are:

1. Homosexuality is an individualistic response to sexism/male supremacy/male chauvinism. Obviously the first problem with this argument is that homosexuality pre-dates sexism, male chauvinism, and male supremacy. Thus, in considering the phenomenon of homosexuality, it could not be a response to those things, unless someone wishes to suggest that homosexuality developed as a response to something which did not yet exist. In terms of the homosexuality of particular individuals in the US today, even if some people do turn to homosexual relations because of bad experiences with the opposite sex, this is in no way a justification for opposition to homosexuality. Some people get married in order to get away from their parents. Is that a justification for condemning marriage? To love someone of the same sex does not require a person to hate or even dislike people of the opposite sex. Few people argue that loving or marrying someone of the opposite sex means that a person hates or dislikes people of his or her own sex. It is only when people begin from the incorrect view that homosexuality is unnatural that they can possibly suggest that homosexuality is petty-bourgeois or individualism.
2. Homosexuality is petty-bourgeois because it is a refusal to struggle with sexism in one's personal life. This argument came from the RCP back when it was the RU. We haven't heard it much lately, but it is such a gem we think it deserves comment. Being a homosexual does not mean that one's only friends are of the same sex; it means that the person one has sex with is of the same sex. We never realized that the method of struggle against sexism is heterosexual intercourse and the battleground for proletarian revolution is the bedroom! By analogy, we must assume that these same people would say that anyone not involved in a bi-racial sexual relationship is refusing to struggle with racism in his or her personal life. Obviously, the position that being homosexual is a refusal to struggle with sexism is totally absurd.
3. Homosexuality is self-indulgent, it puts an overemphasis on sex. What this line of reasoning says is that because homosexuals do not bear children, homosexual relationships are based on self-indulgent sex. This is nothing but slander against gay people. It is saying that the only or primary reason for homosexual relationships, for two people making a commitment to each other is so that they can lay around in bed. It may be that some homosexual relationships are based on sex, just like some heterosexual relationships are. But homosexuals are just as likely to form close ties and personal relationships based on mutual respect and love as heterosexuals.
4. Homosexuals put an over-emphasis on personal relationships as a source of well-being or salvation. This argument is not much different than the one just above it. What we must remember is that almost all arguments which start out by saying that "all or most homosexuals do something" are based on the view that homosexuality is unnatural. Some homosexuals undoubtedly do see their personal relationships as the source of well-being or salvation, as do some heterosexuals. The fact, although many people seem to forget it, is that homosexuals are people. Homosexuality is a form of human sexuality, not a disease or perversion. If it can be said that some people do a certain thing, for example, place an over-emphasis on their personal relationships, then it almost certainly can be said that some homosexuals do that thing. We never hear the argument that heterosexuals place an over-emphasis on personal relationships as a source of salvation, even though some heterosexuals undoubtedly do, because heterosexuality is assumed to be "normal" and something which is "normal" is not viewed as causing particular forms of behavior. What this paper has proven is that homosexuality is just as "normal" as heterosexuality.

It is time for people who wish to be scientific in their analysis to put aside all these arguments which begin by assuming that homosexuality is "unnatural" and therefore leads to or causes bad things."

5. Homosexuality is self-indulgent because homosexuals choose to be gay and could choose not to be. Human sexuality has always included both homosexuality and heterosexuality. Unlike those who put forward this argument, we do not presume to know what determines a person's sexual orientation. We believe it is a process which is affected by the society as a whole as well as by the individual's personal experiences and decisions.* But we do know that most people do not simply wake up one morning and say "I'll be heterosexual" or "I'll be homosexual." To say that homosexuals choose to be gay is essentially saying that consciousness determines being. People may choose whether or not to call themselves "gay" or call themselves "straight" but that doesn't change the way they feel, the way they are.

6. "If homosexuals were really revolutionary, they would give up being homosexual for the good of the revolution!" We have shown that homosexuality is not non-proletarian, unnatural, decadent, etc., etc. We have also shown that anti-homosexuality is a part of bourgeois ideology, having been adopted by the bourgeoisie. In view of those two facts, what this argument says is: because part of the movement has taken an incorrect stand on this question which perpetuates bourgeois ideas, it is the duty of homosexuals who are revolutionaries to 1) unite with this incorrect stand and not struggle against it, and 2) "become" or declare themselves something they are not - heterosexual.

We believe that the correct position is that "if those forces putting forward anti-homosexuality were consistently revolutionary they would drop their incorrect position on the question for the good of the revolution!"

It is true that revolutionaries do not fear personal sacrifice for the good of the revolution. But it is also true that revolutionaries do not pretend to be something which they are not. Sexual orientation is not an ideological question, because sexuality is both a natural and a social question. The question of what importance revolutionaries place on their personal relationships and how much of their energy goes into them is an ideological question. Even the question of the class stand of the person a revolutionary is involved with can be said to be an ideological question. But, since we have shown that homosexuality is not un-proletarian, there is no justification for saying that the sex of the person to whom one is attracted is an ideological question.

We would also add that the position one takes towards honest elements who study the science, practice criticism/self-criticism, provide leadership to the class struggle, and make personal sacrifices in their lives for the revolution is an ideological question. Those who would exclude such forces because of their own subjective prejudices against homosexuality, are making an ideological error.

7. Homosexuality is petty-bourgeois because the Gay Rights Movement is petty-bourgeois. This argument is about as unscientific as one could possibly be. First, it denies dialectics by denying that the movement has both a positive and a negative aspect. One positive aspect of this movement is that it has raised the consciousness of the homosexual masses (some estimates on the number of homosexuals in this country run as high as 20 million) that they are oppressed, that they must fight that oppression, and that in unity there is strength. As a result of this movement, some gay people became anti-imperialists. Lenin has told us that no movement spontaneously develops into a scientific, socialist movement. Where socialist ideas are not consciously interjected, bourgeois ways of thinking and acting will fill the void. Even the worker's movement, left to

*Hormone levels and/or some other biological factor may also be a key factor.

itself, will not develop beyond the level of trade unionism. Certainly the Gay Rights Movement has not spontaneously developed into a conscious fight for socialism.

Similar to movements against religious oppression, the Gay Rights Movement in its spontaneous form has both positive and negative aspects. In order for this movement to be a revolutionary movement, the target clearly has to be the system of monopoly capitalism/imperialism.

We do not see working within the Gay Rights Movement as a main method of striking blows at imperialism or fighting the threat of fascism because democratic rights/reforms could be granted to homosexuals without substantially weakening imperialism. Furthermore, it is the working class and national liberation struggles/movements which will strike killing blows to monopoly capitalism, and it is these movements (along with student, women's, etc.) in which homosexuals can, will, and should take part. Within these movements, the question of homosexuality should be dealt with as a contradiction among the people. Opposition to all attacks against homosexuals should be raised when appropriate.

At the same time, we feel that in particular circumstances of fascist attacks on homosexuals, such as the Anita Bryant/Save Our Children campaign, it is correct to lend support to short term organizing of protests and resistance, and in doing this, expose the rise of fascism and the social props (such as Bryant) of monopoly capital.

As for the negative aspects of the Gay Rights Movement, we see the Gay Liberation Front, gay separatism, radical lesbianism, "go gay and smash the state", promiscuity, and hedonism and reformism (like "write your congressman/woman" campaigns) as reactionary trends serving the bourgeoisie.

Revolutionaries should willingly speak at mass rallies held in opposition to fascist attacks on homosexuals and should put forward the above line.

8. The working class rejects and will not accept homosexuality. This argument has two parts, first the assertion that the working class rejects homosexuality, and second the assertion that the working class will not accept homosexuality.

Does the working class really reject homosexuality? It is certainly not rejected by working class homosexuals. And friends, there are a large number of working class homosexuals. If anyone doubts it, they should try going to some of the many working class gay bars. Those who are not blinded by their own ignorance and biases will find homosexuals among the work force in their plants. The point is, when people say that the working class will not accept homosexuals they are displaying ignorance and chauvinism, because the working class includes homosexuals.

Furthermore, is it even true that homosexuality is rejected by heterosexuals in the working class? Well, yes and no. Anti-homosexuality is an aspect of bourgeois ideology (as we have demonstrated) and the working class in this society is not unaffected by bourgeois ideology. Some heterosexual workers are rabidly anti-homosexual. Others are, in general, opposed to homosexuality but accept and become friends with homosexuals at their work place. Some are not opposed to homosexuality at all, and, in fact, defend homosexuality (although usually not with scientific arguments).

Is homosexuality rejected by advanced elements, advanced workers? Again we suspect, yes and no. Our experience has been that advanced workers are either not anti-homosexual or are easily won to our position on the question. However, we suspect that if the people, that the advanced take leadership from or work most closely with, ridicule and oppose homosexuality, the result is probably different.

The question of will the working class accept homosexuality must be put into perspective. The working class in this society is divided by national chauvinism and male supremacy. Yet, we do not conclude that we should not take up the fight for national equality and equality between the sexes. We ask what is correct and we believe that, with proper work by the subjective factor, the working class will support the correct position because it is in the interest of the proletariat to do so. The argument for opposing homosexuality because "the working class is opposed to it," even if it were true that the proletariat is opposed

to homosexuality (which we have said is not entirely true), is nothing but tailing the reactionary sentiments of the spontaneous movement. This argument is crass pragmatism.

D. Homosexuals are security risks. We place this argument under the general category of unnatural because, like so many others, it is based on the unstated premise that there is something negative about homosexuality. That unstated premise is hidden with the cover of saying that because homosexuals can be threatened with the loss of jobs, respect, etc., they represent a security risk to the communist movement. Friends, revolutionaries in this country are subject to the threat of losing their jobs, their "freedom" and their lives for being revolutionaries. It is nothing but a gross slander against the homosexuals who have committed themselves to the dangers of being revolutionaries to say that they would sell-out the movement because they are afraid of losing their jobs. Perhaps for those who view being a revolutionary as an armchair occupation, the possibility of losing a job or being subjected to personal attack seems like sufficient grounds to sell-out. But to those who view revolution as a life and death struggle against the capitalist class, it is not.

II. Homosexuality is natural (animal) as opposed to social (human and productive). The bare form of this argument is, at best, bourgeois scholasticism. It attempts to appeal to philosophical writings (of Marx) to justify the subjective opinions of the authors. We have dealt with this argument in depth in the body of this paper (See Section Five), but we will touch on it again here. Those who put forward this argument say that homosexuality is pure sex (animal behavior) while heterosexuality is based on consciousness (human behavior). This argument is pure sophistry. Marx clearly states that activity can have a dual character, being both natural and social. Human sexual activity--both heterosexual and homosexual--is both natural and social. Twisting and distorting Marx may confuse some people, but it is not the action of a scientific socialist.

The related arguments that grow out of this position are:

A. Homosexuality is not productive. We have dealt with this argument at length in Section Five. Reproduction is only one form of production. Basically, we believe that if a relationship increases the ability of the people to build socialism, it is productive, whether it produces offspring or not. Just as people who do not marry are not necessarily unproductive, Ho Chi Minh for example, so people who do not bear children are not necessarily unproductive.

B. The existence of homosexual relationships puts an unfair burden on heterosexual women. We wonder if the people who put this argument forward would also advocate that the proletariat forbid women to remain single. After all, single women put an unfair burden on married women, don't they? We certainly hope that in socialist society people who have children will do so not simply because the "burden" of bearing children is their duty. But, if in fact having children is a "burden" which women must assume, homosexual women are quite capable of bearing children--in fact many homosexual women choose to bear children. Scientific developments, which already exist, have made heterosexual intercourse unnecessary for producing offspring. So as we said before, to have a baby, one doesn't have to be heterosexual, one only has to be female.

C. Homosexuality is unproductive and counter-revolutionary because the nuclear family is the basic unit of proletarian culture. This argument was an old favorite of the RU which the OL also picked up. They seemed to believe that this statement came from Marx or Engels. We have never come across this quote in the classics. We do know that Engels said that the full emancipation of women "demands that the quality possessed by the individual family of being the economic unit of society be abolished." (Origins, p. 74) We also know that Marx said "That the abolition of the individual economy is inseparable from the abolition of the family is self-evident." (C.I., p. 50, ft. note). We are not suggesting or advocating a campaign to "smash

the family." But, we believe that the full integration of women into the work force and the abolition of the economic role of the family will make changes in the forms and content of the proletarian family from that of the current bourgeois family structure. Certainly human society has always had some social unit or family grouping, and we suspect it will continue to do so. And, we believe that homosexuality can and will exist within the society. It is only the bourgeois family, or at least the "classical monogamous family" (terminology from Engels) which, because of its economic role, is in conflict with the existence of homosexuality.

III. Homosexuality is too unimportant to talk about. The bare form of this argument is that homosexuality is a minor question, and therefore not worth talking about. This position is usually accompanied by the accusation that those who oppose anti-homosexuality are elevating a minor question to the level of a major question and are holding back the struggle in general, or some discussion in particular.

