

THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF HATE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE  
MARGINALIZATION AND DEHUMANIZATION OF HOMOSEXUALS IN NAZI  
GERMANY AND IN THE PRE-STONEWALL UNITED STATES

MARIO GUERRERO-CORAL

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN  
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

GRADUATE PROGRAM IN EDUCATION

YORK UNIVERSITY

TORONTO, ONTARIO

DECEMBER 2019

© Mario Guerrero-Coral, 2019

## ABSTRACT

This research study explores and compares substantive and rhetorical strategies through which homosexuals came to be reviled and pathologized in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US by sufficiently large segments of their respective societies that their persecution and eradication became tolerated.

Considering that the majority of manifestations of discrimination (e.g., homophobia, racism, sexism, anti-Semitism) are mostly discursive, my analysis focuses on the reproduction of hatred and discrimination through different types of text and talk within the broader sociopolitical and religious contexts of both Nazi Germany (1933–1945) and the US in the 1950s (van Dijk, 1993). This study seeks to understand the discursive constructions of the *Other*, because in its definition and characterization, the *Other* (the homosexual) was described, portrayed, and presented as a stranger who was different and unwanted in both historical contexts (Bauman, 1993).

Through critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the methodological and analytical framework of this study, I collected and analyzed written and spoken texts that represent a significant sample of moderate mainstream politicians, newspapers, and education texts for both historical contexts. The analysis of the collected data demonstrates that in both contexts the discursive construction of the *Other* mostly relied on stereotypical notions of homosexuals. However, there were differences between the institutional and political approaches against homosexuals in the two societies in terms of levels of homophobia. Persecution (i.e., medicalization, criminalization, dehumanization, and extermination) and the use of rhetorical devices largely depended on the sociopolitical structures of each nation (e.g., democracy versus dictatorship). At the same time, there were also similarities, as both societies needed to rely on

pseudoscientific information to legitimize institutional, social, and violent homophobia and to persuade their citizens to turn against homosexuals.

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this dissertation to all the individuals who were victims of hatred and homophobic acts in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US. During these historical eras, many men were subject to persecution, incarceration, and extermination simply for being homosexuals.

I also dedicate this dissertation to my loving and caring mother, who instilled in me the important values of perseverance and resilience. She also supported me during the most challenging moments as I worked towards my PhD. This milestone is specially dedicated to her for all her efforts in supporting me to achieve this degree.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge the support from York University and Freie Universität for funding my journey as a PhD student in Canada and in Germany. It would have not been possible to achieve this important goal in my life without the support from these two institutions.

I want to thank Dr. Sandra Schecter not only providing me with the necessary feedback to continue my academic journey as a PhD student, but also for giving me significant lessons about the life of a scholar. I am also very thankful that Dr. Schecter has demonstrated continuous support to help me secure job opportunities since I started this process with her and for supporting me to move to Berlin as part of my research process.

Thanks to Dr. Didi Khayatt and Dr. Laura Wiseman for their invaluable advice.

I am very thankful to Dr. Uwe Gellert, my supervisor at Freie Universität, for his support and guidance during my stay in Berlin.

Special thanks to Loretta Fiorini for her guidance and help with all the logistics of my PhD process.

And thanks to:

- Benedict Gudrich for his patience and support translating all the German documents into English;
- Sara Potkonjak and her loving family for offering me support when I needed it the most;
- Bibiana Benavides for her advice and for always cheering me on to keep going.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
__Historical Overview .....	2
Homosexuality: Definition.....	3
Sodomy and Anti-Homosexuality Laws: Historical Overview .....	4
Homosexuality in Germany .....	6
Homosexuality in the United States.....	8
The Lavender Scare .....	10
The Kinsey Report .....	11
Significance of the Study.....	12
On the Use of Terminology in This Dissertation.....	14
Summary and Dissertation Outline.....	17
Chapter 2: Conceptual Frameworks.....	19
Discursive Construction of Hate.....	19
Discursive Discrimination and Elite Discourse .....	20
Theoretical Dimensions of Discrimination.....	23
Linguistic Strategies of Hate.....	24
Mental Structures, Beliefs, and Ideologies .....	25
Bauman: The Texture of Hatred and Dehumanization .....	27
The Normalization of Hatred.....	28
Dehumanizing the <i>Other</i> .....	30
Defining the <i>Other</i> .....	31
Aliens Versus Neighbors .....	32
Summary .....	35
Chapter 3: Literature Review.....	36
Hate Speech and Homophobic Discourse.....	36
Hate Speech: Definition.....	36
Implications of Hate Speech .....	37

Homophobic Discourse.....	38
Masculinity and Stereotyping .....	42
Stereotyping .....	42
Discourse, Identity and Categorization.....	44
Gender Stereotypes .....	45
Homosexual Stereotypes.....	46
Discourse and the Construction of Hate .....	47
Metaphors and Hate Speech.....	47
Identifying and Analyzing Metaphors .....	50
Presuppositions .....	51
Legitimizing and Coercive Rhetorical Strategies .....	53
Summary .....	56
Chapter 4: Methodology .....	57
Research Questions.....	57
Study Design.....	57
Data Collection .....	58
Data Collection in Germany .....	58
Data Collection in the United States.....	61
Analytic Framework .....	64
Policy or Political Discourse.....	65
Academic Discourse .....	66
Media Discourse .....	67
Data Analysis.....	67
Discourse Analysis.....	68
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) .....	69
Purpose of CDA.....	70
CDA's Methodological Approach.....	70
Critical Discourse Analysis and My Dissertation.....	71
Analyzing Political Discourse.....	72
Analyzing Newspaper Texts .....	74
Collected Data: Historical Texts.....	77
Academic Texts and Scientific Reports.....	78
Media Documents .....	79

Policy Documents .....	81
Summary .....	82
Chapter 5: The Discursive Construction of Hate in Nazi Germany .....	83
Substantive Axis: Constructing the Argument Against the <i>Other</i> .....	83
Stereotypes .....	83
Biological/Physical Stereotypes .....	85
Sociopolitical Stereotypes.....	88
Medical Stereotypes.....	90
Criminal Stereotypes.....	94
Religious/Moral Stereotypes.....	97
Defining and Understanding the <i>Other</i> in Nazi Germany .....	99
The Stranger Within Us .....	103
Rhetorical Axis: Nazi Homophobic Discourse.....	104
Metaphors of Fear .....	105
Legitimization of Hate .....	114
Summary .....	118
Chapter 6: The Discursive Construction of Hate in the Pre-Stonewall US .....	121
Substantive Axis: Constructing the Argument Against the <i>Other</i> .....	121
Stereotypes .....	121
Biological/Physical Stereotypes.....	123
Sociopolitical Stereotypes.....	125
Medical Stereotypes.....	128
Criminal Stereotypes.....	132
Religious/Moral Stereotypes.....	134
Sexual Stereotypes .....	136
Defining and Understanding the <i>Other</i> in the US.....	138
Stranger Within Us .....	145
Rhetorical Axis: Homophobic Discourse in the Pre-Stonewall US.....	147
Legitimization of Hate .....	147
Presuppositions and the Use of Questions in Homophobic Discourse in the US .....	153
Summary .....	159
Chapter 7: Discussions And Conclusions .....	161
Summary of Research Findings .....	161
Normalization of Hatred Through the Discursive Construction of the <i>Other</i> .....	161