Let us set the record straight. Organizations have publicly put forward that homosexuality is decadent and counter-revolutionary; have excluded homosexuals and homosexual groups from united front activities over the question of homosexuality; have refused to admit homosexuals to their organizations; and have refused to work or study with homosexuals. A top member of PRRWO (Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers' Organization - formerly the Young Lords Organization) stated publicly that homosexuals should not even try to do revolutionary work and that organizations with homosexuals should expel them. (This was in late 1975 - early 1976 when PRRWO was, at that time, one of the 3 or 4 best organizations in the U.S.)

All of this around a question that is "too unimportant to talk about"!

When organizations make public statements on a question and turn that question into a line of demarcation, as organizations in this country have, then to suggest that the question is "too unimportant to talk about" is absurd. If they had not adopted an incorrect view on the question of homosexuality, then it might be too unimportant to talk about - probably because the struggle of homosexuals and other struggles they are involved in would be much further along than they are now, due to the lack of leadership and sectarianism. But, for these organizations to argue that the question of homosexuality is "too unimportant to talk about" is to deny the reality which they have helped to create.

The additional form of this argument is:

1. Homosexuality is opposed or suppressed in every socialist country, no revolutionary party has ever admitted homosexuals. We do not claim to have done the investigation necessary to comment on: 1) what in fact are the positions of the socialist countries on homosexuality; 2) on what investigation and analysis do the socialist countries base their positions; and 3) do (and have) all revolutionary parties barred homosexuals from membership. We are fairly certain that the international revolutionary movement has never raised the question of homosexuality to the level of a major question, or viewed it as a line demarcating genuine organizations from sham ones.

We agree that it is correct to take leadership from the international revolutionary movement. However, we also believe that it is the duty of every party and group to do more than "just" follow the international revolutionary movement.* Even their leadership can be in error, especially on a minor question.** We believe that this

* Our duty includes (to the extent we are able) to investigate and study the facts independently.

** This, of course, does not change the fact that they are the best groups in the world.

paper represents the most comprehensive investigation and analysis of the question of homosexuality ever presented to the movement.

We are convinced, on the basis of both the data presented and scientific theory, that any group (or individual) which takes a stand against homosexuality is wrong. It may be that they have not had the resources to do the investigation, or that they did not realize that the investigation was necessary. But now that this paper exists, there is a basis for dealing with the question in a dialectical and historical materialist manner, an open, scientific and un-subjective manner. We call on all honest people and organizations to read this document, offer friendly criticism, study it, and unite with it.

X. (One over-all argument, which has been raised periodically over the years must also be dealt with...) Homosexuality does not serve the working class; which class does it serve...does homosexuality push forward or hold back the revolutionary struggle of the working class?...those who "uphold" homosexuality have not dealt with the question of homosexuality from the standpoint of the class question.

Those who raise this question show, among other things, that they have not really studied this paper. But let's answer the question. First off, we showed again and again that anti-homosexuality is a ruling class-pushed phenomenon, an aspect of male supremacist ideology and, in capitalist society, part of bourgeois ideology. (Thus we dealt with the class character of anti-homosexuality.) Then we pointed out repeatedly that homosexuality, just like heterosexuality is one of the two forms human sexuality and human sexual relationships have always taken. We pointed out that both homosexuality and heterosexuality are both natural and social. The actual sexual activity is the natural aspect. The human social interaction/relationship is the social part. As to our class stand toward the natural part: we would hold that sex, or sexual activity per se, in the abstract, is neither proletarian nor bourgeois. Sexual activity is natural. But hedonistic sexual activity or unequal/exploitative sexual activity (including rape outside and inside of marriage) are bourgeois. Homosexual sexual activity does not have to involve either hedonistic sex or unequal/exploitative sex. Thus the question of which class it serves is a question of how often and of what quality.

In terms of the social aspect of homosexuality, we would ask friends - what class does heterosexuality, per se, serve? When people say that we are only dealing with homosexuality by looking at individuals and not classes or strata... how would one answer this question then?. We would say that heterosexuality is not per se either proletarian nor bourgeois. It is proletarian, serves the proletariat, if its content is one which promotes the ability of the proletarians involved to make revolution. It is bourgeois when it is practiced by the bourgeois - which are uniformly degenerate in content and which can only serve to hold back the proletarian struggle. It is bourgeois too if it is unequal and not based on "free choice" and/or if it is oppressive/exploitative and does not promote but indeed holds back the ability of the proletarians involved to make revolution. We must distinguish between form and content. Human sexuality and sexual relationships have always had two forms. Neither is inherently bourgeois or proletarian. It is the content that determines whether they are proletarian and push forward revolution or bourgeois and hold it back.

A FEW SUGGESTED FURTHER READINGS:

On the History of Society: "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" - F.Engels

On Socialism: "Introduction to Socialism" - Huberman and Sweezy (Introduction-Einstein)

On Capitalism and Imperialism: "The Enemy" - Felix Greene

On Dialectics: "On Contradiction" - Mao TseTung

"Dialectical and Historical Materialism" Joseph Stalin

(Note: You've probably heard "horror" stories about some of these authors. Take up our challenge here to you; read these articles and books and decide for yourself. Millions of people, the world over, have read and re-read these and learned much.)

ANTHROPOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 10: Aginski, E-15, (1934-6) 1939, NS18 POMF (HRAF) Subject #838
- De Alba, Gregorio Hernandez, "North Central Venezuela Tribes" from Handbook of South American Indians, Julian Stenard (Ed.), Vol. 4, 1948, Pg. 479. (Caracas, Maracaypana)
- Angelino, Henry, "A Note On Berdache", American Anthropologist, Vol. 57, No. 1, Pt. I, Feb., 1955, Pgs. 121-6. (Choctaw)
- Armstrong, John M. and Alfred Mettraux, "The Goajiro", Handbook of South American Indians, Julian Stenard (Ed.), Vol. 4, 1948, Pg. 379. (Goajiro, Taino)
- Bancroft, Hubert Howe, Works, Vol. 1, "The Native Races", 1853, Pg. 81, 82, 32, 415, 515, 585-8, 635, 706, 773, 774. (Northern Mexico, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Guaya, Caretta, Kodiak, Thlinkets, Aleuts, Koniags, Cahuillas, Dieguefles)
- Bandelier, Adolph F., The Southwestern Journals, 1880-82, 1966, Pg. 326. (Pueblos).
- Bandelier, Adolph F., "Documentary History of the Rio Grande Pueblos", New Mexico Historical Review, Vol. 5, 1930, Pg. 58. (Pueblos)
- La Barrie, Westin, "The Aymara Indians of Bolivia", American Anthropologist, Vol. 50, 1948, No. 1, Pt. 2, Pg. 133-5, 194, 216. (Aymara)
- Bateson, Gregory, Navien, 1936, Pg. 131, 150-1, 199-202. (Tatum)
- 1: Beal, E-5 (1940-1) 1946 NU 34 Tarasco, Sierra Tarascons (HRAF) Subject #838
- Beals, Ralph, "Ethnology Of The Nisenan.", University of California Publications In American Archaeology & Ethnology, Vol. 31, 1931-33, Pg. 378 (Maidu)
- 4: Belo E-5 (1931-9) 1949 P 77 Bali (HRAF) Subject #838
- Bennett, Charles S. (Ed.), Settlement Of Florida, Part I-The Engravings Of Le Moyne, Pg. 36.
- 5: Berndt E-5 (1946-7) 1951 Murnigin @ I 17 (HRAF) Subject #838
- Birket-Smith, Kaj, "The Chugach Eskimo," Vol. 6, Pg. 94 (Chugach)
- Birket-Smith, Kaj & Frederica De Laguna, The Syak Indians Of The Copper River Delta, Alaska, 1938, Pg. 206 (Syak)
- 1: Blackwood E-5 (1929-30) 1935 0N6 Buks, Kurtatchi (HRAF) Subject # 838
- Bogoras, Waldemar, "The Chukchi Of Northeastern Asia," Found In Selected Papers From The American Anthropologist, Frederica De Laguna (Ed.), Vol. 3, 1901, Pg. 98-99 (Chukonets)
- 1: Bogoras--451-452 (1890-1901) 1904 Ry 2 116, 756, 838, 521 Chukchee (HRAF)
- 7: Bolinder-- 178 E-5 (1914-5, 1920) 1925 SC7 Cagaba (HRAF) Subject #838 (Lache, Cagaba, Coajjird)
- 7: Bolinder T-5 (1920, 1955) 1957 SC13 Coajjird (HRAF) Subject #838
- Bolton, H.E. (Ed.), Anna's California Expeditions, Vol. IV, (Font's Complete Diary), Pt. 105. (Yuma)
- 2: Bowers E-5, (1930-1), 1950 NQ17 Mandan (HRAF) Subject #838 (Mandan, Hidatsa)
- Carstairs, C. Morris, The Twice Born: A Study of a Community of High-Caste Hindus, 1929, P. 59.
- Catlin, George, North American Indians, Vol. 2, PG. 713, 215 (Sioux, Sauk, Fox)
- Churchill, Wainright, Homosexual Behavior Among Males, 1967, p.60-69, 70-88. (Animals and Twenty-two Societies)
- 16: Christensen, 92 E-5 (1950-51), 1952, FE12, Panti (HRAF) Subject #838
- Cooper, "The Araucanians" from Handbook of South American Indians, Julian Stenard, (Ed.), Vol. 2, 1947, P. 710, 750 (Mapuche, Huilliche)
- Cooper, John M., "Patagonian and Paean Hunters" from Handbook of South American Indians, J. Stenard (Ed.), Vol. 1, 1948, P. 160 (Poya)
- Cory, Donald Webster, Homosexuality: A Cross Cultural Approach, 1956, P. 103-6, 108, 110-5, 157, 234-6, 238-40, 258, 128, 131, (55 Societies)
- Coves, Elliott, New Light on the Early History of the Greater Northwest, (Henry-Thompson Journals), Vol. I, P. 53-9, 163-- (Ojibwa, Assiniboline)
- Curtis, Edward S., The North American Indian, 1908, Vol. 4, p. 70; Vol. 12, p. 183; Vol. 15 p. 84, 80; Vol. 16, p. 40; Vol. 3, p. 176. (Apsaroke (Crow), Awatobi, Mono, Faviotso, Keres)
- 20: Czekanowski--56 (3) (1907-8), 1924, Azande (HRAF) Subject #838, F607.
- Davenport, William, "Sexual Patterns and their Regulation In A Society Of The Southwest Pacific", In Sex and Behavior, Frank A. Beach (Ed.), 1965, P. 164-207. (Melanesians)
- Dacon, A. Bernard, Malekula, A Vanishing People Of The New Hebrides, 1934, P. 14, 156, 170, 171, 261, 262. (Big Nacosa, Lambubu, Lagaiag)
- Devereux, George, "Institutionalized Homosexuality of the Mohave Indians", Human Biology, Vol. 9, 1937, P. 498-527. (Mohave)
- Devereux, George, "Mohave Culture and Personality", Character and Personality, Dec. 1939, Vol. 8, P. 91. (Mohave)
- Devereux, George, "Mohave Indian Autosexual Behavior", The Psychoanalytic Review, Vol. 37, July, 1950, P. 205, 207. (Mohave)
- 11: Diaz, T.H-5 (1919-20) 1910, NU7 AstTe (HRAF), Subject #838.
- Dickson, H.R.P., The Arab of the Desert, 1949, P. 204. (bedouin)
- Dorsey, George A., "A Study of Siouan Cults", Eleventh Annual Report of U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology, P. 361-544. 378-9, 516-7. (Omaha, Kansa, Hidatsa, Dakota)
- 5: Dorsey and Murie E., I-5, (1903-7) 1940, NQ18, Pawnee, (HRAF), Subject #838
- Driver, Harold E., Indians of North America, 1961, p. 535. (Plains Indians)
- 1: Druoker E-5 (1935-5) 1951 NE11 Nootka, (HRAF) Subject #838
- 1: Du Bois E-5, (1938-9), 1944, 0F5, Alor (HRAF) Subject #838
- Ellis, Albert and Abarbanc, (Eds.), The Encyclopedia of Sexual Behavior, New York, 1967, P. 95, 100, 127, 128, 158, 505, 538. (Mochica, Coastal Peru and Ecuador, Old Testament, Mohave, Goyiros, Araycano, Caracas, Arawaks, Tainos, Lache, Caquiteros, Marryesan IS., Tahiti)
- Ellis, Havelock, Studies in the Psychology of Sex, Vol. 2, 1925, p. 16-25, 205-6, 10, 14. (Aleuts, Koniags (Konyags), Louisiana, Florida, Yucatan, Brazil, Pueblos, Montana, Tahitians, Sakalaves, Zanzibar, Uganda, Unyawexli, Bangala, Kinzerli, Nioi-Nioi, Soulis, Brazilian Tribes, Baliah, Fox, Assinibione, Bali, Caledonia, China, Ancient Mexico, Papuans, Solomon Is.)
- Encyclopedia Britanica, under "Yokuts". (Yokuts)
- 2: Evans-Pritchard E-5 (1931, 1936) 1951, FJ22, Nuer (HRAF), subject #588
- 2: Evans-Pritchard '6-7, (1926-9) 1937, F907 Azande, Subject #838 (HRAF)
- Falkner, Thomas, A Description of Patagonia, 1793, London. p. 117. (Moluches and Puelones)
- Feller, Seymour (Ed.), Jean-Bernard Bossu's Travels In The Interior Of North America, 1751-1762, P. 168-9 (Choctaw)
- 2: Firth, E-5, (1928-9), 1936 WT11 Tikopia (HRAF) Subject #838
- Flannery, Regina, An Analysis of Coastal Algonquian Culture, 1939, p. 129, 183. (Iroquois, Delaware, Virginia Indians, Southern Indians)
- Fletcher, Alice and Francis La Flesche, "The Omaha Tribe", 27th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Vol. 27, 1905-6, Pg. 132-3. (Omaha, Osage)
- Ford, Glellan S., Frank A. Beach, Patterns of Sexual Behavior, London, 1952, Pg. 125, 130-3. (Chukchee, Koniag, Lango, Tanaca, Siwan, Aranca, Kerkwi, Kiwai, and many others)
- 1: Forde E-4, 5 (1935-40) 1951, FF62, Yoruba, (HRAF) Subject #588.
- Forde, C. Daryll, "Ethnology of the Yuma Indians", University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 28, 1931, Pg. 90-157. (Yuma)
- Catschett, Albert, "Ethnographic Sketch of the Karankawa Indians", Archaeological and Ethnological Papers of the Peabody Museum, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1891, p. 67. (Karankawa)
- 1: Gayton, E-5 (1925-30) 1948, NS29, Yokuts, (HRAF), Subject #838.
- 7: Gifford, E-5, (1919) 1926, NS18, Pomo, (HRAF), Subject #838.
- 16: Gifford and Kroeber E-5 ((1934) 1937 NS18 Pomo (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Gifford, E.W., "The Cocopa", University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 31, 1933, Pg. 294. (Cocopa)
- Gifford, E.W., "The Kania of Imperial Valley", Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin #97, 1931, Pg. 56. (Kania, Yuma)
- Gillin, John, Moche-A Peruvian Coastal Community, Smithsonian Institute for Social Anthropology, Publication #3, 1945, Pg. 94. (Moche)
- Goldman, Irving, Ancient Polynesian Culture, 1970, Pg. 566. (Hawaiians)
- Goldman, Irving, The Cubed Indians of the Northwest Amazon, 1963, Pg. 181. (Cubed)
- 7: Gones, M-5 (Ca. 1890) 1911, 0C6 IBAN, (HRAF), Subject #838
- 27: De Graer---362, 1929, Azande, (HRAF), Subject #838 F9077
- Green, Richard, Sexual Identity Conflict In Children and Adults, 1974, Pg. 1-13 (Scythians, Yuma, Cocopa, Mohave, Pueblo, Chukchee, Aleut, Yuki, South India, Antilles, Louisiana).
- 1: Gusinde---1760, E-5, (1919-24) 1937, SH6, Yaghan (HRAF) Subject #838
- 1: Gutierrez, De Pineda---232, E-5 (1947) 1950, SC13, Coajiro (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 12: Haddon and Start, E-4, 1936, 0C6, IBAN, (HRAF), Subject #838.
- 155: Hails--39, M-5, 1933, NT13 Navaho, (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Hambley, Wilfrid D., Sourcebook for African Anthropology, Pt. II, 1937, Pg. 426-8. (Bangala, Azande, Danoney)
- 3: Hamby, E-5, (1929-30) 1934, FP13, Mbutu (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 1: Handy, E-5 (1920-1) 1923 0X6 Marquesas (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Harrison, Tom, Savage Civilization, 1937, Pg. 410. (Big Nambas).
- Hays, H.R., The Dangerous Sex: The Myth of the Feminine Evil, 1964, P. 55, 57-9, 62. (Tonabuli, Mamboutji, New Hebrides, Karkki, Fiji)
- Heizer, R.F. and M.A. Whipple, (Eds.) The California Indians, 1957, Pg. 213--. (Chumash)
- Held, G.J., The Papuas of Varopen, 1957, Pg. 07-8. (Papuans)
- 2: Henry E-5 (1924-4) 1941 SM3 Cainingang, Awelkome (HRAF) Subject #838
- 10: Hilger E-5 (1946-52) 1957 SC4 Aruicanians (HRAF) Subject #838
- 93: Hill--273 (2) E-3 (1935) 1935 NT13 Navaho (HRAF) Subject #838
- Hill, W.W., "Note on the Pina Berdache", American Anthropologist, Vol. 40, 1938, Pg. 31, 340. (Pina)
- Hill, W.W., "The Status of the Hermaphrodite and Transvestite In Navaho Culture", American Anthropologist, Vol. 37, 1935, P. 273-9.
- Hoch, Paul H. and Joseph Zubin (Eds.), Psychosexual Development In Health and Disease, Pg. 72, 81-2, 98, 108-9, 120-1. (Pilaga, N. Ojibwa, Animals)
- Hoebel, E. Adamson, The Cheyennes: Indians of the Great Plains, 1960, Pg. 77.
- 10: Hoffman E-5 (1887-9) 1891 NG6 Ojibwa (HRAF) Subject #838. (Illinois, Dakota)
- 8: Hogbin, E-5 (1934) 1946, 0J27, Voged, (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 1: Honigman E-5 (1943-5) 1949 ND12 Nanane (HRAF) Subject #838. (Kaska, N. Canada)