Comparative and Contrastive Analysis of Research Findings.....	166
Similarities .....	166
Differences .....	168
Implications of Research Findings.....	171
Implications for Gender and Sexuality .....	171
Implications for Language and Discourse Analysis .....	172
Implications for Social Justice Education.....	175
Suggestion for Future Research .....	176
Conclusions.....	176
Researcher's Postscript .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
References.....	179
Appendices.....	190
Appendix A: German Documents.....	190
Policy Document 1 .....	190
Policy Document 2.....	190
Policy Document 3.....	195
Policy Document 4.....	196
Policy Document 5.....	197
Policy Document 6.....	198
Policy Document 7.....	199
Policy Document 8.....	199
Policy Document 9.....	199
Policy Document 10.....	200
Policy Document 11.....	200
Policy Document 12.....	200
Academic/ Scientific Document 1 .....	201
Academic/ Scientific Document 2 .....	201
Academic/ Scientific Document 3 .....	201
Academic/ Scientific Document 4 .....	202
Academic/ Scientific Document 5 .....	202
Academic/ Scientific Document 6 .....	202
Academic/ Scientific Document 7 .....	203
Media Document 1 .....	205

Media Document 2..... 207

Media Document 3..... 207

Media Document 4..... 209

Media Document 6..... 209

Media Document 7..... 210

Media Document 8..... 210

Media Document 9..... 212

Speech Document 1 ..... 213

Speech Document 2 ..... 213

Appendix B: US Documents..... 215

Media Document 1..... 215

Media Document 2..... 216

Media Document 3..... 217

Media Document 4..... 218

Media Document 5..... 223

Media Document 6..... 225

Media Document 7..... 226

Media Document 8..... 227

Media Document 9..... 228

Media Document 10..... 233

Media Document 11..... 233

Media Document 12..... 233

Policy Document 1..... 234

Policy Document 2..... 236

Policy Document 3..... 237

Policy Document 4..... 239

Policy Document 5..... 239

Policy Document 6..... 240

Policy Document 7..... 241

Policy Document 8..... 243

Policy Document 9..... 244

TV Commercial 1 ..... 245

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Hate speech has commonly been used as a linguistic strategy to shape views on specific sociocultural matters and as a political approach to persuade citizens and legislators of the dangers posed by certain minority groups based on their sexual orientation, race, or political or religious persuasion. Much of the academic research on hate speech has focused on the atrocities committed against disenfranchised minority groups. However, little has been written about strategies used to justify hate (Whillock & Slayden, 1995) or about the specific linguistic and rhetorical devices that have been used to justify dehumanization of, criminalization of, and discrimination against minorities. In particular, there has been a dearth of research regarding hate speech directed against homosexuals during the Holocaust and in the United States (US) before the Gay Liberation riots (also known as Stonewall Riots) in 1969 in New York City.

Homosexuality has often been considered a threat to heterosexuality. That is, some people have believed that accepting homosexuals in their societies would make everyone homosexual, to the detriment of procreation (Boswell, 1980). Although attitudes towards homosexuals have been progressively shifting, homosexual inclusiveness and acceptance have varied depending on the geographical and historical contexts. In Nazi Germany, for instance, homosexuals were sent to concentration camps; in Russia homosexuals are harassed without any protection from the police. As a matter of fact, the Russian government created an anti-gay propaganda law to prevent protect Russian children from the dangers of homosexuality. In Egypt, the Arabic language does not have a lexicon to refer to homosexuality or heterosexuality. However, this only applies to female homosexuality. There are plenty of words that set apart homosexual men (Khayatt, 2003). This lack of linguistic categorization can have a number of implications in terms of same-sex relationships, but most importantly in terms of sexual identity

(Khayatt, 2003). In the US, homosexuals have experienced discrimination and oppression from the police and the government, preventing them from accessing full citizen rights in that country as well as keeping them out of federal employment (Carter, 2004).

### **Historical Overview**

To understand how the discrimination against and pathologization of homosexuals were justified through discursive strategies in Germany and the US, it is imperative to understand, first, the overall historical, religious, sociopolitical, and cultural implications of homosexuality, and second, the differences between the two historical contexts in which these appalling homophobic events were normalized and institutionalized.