- 45
- Hrdlicka, Ales. "Physiological and Medical Observations Among the Indians of the Southwestern U.S. and Northern Mexico," Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin #34, 1908, pp. 51, 47 (Pueblo).
- 2: Hulstaert -- 73 H-5 (Ca. 1930) 1938 F032 Mongo, Hkundu Subject #838 (HRAF).
- Jochelson, Waldemar. "The Mythology of the Koryak," Vol. 6, 1904, pp. 413-23; Found in Frederica De Laguna (Ed.). Selected Papers From the American Anthropologist, 1960, p. 755 (Koryak, Hukchee).
- Johnson, Sir Harry H. British Central Africa, 1897 (Atunga).
- Karleen, Arno. Sexuality & Homosexuality - A New View, 1971, pp. 464-9, 479-83, 3, 6, 9, 10, 44, 45, 67, 71-79, 86-97 (Choctaw, Seminole, Crow, Illinois, Yakut, Koryak, Samoyed, Aleuts, Flatheads, Amara, Mohave, Marquesans, Hindus, Trobrianders, Melanesians, Arabs of Red Sea, Babylonians, Egyptians, Ephesus, Corinthians, Phoenicians, Canaanites, Persians, Cretans, Thrace, Syrians, Albanians, Hebrews, Celts, Etruscans, Visigoths, Scandinavians, Normans).
- Kinietz, W. Vernon. The Indians of the Western Great Lakes, 1615-1760, pp. 388-9, (Illinois and Miami).
- Kinietz, E-5 (1939-40) 1947 NG6 Ojibwa-5, Ojibwa (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Kinsey, Alfred F., et al. Sexual Behavior in The Human Female, 1953, pp. 451, 679 (Navajo, Kwakiutl, Crow, North American Eskimo, Tanaca, Lanoo, Mbundu, Uriper, Dyak, Chukchee, Yakut, Yukaghir, Lushais, Mohave).
- Kirchhoff, Paul. "Tribes North of Orinoco River," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, vol. 4, 1948, p. 487.
- Kirchhoff, Paul. "Venezuelan Llanos Tribes," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 4, 1948, pp. 453, 467 (Guahibo, Chiricua, Guano).
- 2: Kramer and Neveermann--263 E-5 (1908-10) 1938 OR11 Marshalls (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 4: Kramer--278 (1909) 1937 OR21 116, 839. Walerians, Woleai (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 3: Krige E-5 (1928-38) 1938 FX14. Lovedu (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-39) 1943 FX14 Lovedu (HRAF) Subject #588.
- Kroeber, . Handbook of the Indians of California, Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 78, pp. 46, 497, 547, 748-9, 803 (Yurok, Juaneno, Quicama, Coana, Cunana (Kamia)).
- Kroeber, . "The Patwin and Their Neighbors," University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology, Vol. 29, 1932, p. 272 (Patwin).
- 9: Kroeber, E-5 (Ca. 1920) 1925 NS31 Yurok (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Kubler, . "Colonial Quechua," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 2, 1947, p. 400 (Quechua).
- De Laguna, Frederica. "The Story of a Tlingit Community," Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin #172, p. 155 (Wrangell).
- De Laguna, Frederica. "Under Mount Saint Elias: The History and Culture of the Yakutat Tlingit," Smithsonian Contributions to Anthropology, Vol. 7, 1972, pp. 301, 302, 499, 500, 676, 717, 874, 895-7, (Yakut).
- Landes, Ruth. "The Abnormal Among the Ojibwa Indians," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. 33, 1938, pp. 29-30 (Ojibwa).
- Landes, Ruth. The Mystic Lake Sioux: Sociology of the Moewakan-tonwan Santee, 1968, pp. 29, 31, 32, 57, 56, 112, 113, 122, 125, 127, 128, 153, 193, 206, 207, (Santee Sioux-Dakota).
- 2: Landes E-5 (1932-5) 1937 NG06 Southern Ojibwa (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Landtmann, Gunnar. The Kiwai Papvans of British New Guinea, 1927, p. 237 (Kiwai).
- 9: Langsdorff-- 345 (1805) 1817 NA06 Aleut (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 8: Larklen -- 24 (c. 1925) 1926 Azande (HRAF) Subject #838 F007.
- 4: Latham F-5 (1888-93) 1909 SG4 (HRAF) Araucantians, Subject #838.
- Layard, John. "Homosexualism in Primitive Society as a Function of the Self," Journal of Analytical Psychology, Vol. 4, 1959, pp. 101-115 (Arunta, Sepik River, Melekula).
- 13: De Leon, Cleza G-5 (1541-1550) 1883 SE 13 (HRAF) Inca, Subject #838.
- 5: Lery --563 [3] (1557-8) 1906, Tupinamba 116, 838 (HRAF) 5009.
- Levi-Strauss. "The Tupi-Cawanib," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 3, 1948, p. 305 (Tupi-Cawanib).
- 6: Levi-Strauss. E-5 (1938-9) 1943, SP17 (HRAF) Nambicuara, Subject #838.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude. "The Nambicuara," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 3, 1948, p. 366 (Nambicuara).
- Levi-Strauss. "Tribes of the Upper Xingu," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 3, 1948, p. 337 (Camayura and Trumai).
- Lewinson, Richard. A History of Sexual Customs, 1956, pp. 31-2 (Mesopotamia).
- 1: Linton E-5 (1926-7) 1933 FY8 Tanala (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 10: Linton E-5 (1920-1) 1939 OX6 (HRAF) Marquesas, Subject #838.
- Little, Suzanne. "You Can Fool Mother Nature," MS Magazine, Feb. 1973, pp. 76-79, 94 (Bala, Navajo, Lovedu).
- 3: Low G-5 (1844-7) O C6 18AH (HRAF) Subject #838 (Dyak).
- Lowie, Robert H. "The Assiniboine," Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 4, 1909, p. 42 (Assiniboine).
- Lowie, Robert H. The Crow Indians, 1935, pp. 48, 312, 313 (Crow).
- Lurie, Nancy Oestreich. "Winnebago Berdache," American Anthropologist, Vol. 55, 1953, pp. 708-712 (Winnebago).
- 12: Magalhães De Gandavo-- 89-90 (1576) 1922 S009 Tufinamba 116, 838, 588 (HRAF).
- De Magalhães, Pero. The Histories of Brazil, 1576, pp. 89-90 (Santa Cruz, Brazil).
- 5: Malinowski E-5 (1914-20) 1929 OL8 Trobriars (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Malo, David. Hawaiian Antiquities, 1898, pp. 65, 67, 256, 257.
- 9: Maquet E-5 (1949-51) 1961 F042 Rundi (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Marshall, Donald S. & Robert C. Suggs (Eds.). Human Sexual Behavior: Variations in the Ethnographic Spectrum, pp. 94-7, 161, 167, 169, 68 (Bala, Mangala, Marquesas, Iuru).
- Mayhall, Mildred. The Kiowas, 1962, pp. 33, 163 (Kiowas, Mandan, Karankawas, Cheyenne).
- Mead, Margaret. Coming of Age in Samoa, 1928, pp. 69, 136, 138, 147, 95 (Samoa).
- Mead, Margaret. Growing up in New Guinea, 1930, p. 166 (Manu).
- Mead, Margaret. Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies, 1935, p. 240 (Tchambuli).
- Mead, Margaret. Male and Female, 1949, New York, pp. 96, 228 (Iatmul, Marind-Anim).
- 3: Mean E-5 (1930) 1932 NQ12 Dhegaha, Omaha (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Meggitt, M. J. Desert People, 1962, p. 183 (Wabirri).
- 1: Metraux E-5 (1934-5) 1940 OY2 Easteris (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Metraux, Alfred. "Ethnography of the Chaco," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 1, 1948, p. 324 (Mbaya).
- Metraux, Alfred & Paul Kirchhoff. "Northeastern Andean Culture," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 4, 1948, p. 363 (Lache and Arawakan Caquetio).
- 1: Middleton S-4 1953 FL10 Kikuyu (HRAF) Subject #588.
- Morgan, Lewis H. League of the Ho-De-No-Sau-Neé or Iroquois, Vol. 1, 1901, p. (Iroquois, Delaware).
- Munroe, Robert L. & Whiting. "Institutionalized Male Transvesticism and Sex Distinctions," American Anthropologist, Vol. 71, p. 87, 1967 (Goajiro, Araucanians, Karaw, Mandan, Omaha, Tanala, Navaho, Chukchee, Hausa, Marquesans, Papago, Ontong-Java, Tubatuisbal, Amara, Klamath, Makassar, Iban, Yurok).
- 4: Murie I-5 1914 NQ18 Pawnee (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Murra, . "Tribes of Ecuador," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 2, 1947, p. 805 (Coastal Ecuador, Manta Esp.).
- 1: McIlwraith E-5 (1922-4) 1948 Neg Bellacoola (HRAF) Subject #838 (Kimsquit, Bella Bella, Kitimat, Carrier, Naida).
- McIlwraith, T. F. The Bella Coola Indians, 1948, Vol. 1, pp. 45-6, 53, 179 (Bella Coola, Kimsquit, Kitimat, Carrier, Naida).
- 1: Nadel E-5 (1934-6) 1942 FF52 NUPE (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Newcomb, W. W. Jr. The Indians of Texas, 1961, pp. 51, 74, 301 (Coahuiltecos, Karankawas, Caddos).
- Newcomb, W. W. Jr. North American Indians: An Anthropological Perspective, 1974, p. 97 (Plains Indians).
- Nimwenaju, Curt. "The Tucuna," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 3, 1948, p. 719 (Tucuna).
- 5: Nordenskiöld -- 76 E-5 (1908-9) 1912 SF10 Chiriguano, Chane (HRAF) Subject #838.