Bauman (2002) asserts that, even when compared to other historical genocides such as the religious crusades or the British invention of concentration camps during the Boer War, the Holocaust is unique. Homophobia was a salient example of hatred shown towards the *Other* during the Holocaust. Adolf Hitler was first the Chancellor and then the *Führer* (leader) of *Nationalsozialistische* (National Socialist, also known as *Nazi*) Germany and head of the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei*, or Nazi Party, from 1933 to 1945. To become the leader of the Nazis and to persuade all German citizens to accept his ideology targeting Jews and other minorities, Hitler first appealed to logic and not directly to hatred. In his book *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle), published in 1925, Hitler not only outlined his political ideology and plans for the future of Germany, but also clearly stated:

I know that men are won over less by the written than by the spoken word, that every great movement on this earth owes its growth to great orators and not to great writers. Nevertheless, for a doctrine to be disseminated uniformly and coherently, its basic elements must be set down for all time. (Hitler, 1925, preface)

If Hitler's ideas on the importance of oratory are accurate, it is then imperative to study and analyze the ways in which language (i.e., both spoken and written texts) has been used to

persuade individuals to despise and dehumanize Jews, homosexuals, prostitutes, the Roma and Sinti peoples (gypsies), and other minority groups.

Besides the Holocaust, there are numerous examples on how hate speech, and most specifically homophobia, have contributed to the subjugation of minorities throughout history. This study considers two relevant historical contexts in which the instantiation of homosexual dehumanization and persecution is clearly exemplified through hate speech. These two contexts are Nazi Germany (1933–1945) and the United States (US) from the 1950s until the Stonewall riots in 1969.

### **Homosexuality: Definition**

Homosexuality, of all variations of sexual behavior, has often been a polemical topic in the history of humankind. This is because homosexuality, as the form closest to the heterosexual norm in our culture, has been an obvious target of social oppression (Havelock & Kinsey, as cited in Weeks, 1981, p. 96). The term *homosexual* is a product of the 19th century, and the recognition of homosexuality as a societal phenomenon was the result of the work of many experts in the field of medicine, law, and psychiatry during that period (Altman, 1982). Freud did not consider homosexuals sick or criminal individuals because he believed in an innate bisexuality in every individual (Mondimore, 1993).

Weeks (1981, p. 96) states that it is essential to study homosexuality because of “the light it throws on the wider regulation of sexuality, the development of sexual categorization and the range of possible sexual identities.” The continuous debate over homosexuality as a biological or a culturally based phenomenon has generated many assumptions about the nature or nurture understanding of sexuality. Regardless of the stance that homophobes assume with regard to the

nature-nurture debate, their primary wish continues to be to either reverse homosexuality to heterosexuality or eradicate it entirely (Sedgwick, 1990).

### **Sodomy and Anti-Homosexuality Laws: Historical Overview**

In the history of humanity, homosexuals have generally been harassed and persecuted (Boswell, 1980). One common justification for the discrimination against homosexuals and other lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) individuals has been the fact that some homosexual practices contravene specific laws of the Hebrew Bible or the moral principles that underpin many religions around the world. As an example, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam have historically condemned the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah, which has been associated with homosexual misconduct, although this sin refers more specifically to anal intercourse rather than same-sex sexuality (Boswell, 1980). These religious views have served politicians and anti-gay activists as a fundamental justification for discriminating against homosexuals (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009; Crompton, 2003; Johnson & Vanderbeck, 2014). The most influential passage, in the book of Genesis, recounts the story of two angels that were sent to Sodom to announce the destruction of the city. Genesis 19:4 (Bible Hub, 2017) says: “Before they had gone to bed, all the men from every part of the city of Sodom—both young and old—surrounded the house.” The residents of Sodom wanted to “know” the angels; the biblical Hebrew for this phrase (*nid’a*) meant to know them carnally. In Genesis 19:8 it is said that Lot offered his own daughters for the men who surrounded the house to do what they wanted. This passage suggests that sex between men was considered a taboo.

As described in the Bible, the crime against nature also known as *sodomy* is defined as any type of unnatural sexual relations. In other words, sodomy meant anal intercourse and bestiality (Stone, 2017). Generally, the crimes against nature have influenced the laws of many

societies and have, consequently, established what types of sexual behavior are socially appropriate, what behaviors not acceptable, and what behaviors are criminalized. Once societies arbitrarily decided that only procreative and heterosexual behaviors (until recently, always within marriage for women) were acceptable, any other expressions of sexuality were judged and even criminalized (Boswell, 1980). Laws have been informed by various Puritan and neo-Puritan views as well as religious beliefs that agree that the only normal expression of sexual interaction is the one with the purpose of heterosexual procreation within the context of marriage.

These religious views have various implications for human sexuality. First, these laws have justified hatred towards homosexuals, and second, homosexual behavior has been associated and categorized with more controversial and harmful expressions of sexuality such as incest, pederasty, or zoophilia (i.e., the act of bestiality) (Nussbaum, 2006). In other words, sodomy is seen as a threat to the boundaries between man and beast; effeminacy as a threat to sexual and gender identity; interracial sex as a threat to the purity of the white race; and homosexuality as a threat not only to the boundaries of procreative sex within marriage but also to the notion of masculinity because homosexuality has historically been conflated with effeminacy (Eskridge, 2008). As a result, homosexuality became a dangerous threat to the heteronormative society where self-indulgent sexual practices were seen as predatory and homosexuals as individuals who were luring innocent children into a hedonistic lifestyle away from heterosexual marriage and procreation (Eskridge, 2008). Sodomy laws and religious-based discrimination were salient reasons used by Nazis and Americans to justify the criminalization and dehumanization of homosexuals in these two historical contexts.

## Homosexuality in Germany

In Germany, homophobic views and Nazi ideologies perpetuated a view of a racially pure society, exclusive of minorities: Jews, Roma and Sinti, disabled individuals, prostitutes, immigrants, and homosexuals (Bartov, 2015; Black 2016). Once Hitler assumed power, it was vital for him and other Nazi leaders to get rid of the problem cases or social outsiders. Anyone who did not fit the perfect racial image of the Nazi ideology was vulnerable to discrimination, isolation, deportation, criminalization, and murder (Dwork & Van Pelt, 2002). The severity of the punishment and treatment depended on the type of purported deviance. For homosexuals, there was brutal maltreatment because both Hitler and, especially, Heinrich Himmler were convinced that homosexuals were pederasts who would put children at risk of being corrupted and raped (Hale, 2003). Longerich's (2012) biography of Heinrich Himmler is a thorough analysis of the life of this Nazi political figure and leader of the *Schutzstaffel* or *SS* (Protection Squadron). A speech given by Himmler in 1937 in Germany, revealing his homophobic stance, is one of the many public discourses that typify the discursive construction of hate at that time, serving as a linguistic tool used by ideologues to perpetrate hatred against homosexuals (van Dijk, 2015). Himmler created the *Reich Central Office* to combat homosexuality and abortion. Homosexuals were singled out and brutally abused during this period. The perpetrators also believed—or at least conveyed the position—that homosexuality was as infectious as other putatively epidemic diseases (Padfield, 1990). In consequence, Himmler took considerable pains to ensure that homosexuals would not become prominent in the Nazi Party. All homosexuals were subject to the most ruthless and inhumane punishments (Gellately & Stoltzfus, 2001).