- Olsen, Ronald L. The Quinault Indians, 1936, pp. 97, 99 (Quinault, Queet, Quillece, Humpulips).
- Opler, Marvin K. "Anthropological & Cross-cultural Aspects of Homosexuality," from Judd Marmor (Ed.), Sexual Inversion - The Multiple Roots of Homosexuality, 1965, pp. 108-123 (Apache, Calamari, Chukchee, Nata, Cubed).
- 1: Opler E-5 (1931-7) 1941 CA 1870 NT8 Eastern Apache, Chiricahua (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Oswalt, Wendell H. Alaskan Eskimo, 1967, p. 202, (Koniag, Chugach).
- Oswalt, Wendell H. This Land Was Theirs, 1966, pp. 220, 489 (Fox, Natchez).
- Parsons, Elsie Clews. "The Last Zunni Transvestite," American Anthropologist, Vol. 41, 1939, pp. 338-340 (Zunni).
- Parsons, Elsie Clews. "The Zunni La'mana," American Anthropologist, Vol. 18, 1916, pp. 521-8 (Zunni, Assiniboine, Koryak, Chukchee).
- Perrin Du Lac, F. M. Travels Through the two Louisians and Among the Savage Nations of the Missouri, 1807, p. 74 (Otocatob [Otos?], Malitane, Chaguyennes [Cheyenne?]).
- Picart, Bernard, 1673-1733, Vol. 3 (Florida).
- 3: Rattray E-5 (1921-) 1929 TWI, Ashanti, Mampon FE12 (HRAF) Subject #588.
- Ray, Verne F. Primitive Pragmatists: The Modoc Indians of Northern California, 1963, p. 43 (Modoc).
- 2: Redfield & Villa Rojas. E-5 (1927-33) 1934 NW10 Yucatec Maya (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 40: Reichard -- 140 [2] E-5 (1930-Ca. 1948) 1950 NT13 Navaho (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 63: Reichard -- 140-141 E-5 (1930-Ca. 1948) 1950 NT13 Navaho (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Reichel - Dolmatoff -- 220 E-5 (1946-9) 1951 SC7 Gagaba, Kogi (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Robinson, Alfred. Life in California, 1846, pp. 283-4 (Southern California Indians).
- 9: Roneim -- 72 [3] 1945, Aranda O108 pp. 116, 538, 171, 838, 881 (HRAF).
- 4: Roth E-4 1891 OC6 Iban (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Rouse, Irving. "The Arawak," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 4, 1948, p. 531 (Taino).
- Rowe. "Inca Culture," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 2, 1947, p. 187 (Huayla).
- Ryan, Peter (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Papua and New Guinea, 1972, pp. 163, 529 (W. Papua, Iatmul).
- 16: Sauer -- 160 [3] (1970-2) 1802 NA06 Aleut (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Schapera E-4, 5 1930 FX13 Hotontot, Nama (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 1: Seligman -- 506-7 (1926-9) 1932 Azande (HRAF) FO 07 Subject #838.
- Simms, S. C. "Crow Indians Hermaphrodites," American Anthropologist, Vol. 5, p. 580, 1903 (Crow).
- 3: Skinner E-5 (1909) 1912 NG06 Northern Ojibwa (or W. Saulteaux) (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Smith & Dale M. G-5 (1902-14) 1920 FQ 6 Ila (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 8: Soares De Souza -- 316 (1570-87) 1851 Tupinamba 116, 838 (HRAF) SO 09 (Tupinamba, Tupina).
- De Solis, Fray Gaspar Jose. "Diary of a Visit to the Texas Missions," Southwestern Historical Quarterly, Vol. 35, 1931-2, p. 44 (Coahuilans, Guapites, Carancaguases, Coopane).
- Spier, Leslie. "Klamath Ethnology," University of California Publications in American Archaeology & Ethnology, Vol. 30, 1930, pp. 51-3 (Klamath).
- Spier, Leslie. Yuman Tribes of the Gila River, 1933, pp. 6, 242-3 Yuma, Maricopa).
- 28: Spiro -- 127-128 (1947-8) 1948 OR21 Moleatians, Ifalik (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Stern, Theodore. The Klamath Tribe, 1965, p. 20 (Klamath).
- Stevenson, Matilda Cox. "The Zunni Indians," 23rd Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Vol. 23, 1902, pp. 37, 38, 310-313, 374.
- 4: Stevenson E-5 (1879-1900) 1904 Zunni NT23 (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 4: Stevenson E-5 (1879-1900) 1904 NT23 Zunni (HRAF) Subject #588.
- Steward, J. H. Handbook of South American Indians, Pub. by Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 143, Vol. 1, pp. 160-324; Vol. 3, pp. 718, 366, 337, 304; Vol. 4, pp. 363, 453, 467, 478, 486; Vol. 5, pp. 757, 723 (Araucanians, Arawak, Cuna, Many Colombian Tribes, Coast of Ecuador).
- 3: Stout -- 83 [4] (1940-1) 1947 SB05 116, 177, 838, 548 Cuna (HRAF).
- 25: Strehlow -- 78 (1895-1907) 1913 Aranda, 116, 171, 838 O108 (HRAF) (Aranda, E. & W. Arunta, Loritja, Yuma, Warangars, Katitja, Ipara, Warramunga, S. Arunta).
- Swanton, John R. "Indian Tribes of the Lower Mississippi Valley," Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 43 (Natchez).
- 6: Tauxler -- 108 G-4,5 (Ca. 1908) 1912 FA28 Mossi (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Tessman--105 E-5 (1904-9) 1913 FH9 Fang (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 28: Tessman--361 [6] 1930 Jivaro 116, 838 SD09 (HRAF).
- 3: Thompson E-5 (1933-4) 1940 OQ6 Lau, Kambara (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Thwaites, R. G. The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, Vol. 59, 1899, pp. 129, 309-10 (Illinois, Nadoouessi [Sioux]).
- 1: Titley E-5 (1948) 1951 SG4 Araucanians, Mapuche-Huilliche (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Tozzer, Alfred M. (Ed.), "Landa's Relacion De Las Cosas De Yucatan," Papers of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology, Vol. 18, 1941, pp. 124-5 (Xius, Indies, Cozumel, Panama, Guatemala).
- Tschopik, Harry, "The Aymara," from Steward, Handbook of South American Indians, Vol. 2, 1947, pp. 544, 400, 187, 770, 750, 805 (Aymara).
- 1: Tschopik E-5 (1940-2) 1946 SF5 Aymara (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Tschopik E-5 (1940-2) 1951 SF5 Aymara (HRAF) Subject #838 (Aymara, Chucuito).
- 40: Tschopik 45 (1937-8) 1941 NT13 Navaho (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Turney-High, Harry H. Ethnography of the Kutenai, American Anthropological Association, Memoirs, 56, p. 128 (Blackfoot, Kutenai).
- Turney-High, Harry H. "Flathead Indians of Montana," American Anthropological Association, Memoirs, 48, p. 85.
- 1: Underhill E-5 (1931-5) 1946 NU28 Papago (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 2: Underhill E-5 (1931-5) 1939 NU28 Papago (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Underhill, Ruth. "The Autobiography of a Papago Woman," American Anthropological Association, Memoirs, No. 46, 1936, p. 43-4 (Papago).
- Von Krafft-Ebing, Richard. Psychopathia Sexualis, 1950, pp. 302-3 (Scythians, Pueblos).
- De Villagra, Gaspar. History of New Mexico, 1610. Quivira Society Publications, Vol. 4, pp. 141, 145 (Tigua Pueblos).
- Westermarck, Edward. The History of Human Marriage, 1922, 3 Vols., Vol. 1, pp. 224, 370; Vol. 3, pp. 254, 323 (Morocco, Hawaii, Kimberly, W. Loritja, Celts).
- Westermarck, Edward. The Origin & Development of The Moral Ideas, Vol. 2, 1926, pp. 457, 460, 489 (Brazil, Incas, Peru, Isthmus, New Mexico, Ancient Mexico, Yucatan, Florida, Illinois, Nadoouessies, Mandan, Manitarries, Osage, Sioux, Omana, Iroquois, Cree, Californians, Washington, Northwest, Kimberly).
- Wickler, Wolfgang. The Sexual Code, The Social Behavior of Animals and Men, 1969, pp. 47, 48 (Baboons, Flat Bugs).
- 6: Wied-Neuwied. T-5 (1832-4) 1843 NQ17 Mandan (HRAF) Subject #838 (Mandan, Manitarries).
- 3: Will & Spinden E-5 (1905) 1906 NQ17 Mandan (HRAF) Subject #838.
- 1: Wilson E-5 (1934-8) 1951 FN17 Nyakyusa (HRAF) Subject #838.
- Wissler, Clark. "Societies of the Plains Indians," Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History, Vol. 11, 1916, pp. 92, 93 (Oglala).
- "Zunni Creation Myths," U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology, Annual Report, 1892, Vol. 13, pp. 401-403 (Zunni).

TABLE I

47

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
Acoma		X X	Middle Barbarism	Accepted	Banoler (2)	Caribs		X	Upper Savagery	Common	Cory
Afgnans		X	Middle Barbarism	Prevalent	Cory	Carrier	X		Upper Savagery		McIlwraith
Albanians		X		M Popular Custom; Temple Prostitutes in old times	Karleen, Cory	Celts		X	Upper Barbarism	Disapproved (?)	Hastings, Churchill
Aleuts	X	X	Upper Savagery	well-liked. Raised Boys as Girls; Shamans	Bancroft, Sauer, Langsdorf, H. Ellis, Cory	Chaldeans		X	Civiliz.	Common, accepted	Churchill
Alor	X	X ?		Disapprove, but don't punish; M marriage	Dubois	Chamorro		X	Lower Barbarism	Approved	Ford
Amazons		X		FM Universal	women's Lib.	Cheyenne	X	X	Upper Savagery	Respected; marriage ceremonial functions	Perrin Dulac, Hoebel, Maynall
Amhara	X	X		MT were pitied	Monroe, Karleen	Chibcnas		X	Middle Barbarism	Capital offense	Cory
Ankistimane	X	X		Disapprove	Cory	China		X	Civiliz.	Accepted; found in all classes	Karleen
Apache	X	X X	Lower Barbarism	Forbidden	Opler	Chingalee	X	X	Middle Savagery	Common, accepted?	Cory
Arabs of Red Sea		X	Upper Barbarism		Karleen	Chiricanua	X	X	Lower Barbarism	M forbidden; MT ridiculed in private	Opler
Aranda		X X	Middle Savagery	Accept; Puberty Rites; Ritual with FM	Roheim, Ford	Chiricoa		X	Lower Barbarism		Kirchnhoff
Araucano	X	X X	Lower Barbarism	Open & common for bachelors; respected institution	Fittiev, Monroe, Steward, Latham (2), Milger, Cooper, A. Ellis	Chiriguano		X		Is O.K. for "active partner"	Nordenskiold
Arawaks	X ?	X	Lower Barbarism	Female warriors	Steward, A. Ellis	Choco		X	Lower Barbarism	Common; M "slaves"	Tozzer, Cory
Arunta		X X	Middle Savagery		Strenlow, Layard	Choctaw	X	X	Lower Barbarism	MT are disliked	Feller, Angelino
Asnanci		X	Middle Barbarism	Chief Marriage	Rattray	Chugach	X		Upper Savagery	Accepted; considered skilled	Oswalt
Assiniboine	X	X X	Upper Savagery	M Marriage	Parsons, Lowie, H. Ellis, Cory	Chukchee	X	X X	Upper Savagery	Shamans; marriage; respected	Opler, Kinsey, Ford, Parsons, Bogoras (2)
Assyrians	X	X	Civilized	M illegal	Bellay	Chumash	X	X	Upper Savagery	M common; MT liked	Heizer
Atonga	X	X	Middle Barbarism			Coahuilte- can	X	X	Upper Savagery	Lived as men; somewhat degraded	Newcomb
Auatobi	X	X	Middle Barbarism		Curtis	Goana	X	X	Lower Barbarism		Kroeber
Aymara	X ?	X X	Middle Barbarism	Accepted; Dance C MT	Tschopik (J), Labarre, Ford	Gacopa	X	X X	Upper Savagery	Disliked T; FM marriage	Gifford
Azande	X	X X	Upper Barbarism	M common; Boy marriage; FM Condemned	Seligman, Larklen, Hamby, DeGraer, Ford, Czekanowski, Evans- Pritchard	Comanches		X	Upper Savagery	Strongly condemn	Mintum, Cory
Aztec		X		Myth	Biaz	Coopane	X	X	Upper Savagery		De Solis
Babylonians		X	Civiliz.	Temple Prostitutes	Karleen	Corinthians		X	Civiliz.	Religious	Karleen
Balga		X		Accepted	Mintum	Coxanes	X	X	Upper Savagery		De Solis
Bala	X	X X	Middle Barbarism	Formalized MT & M Toleration	Marshall, Little	Cree	X	X	Upper Savagery		Westermarck
Salinese	X X	X X	Middle Barbarism	M mid disapproval M open & common	Mintum, H. Ellis, Cory, Belo	Creek	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Ford
						Cretans		X	Civiliz.	Religious	Karleen
GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
Balonda		X	Lower Barbarism	Institution - M betochals	Cory	Crow	X	X X	Upper Savagery	Highly regarded; ceremonial function	Simms, Kinsey, Lowie, Karleen, Curtis
Banaka	X	X	Lower Barbarism	M Common	Cory, Samleke	Cubeo		X X		Adolescent; accepted	Goldman
Bangala	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Common, accepted	Hamoly, H. Ellis	Cueba	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Harems-liked by men disliked by women	Bancroft
Baduku	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Common	Cory	Luna	X ?	X	Middle Barbarism	F warriors	Stout, Steward
Batak	X	X	Upper Barbarism	widespread, accepted	Cory	Danomeins	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Disapproved	Hamby, Ford, Cory
Bedouins	X	X	Upper Barbarism		Dickson	Jakoca	X	X	Upper Savagery		Hoffman, Dorsey
Bella Bella	X	X	Upper Savagery	Raise boys as girls	McIlwraith	Delaware	X	X	Upper Savagery		Flannery
Bella Coola	X	X ?	Upper Savagery	Accepted; Myth	McIlwraith (2)	Diakite - Sarracolesse	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Tolerated	Hamby, Cory
Benaur	X	X	Lower Barbarism?			Oteguenos	X	X	Upper Savagery		Bancroft
Bhil	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Disapprove	Mintum	Dobuans		X			Mintum
Big Nembas	X X	X	Lower Barbarism	M almost universal & institutionalized FM common	Layard, Harrison, Deacon	Dorians		X	Middle Barbarism?	Extremely common	Cory
Blackfoot	X	X	Upper Savagery		Turney-High	Dyaks	X	X	Upper Barbarism?	Approved; common; Shamans; feast for new MT; Dreams	Kinsey, Low, Handan, Roth, Gomes, Perman, Cory
Bororo	X	X			H. Ellis, Cory	Easter Islanders		X	Upper Barbarism	Accepted	Ford, Metraux
Boula	X	X	Middle Savagery		H. Ellis	Ecuadorians		X			A. Ellis
Brazilian Tribes	X	X		Marriage	De Magalhães, Cory, H. Ellis	Egyptians		X	Civiliz.	M disapproved?	Bailley, Karleen, Cory
Bua	X	X X		M disapproved of; Ritual FM	Blackwood	Eskimo (E.)	X	X	Upper Savagery		Cory
Cacango	X	X		Approve; marriage	Cory	Eskimo (N. Am.)	X ?	X	Upper Savagery		Kinsey
Cacoo	X	X	Lower Barbarism		Newcomb	Eutruscans	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Recognized and accepted	Churchill
Cacaba	X	X X		Disapproved of	Reichel, Bolinder	Eyak	X	X	Upper Savagery	Disliked	Birket-Smith
Canuillas	X	X	Upper Savagery		Bancroft	Fang	X	X ?	Upper Barbarism	Disapproved of	Tessman
Catngang	X	X	Upper Savagery	Folktales with M	Henry	Fanti	X	X ?	Lower Barbarism		Christensen
Calamari	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Institution, special "class," F warriors	Opler, De Alba	Fiji Is.	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Military Pairs	Hays
Chimayura	X	X	Lower Barbarism		Levi-Strauss	Flathead	X ?	X	Upper Savagery	Tolerated & treated decently	Turney-High, Karleen
Chunantes	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Religious	A. Ellis, Cory	Florida Indians	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Institution - funeral function; nurses	Picart, H. Ellis, Cory
Chiqueto	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Marriage; boys raised as girls	Metraux, A. Ellis	Fox	X	X X	Lower Barbarism	Sacred; ceremony to Berdasne, myths	Oswalt, H. Ellis, Cory, Caclin
Chiracas	X	X	Upper Savagery		A. Ellis, De Alba	French Sudan	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Disapprove	Hamoly
Corca	X	X	Middle Barbarism	M harems; detested by women	Bancroft	Germans Ancient	X	X	Upper Barbarism		Churchill

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
Goyiros	X		Lower Barbarism	T ridiculed; H is O.K. and common	Munroe, A. Ellis, Bullinder (2), Armstrong, Gutierrez De Pin.
Guanibo		X	Lower barbarism		Kirchnoff
Guemo		X	Upper Savagery		Kirchnoff
Guapites	X		Upper Savagery?		De Solis
Guatemalans	X	X	Middle Barbarism	MT Dances	Tozzer, Bancroft
Haida	X	X	Upper Savagery	MT Common	McIlwraith
Haitians (Arawak)		X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	
Haitiane	X	X			Perrin Dulac
Hausa	X	X	Civiliz.	Disapproved	Minturn, Munroe
Hawaiians		X	Middle Barbarism?	Common, accepted	Malo, Goldman, Cory
Hebrews		X		Religious at one time; later capital offense	A. Ellis
Herero		X	Middle Barbarism	Common	Cory
Hidatsa	X		Lower Barbarism	Accepted; dreaming	Ford, Dorsey, Bowers
Hindus	X	X	Civiliz.	MT Are outcasts; MH Common and abhorred	Carstairs, Karleen
Hittites		X	Civiliz.		Bailey
Hopi		X	Middle Barbarism	Accepted	Ford
Hottentots		X	Middle Barbarism	Common	Schapers, Cory
Huayla		X	Middle Barbarism	Common	Rowe
Humtuliip	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Olson
Iatmul	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted; puberty rites, dance	Ryan, Mead, Bateson
Ila	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Common, accepted	Ford, Smith & Dale
Illinois	X	X	Upper Savagery	Boys raised as girls; MH common; Sacred; Gov't. ceremonial functions	Thwaites, Kintetz, Hoffman, Karleen, Cory
Incas		X	Middle Barbarism	Capital offence, Temples	DeLeon, Cory
Indies		X			Tozzer
Irantians		X	Lower Barbarism	Common	Minturn
Iroquois	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Disapproved	Flannery

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
Autenai		X	Lower Barbarism	Dislike; FT Shaman	Turney-High
Awakituel		X	Upper Savagery		Kinsey
Kwoda		X	Lower Barbarism?	Regard as unnatural	Churchill
Lache	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Marriage; boys raised as girls	Metraux, Bolinder, A. Ellis
Lagalag		X	Lower Barbarism?		Deacon
Lamumbu		X	Lower Barbarism?		Deacon
Lango	X	X	Middle Barbarism	H marriage; boys raised as girls	Kinsey, Ford
Leu		X			
Lepcha		X		FH universal	Thompson
Loritja		X	Middle Savagery	Strongly condemned	Minturn
Louisiana Indians	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted; FH common	Cory
Lovedu		X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted?	H. Ellis
Lucayo	X	X	Middle Barbarism	"Queens wives," woman marriage	Krige, Little, Krige & Krige
Lushais	X		Lower Barbarism		Kinsey
Madagascar		X			Cory
Madassar	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted; marriage	Beals
Maldu	X		Civiliz.		Mugroe
Malay Archipelago		X		Common	Cory
Mandau	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted; MT through dreaming	Wied-Newried, Will, Ford, Mayhall, Munroe, Bowers
Mangaia	X	X		Approved, social & religious functions	Harsnall
Manitaries	X				Wied-Newried
Manca		X	Lower Barbarism	MH Prevalent; myth	Murra
Manu		X	Upper Savagery	MH Common & O.K.; FH frowned upon	Minturn, Mead
Mapuche- Huilliche	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Shamans	Titiev, Cooper
Mapacapaná	X	X	Lower Barbarism		De Alba
Maricopa	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Soler, Ford
Marind-Anim		X	Lower Barbarism?	Universal; puberty rites	Mead, Ruitenbeek
Marquesan Island	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted for some; H marriage; MT were disliked	Marshall, Munroe, A. Ellis, Karleen, Linton

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
Jamaicans (Arawak)	X	X	Lower Barbarism		
Japan		X	Civiliz.	Accepted	Karleen
Javanese		X			Cory
Jbala		X	Middle Barbarism	Universal	Cory
Jivaro	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accept	Minturn, Tesson
Juaneno	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accept, marriage	Kroeber
Kafir		X	Middle Barbarism	Disapprove?	Cory
Kaibia	X	X	Lower Barbarism	FH Marriage	Kroeber, Gifford
Kansa	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accept; Religion	Dorsey
Karakl		X	Lower Barbarism	Accept; Institution Puberty Rites	Hays, Ford
Karankawa	X	X	Upper Savagery	Disliked	DeSolis, Newcomb, Mayhall, Gatchet
Karatchi	X	X	Middle Barbarism		Cory
Karen	X				Munroe
Kashefs		X		Accepted?	Cory
Kaska		X	Upper Savagery	Common & Accepted	Minturn
Keres	X		Middle Barbarism	Religious; MT God	Curtis
Kikuyu		X	Middle Barbarism	"Woman Marriage"	Middleton
Kimmerley	X		Middle Savagery	Obey regular taboos Boy wives common, institutionalized	Westermarck, H. Ellis, Cory
Kimsquit	X	X	Upper Savagery	Boys raised as girls; accepted?	McIlwraith
Kinwa	X	X	Upper Savagery	Ceremonial function	Mayhall
Kitimac	X	X	Upper Savagery	Boys raised as girls; accepted?	McIlwraith
Kiwal		X	Lower Barbarism	Institution - Accp. Puberty rites;	Landman, Ford
Klamath	X	X	Upper Savagery	Spiritual commands; MH Marriage	Minturn, Munroe, Stern, Soler
Kodlak	X	X	Upper Savagery	Boys raised as girls	Bancroft
Konlag	X	X	Upper Savagery	Approve; marriage; Boys raised as girls	Oswalt, Ford, H. Ellis
Konyak	X	X	Upper Savagery	Marriage; accepted; Spiritual command	Parsons, Ford
Kurd		X	Middle Barbarism		Minturn