For German courts, homosexuality was initially defined as any type of sexual relationship that involved anal penetration and sometimes oral sex. But considering how challenging it was

for German police to establish this, German courts decided to conclude that any type of sexual indecency between men violated the SS 175 Statute (Lumsden, 1997). SS 175 was a statute that was initially enacted in 1871. Later, in 1936, Nazi jurists rewrote the law, penalizing indecencies between men which included mutual masturbation, penetration, and even sexual intent as evidenced by looking or touching. It is important to note that this law only pertained to men. Hitler mentioned that SS 175 was a law created and enforced to reassure Germans of his commitment to stop the spread of male homosexuality, and called on German mothers to offer their sons to Nazism without any fear that their children would become sexually or morally depraved by succumbing to homosexual behavior (Giles, 2001). Around 78,000 men were convicted under this law. Some men were sent to concentration camps, others were murdered, still others were institutionalized (homosexuals were seen as mentally ill), and some other men were given the opportunity to be castrated with the purpose of taking away their immoral sexual desire (Giles, 2002). In 1940, Himmler made the persecution even more severe: any man convicted of seducing more than one man would be sent to a concentration camp to be punished. Many of the SS 175 convicted men were marked with a pink triangle to distinguish them, whereas women who contravened rules of womanhood and motherhood wore a black triangle. Male homosexual victims were sexually abused, and many perished within a month of being imprisoned in concentration camps.

After the surrender of Nazi Germany to the Allies in 1945, SS 175 convicts, who were already in concentration camps, were sent to German prisons to complete the remainder of their sentences and denied compensation as victims of National Socialism. It was not until 1969 that West Germany decriminalized homosexual relations between men over the age of 21. In 1985, West German President Richard von Weizsäcker was the first German political leader to

recognize homosexuals; but it was not until 1994 that SS 175 was abolished. In 2002, the German Parliament pardoned homosexuals convicted by the Nazi SS 175 statute (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, 2017).

### **Homosexuality in the United States**

In the US, homosexuality was also considered an illness and homosexuals were also persecuted. To prevent the spread of homosexuality, many states created laws with the purpose of criminalizing homosexual behavior, preventing homosexuals from experiencing the full benefits enjoyed by heterosexual US citizens and alienating them from the rest of American society. While in the US, as in Nazi Germany, homosexuals were also treated inhumanely, the history of physical and psychological abuse in the US was on a smaller scale compared with the Holocaust. Still, there were egregious instances, the most salient and disgraceful of which was the creation of the Atascadero State Hospital in California in the 1950s. Atascadero was a maximum-security hospital that was opened with the purpose of institutionalizing sexual psychopaths. Many of these inmates were homosexuals who were forced to serve in various scientific experiments. Many homosexuals in this facility (also dubbed Gay Dachau) were castrated and subject to inhumane physical and emotional treatment (Ingle, 2015). Furthermore, from various sociopolitical perspectives, homosexuals have been denied legal, immigration, labor, educational, and civic rights at the state and federal levels, preventing them from being considered full US citizens. Laws preventing homosexuals from joining the Army were instituted in World War II (Berube, 1990). It was not until 2013 that the US Supreme Court recognized same-sex marriages at the federal level. Notwithstanding, there are still many US states in which employers are legally entitled to discriminate against homosexuals.

The event known as the *Stonewall Riots* refers to the historical moment when the police raided the Stonewall Inn in New York City on June 29, 1969, and the patrons, who were mostly drag queens, decided to stand up and defend themselves, making a statement against the violence and oppression that they had been experiencing for years (Stone, 2017). Subsequently, other riots and demonstrations across New York City were organized and the police lost control of this situation.

This dissertation focuses on the era in which homosexuals lived before the Stonewall Riots because these riots are considered by many the most symbolic and transformational event in the history of gay liberation and LGBTQ rights in the United States and around the world (Carter, 2004). A year after the incident, people marched in New York City and in many other major US cities to commemorate the Stonewall Riots. This march was dubbed the *Gay Pride Parade* and the event has been celebrated annually since then in the US and in a great number of large and smaller cities around the whole world (Frank, 2014). The Stonewall Riots also brought positive changes for the acceptance of homosexuality in American society. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from the category of mental disorder (Frank, 2014). In 1975, the US lifted the ban that prevented homosexuals from working in the government; and later in the decade President Jimmy Carter, for the first time, invited gay and lesbian activists to the White House. Finally, many states decriminalized consensual homosexual behavior and created laws that protected citizens from being discriminated against because of their sexual orientation (Stone, 2017). For these reasons, it is imperative for my research to focus on the era before Stonewall. Pre-Stonewall represents a closer era to the one that homosexuals experienced in Germany during World War II. This pre-Stonewall era in the US was