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
Marshall Islands		X		Forbidden & common	Kramer, Cory
Masri		X	Middle Barbarism	Do not punish	Cory
Mayas	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Common; illegal	Redfield, Cory
Mazdas		X		Capital offence	Cory
Mbaya	X	X	Upper Savagery		Metraux
Mbundu	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Disapproved of; MT Shamans	Kinsey, Hamby
Melanestians		X		MH Almost universal accepted	Karleen, Davenport
Menomini		X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Ford
Mesopotamia		X		Widespread	Levinson
Mexico, Ancient		X		Common	H. Ellis, Cory
Mexico, East coast		X	Middle Barbarism	"Concubinage"	Bancroft
Miami	X	X	Upper Savagery		Kintetz
Mocitca		X	Middle Barbarism	Ritualized	Gillin, A. Ellis
Modoc	X		Upper Savagery	Shamans	Ray
Mohamedans of India		X	Civiliz.	Prevalent	Cory
Mohave	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Approve; myth; Shamans; marriage; ceremony	Kinsey, A. Ellis, Devereau (2)
Moluches	X			Shamans	Falkner
Mongo		X	Lower Barbarism		Huiscaert
Mongols	X	X			Mercer
Mono	X	X	Upper Savagery	Common	Curtis
Montana	X	X			H. Ellis
Morocco (N.)		X		Religion; accepted	Ruitenbeek, Cory
Rossi	X	X	Upper Barbarism	MH Pages	Tauxier
Mowa		X			
Mowat		X		Common	Cory
Muria Gond		X		Strongly condemned	Minturn
Murngin		X	Middle Savagery	Institution; respected	Minturn, Bernat
Nahane	X	X	Upper Savagery	Disapprove? Myth; Boys raised as girls	Honigman
Nahua	X	X	Middle B.		Cory
Nama	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Accepted; MH Common	Schapers, Minturn, Ford
Nandicuarra	X		Upper Savagery	Accepted; open & common for cross- cousins	Levi-Strauss

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	
Nambutji		X		Initiation ritual; Relations with future father-in-law	Hays	
Naskapi		X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Ford	
Naca		X		MH "Slaves"	Opler	
Nacnezh	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Swanton, Oswalt, Ford	
Navajo	X	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted; ceremonial role; myth; social role	Tischopik, Reichard, Ford, Kinsey, Little, Hill, Haille
New Caledonians		X	Lower Barbarism	Sacred; military pairs	Cory, H. Ellis	
New Hebrides		X			Hayes	
Ngajus		X	Upper Barbarism	Approved	Cory	
Nicaraguans	X	X	Middle Barbarism	MH Dances; MH common & capital offense	Cory, Bancroft	
Nootka	X	X	Upper Savagery	Ancient tales of FH	Drucker	
Normans		X	Upper Barbarism	Extremely common	Cory	
Nossi-be		X	Middle Barbarism	Disapprove	Cory	
Rubians		X	Middle Barbarism	Intensely disliked	Cory	
Ruer		X	Middle Barbarism	"woman marriage"	Evans-Pritchard	
Nupe	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Royal harems; dances	Hadel	
Nyakyusa	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Common; U.K.; for young people	Milson	
Nyool-Nyool		X	Middle Savagery		H. Ellis	
Oglala	X	X	Upper Savagery	Sacred; dream	Missler, Lurie	
Ojibwa	X	X	X	Upper Savagery	Sacred; marriage; myth; ceremonial functions	Skinner, Hoch, Kinietz, Landes, Cory
Omana	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted; marriage; Religious	Lurie, Ford, Fletcher, Munroe, Mead, Dorsey	
Ondonga	X	X	Middle Barbarism		Cory	
Ontang-Java	X	X	Upper Savagery	Dreams	Munroe, Fletcher	
Osage	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accept	Cory	
Ossetes	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Accepted	Perrin, Dulac, Ford	
Oto	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Mintum	

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	
Palauans		X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Ford	
Papago	X	X	Upper Savagery	Marriage, well-liked	Underhill, Munroe, Ford	
Papuans		X	Lower Barbarism	Open; puberty ceremonies	Ryan, Held, H. Ellis	
Patwin	X		Upper Savagery		Kroeber	
Pavlovso	X		Upper Savagery		Curtis	
Pawnee	X		Lower Barbarism	Held in disrepute; Religion	Murie, Dorsey & Murie	
Peleu Is.		X		Disapprove	Cory	
Persians		X	Civiliz.	Prevalent	Cory	
Peruvians (Coastal)	X	X			A. Ellis, Cory	
Phoenicians		X	Civiliz.	Religious	Karleen	
Phrygians		X	Upper Barbarism	Religious	Karleen	
Ptjaga	X	X		In children	Hoch	
Pima	X	X		Disliked	Hill	
Pono	X	X	Upper Savagery	MH Common; mild disapproval	Gifford & Kroeber, Gifford, Mintum, Aginski	
Ponca	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Lurie, Ford	
Poya		X	Upper Savagery		Cooper	
Pueblos	X	X	Middle Barbarism	M ceremonies accepted, "clowns"	De Villagra, Hrdlicka, H. Ellis, Green, Parsons, Bandler	
Puelches	X		Upper Savagery	Shamans	Falkner	
Puerto Rico	X	X	Lower Barbarism			
Puka Fukans	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Ford	
Quechua		X			Kubler	
Queet	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Olson	
Quitama	X		Upper Savagery		Kroeber	
Quilleute	X	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Olson
Quinault	X	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Olson, Ford
Redui		X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Ford	
Riffians		X		Common; accepted	Mintum	
Rolians	X	X	Civiliz.	Illigal		
Rundt		X	Middle Barbarism	Widespread; mild disapproval	Mintum, Maquet	
Rwala Bedouin	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Punish with death	Churchill	

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	
Sac	X			Upper Savagery	Feast to Berdashe	
Sakalaves	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Boys raised as girls	H. Ellis	
Salish		X	Upper Savagery	Myth	H. Ellis	
Sambans		X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted; circumcision, pairs	Mead, Ford
Samoyed	X	X	Middle Barbarism	Marriage; Shamans	Karleen	
Sanpiti		X	X	Upper Savagery	Mild disapproval	Mintum
Scandinavians		X	Upper Barbarism	Grounds for divorce	Churchill	
Scythians	X		Upper Barbarism		Green, Kraft-Ebing	
Seminole	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Ford	
Seniang		X		Extremely common; Accepted	Mintum	
Sikhs		X	Civiliz.	Prevalent	Cory	
South India	X	X	Civiliz.		Green	
Sioux	X	X	X	Upper Savagery	Ceremonial function; Gov't. function; Sacred; dance to Berdashe	Twaites, Landes, Cory, Catlin
Sirtano		X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Churchill	
Stwans		X	X	Middle Barbarism	MH Universal; accepted	Ford
Slave		X	Upper Savagery		Mintum	
Society Is.		X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted; Religion; Myth	Cory	
Solomon Is.	X	X		Marriage	H. Ellis	
So. Cal. Indians	X	X	Upper Savagery	Marriage; boys raised as girls; accepted	Robinson	
S. Celebes	X	X	Civiliz.	Accepted	Ruitenbeek	
"Southern" Indians	X	X	Lower Barbarism?		Flannery	
Syrians		X		Religious	Karleen	
Tartarians	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Institutionalized; Religion	H. Ellis, A. Ellis, Cory	
Tainos-Cuba	X	X	Lower Barbarism		A. Ellis, Armstrong	
Tainos-Virgin Is.	X	X	Lower Barbarism		A. Ellis, Armstrong	
Tanala	X	X	Upper Barbarism	Marriage; neutral attitude; boys raised as girls	Munroe, Kinsey, Ford, Linton	
Tarasco		X	X	Middle Barbarism	Seal	

GROUP	TRANS M F	HOMO M F	CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	
Tartars		X	Upper Barbarism	Prevalent	Cory	
Tchambull	X	X	Lower Barbarism	Initiation ceremonies; men in women's masks	Mead, Hays	
Teutons		X	Upper Barbarism	"Passive" partner buried alive	Cory	
Tewa	X		Middle Barbarism	Ritual clowns	Parsons	
Thinkleets	X	X	Upper Barbarism		Bancroft, Cory	
Thonga		X	Middle Barbarism	Accepted	Mintum, Ford	
Thrace		X	Upper Barbarism	Religious	Karleen	
Tikopia		X		Mild disapproval	Mintum, Firth	
Tinacua		X	Upper Savagery			
Tinguian		X	Lower Barbarism	Accepted	Ford	
Tribes North of Orinoco River		X	Lower Barbarism	Frequent; accepted	Kirchhoff	
Trobrianders		X	Lower Barbarism	Derision, but no formal penalties	Malinowski	
Trumai		X	Lower Barbarism		Levi-Strauss	
Tsekats		X	Middle Barbarism	Approve; Religion	Cory	
Tswana		X	Middle Barbarism	Accepted	Ford	
Tubaculaba	X	X	Upper Savagery	Accepted	Munroe, Ford	
Tacuna		X	Lower Barbarism		Nimuensju	
Tumbez Is.		X			Cory	
Tupian		X	Lower Barbarism	Nearly universal	Cory	
Tupi-Cavanib		X	Lower Barbarism	Disapprove?	Levi-Strauss	
Tupina		X		Common; Accepted?		
Tupinamba	X	X	X	Lower Barbarism	MH Open & accepted; FH marriage	Soares de Souza, Ford, Duandava, Lery
Turu		X	Middle Barbarism	Ritual FH initiation	Marshall	
Uganda	X	X			H. Ellis	
Unyamwezi	X	X			H. Ellis	
Urivep		X			Kinsey	
Virginia Indians		X	Lower Barbarism	Common	Flannery	
Visigoths (Christianized)		X	Upper Barbarism	Capital offense	Karleen	
Waganda	X	X	Middle B.	Capital offense	Cory	

GROUP	TRANS		HOMO		CULTURAL LEVEL	NOTES AND ATTITUDES	BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES
	M	F	M	F			
Walbiri			X		Middle Savagery		Meggitt
Wasnambala			X		Middle Barbarism	Disapprove	Cory
Winnebago	X		X		Upper Savagery	Honored; marriage; Religion	Lurie
Witoto			X		Upper Savagery	Accepted	Ford
Wogeo			X		Lower Barbarism	Accepted; sometimes common	Hogbin, Ford
Wolaf			X		Lower B.	Accepted	Ford
Wolerians				X			Spiro, Kramer
Wrangell			X		Upper Savagery		De Laguna
Xius			X		Middle Barbarism	Capital offense	Tozzer
Yaagan			X	X	Upper Savagery		Gusinde
Yakut	X		X	?	Middle Barbarism	Accepted; myth	Kinsey, De Laguna, Ford
Yokut	X		X	X	Upper Savagery		Gayton, Encyclopedia
Yoruba				?	Upper Barbarism	"Woman marriage"	Forde
Yucatan	X		X		Middle Barbarism	Accepted?	A. Ellis
Yukaghir	X				Upper Savagery		Kinsey
Yukis	X				Upper Savagery	Social function	Green
Yuma	X	X	X	X	Upper Savagery	Ritual; accepted; H marriage	Spier, Gifford, Forde, Bancroft, Ford, Bolton
Yungar			X		Middle Savagery	Accepted	Ford
Yurok	X		X		Upper Savagery	Accepted; Shamans	Ford, Kroeber
Zanzibarans	X	X	X	X		FH Common; MH common & accepted	H. Ellis
Zuni	X	X	X		Middle Barbarism	MH Living together; accepted; myth; Ritual dance	"Zuni Creation Myths," Stevenson, Parsons, Ford

Human history covers probably some ten thousand years. This history is a history of development, of progress from lower intelligence to higher intelligence, from more backwards ways of doing things to more advanced ways. The only way to really understand this progress thru history is to break it up into periods or epochs. These epochs have generally the same main characteristics internal to each and different from those preceding and those that follow. Analysing history this way is a most important breakthrough in human understanding because it surely is the case that in order to build a brighter future for our children and their's, we must struggle in the present to improve society; and in order to struggle successfully we must understand the past, our past.

Human society's development is not so much determined by man's ideas as it is by what man (please understand the use of the word "man" to mean mankind - not excluding women) has done in order to survive and continue on. By this we mean, that if you really want to understand human history (present and past and, to some extent, the future direction things are inevitably heading in) you must understand, first of all, his means of production (tools, machines, skills...) and the mode of production (how those means of production were organized - primarily who owned/owns and controlled/controls them). Using this method, we can see there have been 5 fundamentally different epochs in history so far, characterized by 5 different levels of production, 5 different modes of production and five different social systems organized on that basis. Let's take a brief look at them:

1) The first and longest epoch was Primitive Communalism. This epoch started when man first became man. What made man become man, in the first place, was his "opposable thumb" (meaning his hand is built in such a way that the thumb faces, or can face the opposite direction of the other fingers and thus the hand can be used to grasp and pick up and use things.) This ability to manipulate objects allowed man to very slowly learn to wield such things as clubs, bow and arrow, fishing equipment, the plow, to build huts, defences from animals and other humans, weapons, etc. It was this physical ability that led to a situation that slowly produced more advanced thought! The more situations, the more things man could do, the more it produced his very underdeveloped mind to ponder those things...His inability to fend very well in defending himself from the animals and the elements and hostile human enemies forced him early to group together in closer social units than existed amongst the other animals. This situation too pushed forward his thought processes. Such things as speech, human social organization, divisions of labor, divisions between leaders and followers, etc. all developed, not because someone sat down and thought to himself/herself "Gee, we ought to do this or that"; but because the real world, the actual situation, forced upon man these things...and he was left to ponder their significance after the fact.

In other words, the major developments (though not -the major events) in human history from its earliest times until the present have come about basically independent of the will of men. Further, they have caused further developments to follow which in no way did man foresee (much less, control) beforehand. By way of example, the earliest inventors of the first machines had no idea of what they would lead to in the future (and it was really of no concern to them).

Primitive Communalism lasted possibly some 10 thousand years. During that time, the changes, advances made by man were small and far between. But they led to some significant changes that were to happen over a relatively short period of time. When man's social organization and tools and skills were such that he learned how to domesticate cattle and to work with a plow these technological breakthroughs (that it had taken man thousands upon thousands of years to develop) caused nothing less than a radical departure, change and brought man out of Primitive Communalism (where men were basically all equal to each other; but also equal in their near-absolute poverty and defenselessness against nature, disease, etc.) and into the next great epoch - Slave Society. Why?

Because primitive agriculture and cattle raising allowed, for the first time, some people to produce enough food to feed more than just themselves; for the first time

in history there came about the situation where owning a slave made any sense. Before this breakthru, when one tribe captured prisoners of another-they were not made slaves because at best they could only produce enough to take care of themselves and were thus of no use to the tribe- they were thus either killed or taken in as a new member. But now, some men could live off the labor of others.

Now, if you remember, we said that human history is a history of progress. But we must keep in mind that we are not trying to pass moral judgements on something in history that had to come about - we are looking at whether the over-all lot of man improved or not. It was the case that with Slavery man was better able to fend against nature, stay alive, propagate future generations, make more breakthrus in terms of art, social organization, thought in general. And, most importantly, it set the stage for the next breakthrus which were to happen near the end of the Slave epoch. (We are not referring here to the slavery which re-appeared during the 18th and 19th centuries...but instead to the epoch which the whole world went thru-back 2,000 years ago - more and less). We're talking about slavery of the time of the Roman Empire.

The slave was owned and so was his labor by the slave owner. His labor belonged to others, his body could be bought, sold, killed, used for procreation (producing more children) and thus more wealth for the slave owner. Because the slave had absolutely nothing to gain by being docile all the time, slaves, as the first oppressed class, were constantly in a state of rebellion. This took the form of destroying the plows, stealing them and other things, attempts at escape, killing the slave owners, etc. Because of this the slave owners used the heaviest and sturdiest type of plow possible - so the slaves could not break it. This was very inefficient for agriculture, though it was still a much more productive way to raise food than that which existed under Primitive Communalism. The epoch of slavery lasted a long time, possibly a couple of thousand years. Its duration was marked mainly by very small imperceptible changes, but which changes when added together were slowly but surely pushing this society and its technological level forward to the point once again where a major, radical break-thru would be made and in a relatively short period of time (as compared to how long Slavery had existed) Slavery would be over-thrown and replaced by a new epoch - Feudalism.

The technological changes that helped bring about this change had to do once again with the way mankind was producing its means of subsistence (what it needs to survive - food, clothing, shelter...). Slowly but surely, the principles of farming were being learned by repeated trial and error. It became clear that the larger the "farm" and the lighter the plow, the more could be produced which would increase more rapidly the wealth of the owner of the land and labor. Going from wood plows to metal ones was a tremendous breakthru. These things and others (by necessity all of this is over-simplified-this is, after all only an Appendix to a small pamphlet on a very specific aspect of human history and society) caused some slave owners to want to expand their land holdings, want to increase tremendously their laborers...but this could happen only if: 1) the land could be taken (often) from other slave owners; & 2) the life situation of the laborers-slaves-could be changed so that they would not continue to steal and destroy the tools. These future rulers of the future epoch - Feudalism - appealed to the slaves to over-throw their masters in the name of freedom and justice for all. This the slaves were only too willing to do...but they did not get freedom-they got a new class society, a new ruling class - the feudal lords; and the slaves had to, were forced to go to work for them in much the same conditions - as serfs - as they had before as slaves. The differences included: the serf could not be killed at will - he "owned" himself to some extent, and while the majority of his labor was still "owned" by the feudal lord, the serf also worked for himself on his own small private family plot-after working most of the day and week in the fields of the feudal lord. This situation of part-time working for oneself caused the feudal serfs to be more enthusiastic and harder working than had been the slaves-who had no reason (other than the whip) to work hard - and

they just could not be whipped all the time. The serf worked harder more voluntarily, thus did the wealth of the feudal lords increase much more rapidly than had that of the slave-owners; and this is how the feudal lords were able to replace the less economically advanced slave system with their own.

The Feudal epoch lasted about 1,000 years or so - till about the very late 1500's in England, the 1600's & 1700's in Europe, the 1800's in most of the rest of the world, and semi-feudalism still exists in much of the world today. It exists in the countryside of the poor countries simultaneously with the capitalism which exists in the cities and dominates the political life of the country. This co-existence between feudalism and capitalism - the system which followed it - is why it is called semi-feudal rather than feudal. This long period of Feudalism was once again characterized by very slow almost imperceptible changes, which once again built up to the point where a radical break in the technology happened and was quickly followed by a radical change to the next system. (Let's remember that the lot of man was better under Feudalism than Slavery because the serfs were a little better off in terms of "freedom" and better off in terms of the availability of the necessities of life, medicine, etc. Still they were only slightly better off than the slaves - progress thru history, as we can see, has been very slow; but it has accelerated its rate of progress all the time.)

It was the invention of the machine and the spread of the machine and later the industrial revolution, which was the technological break-thru which precipitated the downfall of Feudalism and its replacement by the much more efficient system - Capitalism. The capitalist - the owner of the machines, tools, & factories appealed to the serfs - "Overthrow the Feudal lords and get your freedom." This the serfs did; but they got instead a new ruling class - the capitalists.

Capitalism is the rule of the capitalists over everybody else; just as Feudalism was the rule of the feudal lords over the serfs; and slavery was the rule of the slaveowners over the slaves. As we can see, capitalism hasn't always existed; in fact, it has only existed somewhat extensively in the world for some 300 years. Its epoch too is characterized by relatively slow changes though much more rapid than during earlier epochs. But it too will not and is not lasting forever. It too pushes forward the development of the technological level of society to the point where a break-thru is made, to the point where the oppressed class within it rises up and overthrows it (just as the slaves and serfs did in the past).

Under capitalism, mankind's progress is shown by the fact that for the first time in human history the ability is present to harness the forces of nature - to no longer be at its mercy...to conquer world-wide epidemics, to wipe out disease, poverty, mal-nutrition, lack of clothing and shelter...Capitalism has already developed the machinery capable of putting an end to all these things and more. But...

But ABILITY and PRACTICE are often two different things. Capitalism has not put an end to them - or even come close to this - because the people (the great masses of us) have no say over how production is organized, for what ends things are produced. The capitalists decide all that; and they only produce in ways that will make the most profits for them. (The workers at a GM plant make cars; but General Motors doesn't make cars, it makes money!) And the larger their profit, the greater the poverty the rest of us exist under. It is said that the U.S. alone (not counting such capitalist countries of all of Europe, Russia and Japan) has the industrial capacity to house every family in the world in less than 5 years!!! It's not hard to see why this isn't done. What profit is there in providing good quality cheap housing? Virtually none. What profit is there in providing jobs to all who want them? None - because the capitalists use unemployed workers to keep the wages of their employees down - thru the threat of scabs during strikes. Instead the capitalists decide to spend "their money" in whatever ways are most profitable - like military weapons and products that don't last...doesn't it seem like the real motto of capitalist industry is "Our products are built to fall apart!"? Actually it's our money - we produce all the wealth of society - they "just" own it and control it. A Rockefeller at birth is worth a billion dollars; a working class child is born into debt in more cases than not..

Workers are better off than the serfs. The capitalist does not own the worker, and can not buy or sell him. But the worker has no choice but to go to work for one of the capitalists; because the only thing the worker has which he can sell on the market to stay alive and feed his family is his ability to work. The capitalist buys this with wages. Now all the capitalists, especially the big ones - the monopoly capitalists- exploit the workers, making huge profits off of our labor; while paying us little more than it takes to keep ourselves and our families alive and well. (It is true that some workers make enough to live somewhat comfortably; but this is balanced off by the fact that many workers make "minimum wage" which the U.S. government admits leaves their families far below the poverty line - 40 million people live below the poverty line in the "rich" U.S.. It is further balanced off by the fact that many workers are not working - due to the high unemployment that has always existed under capitalism - but which has risen higher and higher in recent years).

Capitalism, however, no longer exists all over the world. The new system has already arrived: the new epoch is beginning even while most of the world still lives under the old epoch. Socialism is the first epoch in history where not only are the means available to take care of everyone easily and well, but the PRACTICE accomplishes exactly that. Socialism is the rule of the working class - the rule of the majority over the tiny minority of capitalists who try with all their might to regain power and over-throw socialism. Once they have been overthrown, they become like cornered rats - they don't want to work for a living, they don't want to lose their incredible wealth and luxury...they don't give up easily -this is why we speak of "rule of the majority over the minority", for if we did not rule over them and suppress all their efforts to re-gain power, they would surely succeed and all our gains will be reversed; they have never hesitated to use every weapon at their disposal to demoralize us and crush us and they won't change, they'll just get more vicious.

Socialism first appeared, working class rule first occurred, in Russia in 1917. But unfortunately, after 40 years or so, old and new capitalist elements wormed their way back into power, took over the leadership of the country and have re-instituted capitalism in the Soviet Union. This is why we see alcoholism, unemployment, racism, sex discrimination, degenerate culture, and imperialist actions coming from the S.U. These things were being eradicated or had already been eliminated during the 30's and 40's when the country was building socialism; but now they are back. Which is to say that socialism is not perfect...it is born in a world full of capitalism; its people fight hard, work hard, but have faults too - the ways inherited from the past, the capitalist past, are very very difficult to overcome. But before capitalism re-gained power in Russia, socialism had spread to other countries - People's China, Albania, and North Korea among them.

CRISIS AND REVOLUTION

It is because no ruling class in history has ever given up its power peacefully and/or been voted out of power that people turn to revolution. But revolution can take place only during a time of deep crisis within the system. Such a revolutionary situation arises when 1) the ruling class can't rule in the old way anymore (and thus turns toward increased repression of all types) AND 2) the masses can't live in the old way anymore (and thus turn to increased resistance to this oppression of all types and toward revolution as the only real way to end the oppression once and for all.) This increased resistance further deepens the crisis the ruling class is caught up in -further increasing their inability to rule over us in the old "democratic" way; they turn more and more to the "new" way, which is really a continuation of their un-democratic rule over us; but without the pretense anymore that this is supposed to be a democracy...they turn to fascism.

When a revolutionary situation arises, if the oppressed are ready enough, strong enough, they make revolution and succeed in attaining political power and overthrowing the capitalist ruling class and their oppressive system. If the oppressed masses are not strong enough and the ruling class is temporarily able to hold onto its power, its rule becomes ever more repressive.

For example: when world-wide capitalism developed into its last, highest stage - monopoly capitalism or Imperialism (around the year 1900)-from then on, human history has been one of continuous revolutions by the oppressed masses on the one hand, and of continuous oppression and more repression by the ruling monopoly capitalists on the other hand. Capitalism inevitably develops into Imperialism (monopoly capitalism) and Imperialism means war - Type 1) War to conquer other parts of the world for the monopoly capitalists. And in these days, when the whole non-socialist world is already divided up under the control of the main imperialist countries - this type of war becomes war for the re-division of the already divided up world - to get a bigger slice of the pie, or hold onto the slice a country already controls. (World War I and World War II were both this type of war). Type 2) Wars to put down the rebellions, revolutions of the oppressed peoples of the countries which are controlled by the imperialists. (The Vietnam war was of this type-the Vietnamese being just one people in a world full of people who are realizing, one nation after another, that foreign control of the political, economic and cultural life of their countries means poverty and total lack of democratic rights - only by throwing out foreign control and instituting control by the masses of people of that country can genuine progress be made at last...this is why there will be Vietnam-type of situation after Vietnam-type situation. Imperialism means oppression; it also means resistance to that oppression. And inevitably the people will win out over the few monopoly capitalists.

When a capitalist country goes deep into crisis, that's when you see it push its military budget out of sight, and curtail democratic rights at home...for example, Germany turned to war and fascism (actually the German ruling class turned to war and fascism and forced and/or duped the people into going along with it - at least for a time) because Germany had almost no colonies to super-exploit and could only get them by taking them away from the control of the "allies" - countries like England, France and the U.S., which controlled the great portion of the world at that time; she needed fascism to put down the rising working class rebellion that was already going on against the capitalist system there and the increased resistance there against war-like policies.

From this we can see that World War is nothing less than inevitable as long as large powerful monopoly capitalist/imperialist countries exist. World War II happened for pretty much exactly the same reasons as WWI - Germany (and its allies) was in crisis - the capitalist rule of operation - "expand or die" - had put the German ruling class to the brink; when they lost WWI and the country was rebuilt subsequently along capitalist lines again - they faced the same predicament and could choose only between giving up their power (which no ruling class in history has ever done willingly much less peacefully) or once again initiating World War with the hope of grabbing up enough colonies to be able to continue to expand.

In the world today, sorry to say, the situation exists again, where a rising monopoly capitalist country - the Russian Imperialists - (sometimes called "Social-Imperialists" because they are "socialist" in words, imperialist in deeds) is faced with a crisis. It too must expand or die; but it faces a world which is mostly controlled by the U.S. ruling class. Russia is militarizing to the teeth; they are trying every means possible to get the U.S. kicked out of countries so that (they hope) they can sneak in thru the backdoor. The U.S. ruling class, on its part, is fighting with all the weapons and tricks at its disposal to hold onto what it already controls (like South Africa and Rhodesia-where U.S. companies make billions in super-profits off of slave labor) and always on the look out for new places to worm their way into. These two superpowers are heading toward war. In fact, WWIII is inevitable EXCEPT if one thing happens - full scale rebellion/revolution in both these two countries which prevents them from launching such a world war. Is it an accident or insignificant that the U.S. budget includes well over \$100 billion for War (the "defense" department used to be called the "war" department-that's exactly what it is). Even as the two superpowers talk "SALT" disarmament agreements-they are arming themselves at Hitler-type rates!

We can't say when World War III might start; but the signs that the two superpowers are moving in that direction are inescapable. Even as they try to put the

world to sleep with all their talk of disarmament - their very "disarmament agreements" like SALT I; allowed each side to increase, that's right INCREASE TREMENDOUSLY their arms! Read the wording and look at the facts - there is no doubt at all that they have armed up tremendously since they both signed the first so-called "disarmament" treaty. SALT II will be more of the same. These powers are no dummies; they promote sham treaties like this because they know that they have to cover up the fact of what they are really doing and fool us and put us to sleep. We musn't let them get away with it anymore.

CAPITALISM = POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL RULE

CAPITALISM = POLITICAL POWER IN THE HANDS OF THE CAPITALISTS. The government, political parties (the differences between the democrats and the republicans, in fundamental terms, is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee - they both are against the poor and working class and for the rich - their differences are only over how best to continue their rule over us; and which capitalists amongst them and their supporters to give the biggest spoils to. That is why the pro-labor Carter is not any more fundamentally pro-worker than Nixon was. That's why the biggest liberal of them all, Rockefeller, could turn around and order dozens and dozens of prisoners and guards at Attica Prison gunned down.); police forces (when was the last time you saw the police throw someone out on the street for being unable to pay their rent; but when was the last time you saw them bust some landlord for charging too much rent?; when was the last time you saw the police bust striking workers over the head; but when was the last time you saw the police bust some factory owner over the head for paying insufficient wages and having super un-safe working conditions that kill the workers or maim them?); the courts, the military, the laws.

CAPITALISM = ECONOMIC POWER IN THE HANDS OF THE CAPITALISTS. 1/10th of 1% owns/controls all the major factories, corporations, banks, land, machines - the real wealth. They who never soil their hands on the factory floor or out in the fields, take from those who do all the wealth they produce and call it their own. This rip-off is "capitalist democracy" - it's completely legal. They decide to fire you for speaking up about unsafe conditions, to lay off thousands at a time, so they can make bigger profits, to make products that, like Alka-Seltzer are "Built to Fall Apart". It's planned obsolescence - they plan it so that the things we produce in their factories and buy in their stores won't last, or won't work. Their advertising is often aimed at getting us to buy things we don't need with money we don't have. The way they run the factories is so mean; it's no wonder workers come home from work shot, sometimes nervous wrecks, other times so worked up they take it out on their kids and spouses, or they don't come home at all because of an accident caused most often because the boss found it more profitable to run things unsafely than to put out some few bucks more to make things safe (did you know that if you divided the amount of dollars paid in fines by American Corporations for safety violations detected by OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Act/Agency) into the amount of workers killed in their factories and fields every year - it works out to \$25 a head! - no wonder they don't make it safe for us to work!)

CAPITALISM = CULTURAL POWER IN THE HANDS OF THE CAPITALISTS. They own/control all the key media and cultural institutions - the TV, radio, press/news agencies, newspapers, movies. Their main goal in using these institutions is DECEPTION. They want to deceive us into not learning that it is they who control everything that is important in this country; that it is they who call the shots; that it is they who are filthy rich and that their riches come from our blood, sweat and tears; that it is to defend their profits and not to defend our freedoms that they send troops into other countries; that it is not the arabs who are causing gasoline to soar towards \$1 a gallon, but their ruthless greed and their false crises - hiding oil, not pumping it out of the ground, not refining it - anything to make it seem like gas just has to go up. They want us to believe that the shortages (that they "create" themselves)

force the prices to go up. But just because something is in short supply (which, more often than not, is not even true) doesn't mean that the corporations have to raise the price - they could still sell it at the old price. No, they just use real and fake shortages to jack up their prices so they can jack up their profits. If it were really true that the "law of supply and demand" was operating, then how come prices don't ever go down? How come after they doubled the price of gas a few years back - because of a fake shortage - and told us the extra cost would encourage them to explore for more oil and build more refineries - how come the price never went back down? Forget this "supply and demand stuff"; forget their lies about "free competition" - under monopoly capitalism the only real competition is to see which corporations can rip-off their workers and the consumer the most.

They want us blaming other poor people - like the Vietnamese or the Blacks in southern Africa, or the Arabs in the Middle East; they want us to blame each other - like the blacks in the inner cities, the chicanos in the southwest, the indians stuck on the mostly barren reservations, the poor and working class whites in the cities and suburbs, the homosexual or heterosexual working or living next to us. They want us to blame ourselves - like for pollution because we drive our cars (as if we could get to work and the supermarket and visit relatives etc. without cars these days). They want us to forget that it is they who design the cars to pollute as much as they do; they who run the factories which produce half of all pollution too.

It is because of their Economic Power (their ownership of the means of production) that they long ago were able to set up and legitimize their Political Power. It is because of their Political Power that they continue to be able to rule our lives economically. And their profits enable them to have the money to win the elections with the candidates they've bought so that the policies they want continue. It is because of their Political Power and their Economic Power that they are able to rule us culturally as well.

It is no accident that the media portrays the system as good and the people who stand up against it as bad. It is no accident that we, the masses, have turned to drugs, sex, religions (that tell us we can't change the world, we must just accept it and suffer...our rulers just love it!). It is no accident that there is disunity between black, white, brown, and red people; between men and women, between homosexual and heterosexual. It is divide and conquer. They know they can't rule without deception and poisoning our minds - trying to fill us full of hatred for other oppressed and exploited people and for ourselves.

The only way we can do away with all the cultural degeneration around us - the escapism, the violence, the demoralization; the only way to make the cultural life of our country be one which promotes what is best in all of us - is to get Cultural Power. But we can't get it as long as they own/control the cultural institutions including the media. We can't take these away from them and thus stop them from pushing all this garbage and degeneracy down our throats until we take their source of wealth and power away from them - their ownership and control of the means of production - banks, factories, land, etc. But we can't take these away from them and give them back to the people who have built them and produced all this wealth, as long as they have political power. Thus, the first thing we must get, acquire, take from them is Political Power. With it we will get, acquire, take from them Economic Power - we will re-organize first the way the country is run; who the police work for, which class makes all the decisions; then we'll be able to re-organize production in the factories so that production is for meeting people's needs and not for some capitalists' profit. Then we will be able to get, acquire, take Cultural Power, and promote the good and progressive. For example, instead of music that mostly tells us "Oh, baby don't leave me" or "Oh, baby, I love you" or "Oh, baby, let's get stoned"; we'll promote music that tells of the hard times we have faced trying to live under such an unfair, inefficient system; music that sings of the glory of standing up against those who stomp on us in little and big ways (especially big ways). Music that makes us proud instead of trying to make us feel like escaping. The media, instead of telling us lies; will tell the truth. Instead of telling us about a dinner party at the White House and how many times

Tricia Nixon blew her nose (that's news?) will tell us, how many workers got mangled or killed in the factories because of greed (capitalist greed). Real news about real life that we in our millions experience every day. News reporting that will make us ever more angry at abuse; ever more eager to stand up; ever more proud of our victories in our struggle to build a bright new future at last from oppression and exploitation. We will be able to criticize any leader - point out both the good and the bad - and discuss all the important questions - so that we understand the world we live in and control it as well - rather than relying on a few experts and being helpless and at their mercy. Sure, we need experts; but we need control by the people even more - the experts must work for the people, not the people for the experts. The people must become experts, the experts must live like and think like the people.

OUR LEADERS - THE "LEFT" - A MOST IMPORTANT THING TO UNDERSTAND

As more and more people realize that revolution is the only solution to the problems we have under capitalism, they turn to the "Left" for the answers and for leadership in the struggle. The ruling class is no dummy; they recognize this. Thus they try to corrupt as much of the Left as they can. They have been successful so far in corrupting the international and national leaderships of all the unions (although struggle by rank and file is slowly taking back the local leaderships and putting them in the hands of real people's fighters). A number of formerly "well-meaning," groups/organizations on the "Left" have gone bad because of infiltration by police; and, just as often, by succumbing to more subtle pressures - the pressures of living in a capitalist society. We all fall back into thinking in capitalist-type ways of looking at things: Pragmatism (whatever works do it - regardless of the long-term consequences); Reformism (like chasing after crumbs and forgetting that we have every right to have the whole loaf - getting lost in asking for reforms - little changes, and forgetting that we will always be on the defensive and "asking" rather than "getting" and "taking" the things that we all need, as long as we allow the system as a whole to go unchallenged); Chauvinism (which views some people of a particular race, national origin, sex, or sexual preference as superior to others). Many groups have succumbed as much to these sugar-coated bullets as to the uncoated ones (police attacks, etc.)

Such groups as the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA) & Reverend Jones' People's Temple despite calling themselves revolutionary or socialist - are not...in fact, they are empty-headed or crazy schemes that in no way can hurt the system of capitalism, are not real alternatives to it and drive people away from revolution and socialism. Thus even as we, the authors, encourage you all to reject the system of capitalism as the enemy of the people; we must also caution you that the answer is simple - revolution and socialism; but the road is very complex. You all will have to determine which left groups within the revolutionary movement are really revolutionary and which are really not and would lead us down the path to defeat were we to follow them.

The authors of this paper have found, after several years of organizing and study that only the Marxist-Leninists understand capitalism and revolution well enough and only they are dedicated enough and organized enough to be able to lead us to victory. But even amongst those who call themselves Marxists or Marxist-Leninists; most of these groups are making significant enough errors that they too would lead us to defeat were we to follow them (this despite the fact that some of them "mean well" and all of them have some honest and hard working people). We all will have to learn from our own experience and study which is the only correct national organization(s) that can lead us to victory. We must also caution the reader to specifically not judge groups on the basis of their stand on the homosexual question - because almost all of them, at this time, have the wrong position on this question. They currently oppose, look down on homosexuality. This is really not that surprising because up until the time of the publication of this paper, no one had really invest-

igated and studied this question very thoroughly and the dominant position in this society and for many many years has been anti-homosexuality. These groups should be judged on their stand and practice on the most important questions - the questions that will make or break the revolution...the homosexual question, while not unimportant, is not so important that a wrong stand on it would cause the revolution to lose. It is with this in mind that some of us attempt to work with the group we believe to be the best in the country, Workers' Viewpoint Organization, even while we disagree with them on this particular question. Overall, what they say and what they do impresses some of us tremendously - and we have seen a lot of groups come and go, say some good things and do some good things. But, remember, just as no individual is perfect, no group can be perfect either. Thus we work, must work with the best there is; even while we may have some differences with them especially if those differences are only on minor questions.

This Appendix, in a relatively short amount of time and space has had to address a whole gamut of questions. We ourselves didn't come to these understandings by just reading something. We came to these understandings over a period of several years - because our reading and studying and organizing, our successes and our failures taught us these things. Therefore, we know that few will be the readers who will fully understand what this Appendix states; fewer still will be able to agree with it fully at first or second reading. We included it none-the-less because we believe these things to be true. We believe understanding them will help the reader to better understand the body of this paper on homosexuality. Still, the fact that many readers at the present time may not fully understand or fully agree with everything in this Appendix should not stop them from understanding the great majority of the information and analysis contained in the body of this paper; and should not stop them from being able to agree with the analysis - agree that homosexuality is not bad, perverted, degenerate, "unnatural" etc. That instead, homosexuality is and always has been, from the beginning of man, one of the two forms that human sexuality and human sexual relations have always taken.