characterized by dehumanization, criminalization, and pathologization of homosexuals, making the two historical contexts more susceptible to comparative study and analysis.

### **The Lavender Scare**

With developments on the world stage following World War II—the Soviet detonation of an atomic bomb, the Berlin blockade, the Korean War—the US became a country consumed with fear of communism. Fueling the hysteria was Senator Joseph R. McCarthy from Wisconsin, who in 1950 delivered a speech where he stated that he had a list of names of State Department employees who were communists. In addition, John E. Peurifoy, a senior State Department official, testified before the US Senate to the effect that the government harbored many “shady” employees. By *shady* he was referring to “pervert homosexuals” (Stone, 2017 p. 239). His testimony helped instigate the “Lavender Scare”—persecution and purges of homosexuals working for the government. During that same year, the Senate issued a report recommending that sexual perverts should be kept out of government. As a result, various US government agencies started a series of actions to determine the sexual orientation of their employees. Interestingly, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, rumored to be a homosexual himself, published a list of 450 government employees accused of being sexual deviants. This Lavender Scare prompted several state-sponsored actions against homosexuals. First, President Dwight Eisenhower declared sexual perversion a national security risk. Second, the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952 prevented sexual deviants from entering or remaining in the US. Third, 5,000 homosexuals lost their jobs and were denied access to government services. Many of these individuals were sent to jail or to psychiatric wards where psychiatrists ordered castrations, lobotomies, and electroshock experiments with the purpose of curing their homosexuality (hence the establishment of the facility in Atascadero, California). Finally,

different media outlets contributed to the persecution of male homosexuals by publishing articles outlining the risks posed by male homosexual behavior (Stone, 2017).

### **The Kinsey Report**

In 1948, Dr. Alfred Kinsey, a professor from Indiana University, published a research study called *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Kinsey, Pomeroy, & Martin, 1963). For this research more than 10,000 males were interviewed. The results suggested that 50% of men had an erotic interest in other men, 37% had had at least had one homosexual experience, and the rest were homosexual or had been homosexual for at least 3 years. Kinsey and his colleagues created the Kinsey Scale in which different levels of sexual orientation were laid out. The gradations of this scale suggested that sexual orientation was not absolute and that individuals did not have to fit exclusive homosexual or heterosexual categories:

<b>Rating</b>	<i>Description</i>
<b>0</b>	<i>Exclusively heterosexual</i>
<b>1</b>	<i>Predominantly heterosexual, only incidentally homosexual</i>
<b>2</b>	<i>Predominantly heterosexual, but more than incidentally homosexual</i>
<b>3</b>	<i>Equally heterosexual and homosexual</i>
<b>4</b>	<i>Predominantly homosexual, but more than incidentally heterosexual</i>
<b>5</b>	<i>Predominantly homosexual, only incidentally heterosexual</i>
<b>6</b>	<i>Exclusively homosexual</i>
<b>X</b>	<i>No sociosexual contacts or reactions (Kinsey Institute Online, 2019).</i>

The study concluded: “It is difficult to maintain the view that psychosexual reactions between individuals of the same sex are rare and therefore abnormal” (Kinsey et al., 1963). Evelyn Hooker, who was hired by a group of homosexual men, also conducted a study in which she administered a questionnaire to two groups of men with the purpose of identifying psychopathological or maladjusted behavior in these groups of men. All the males in group A identified as homosexual, with heterosexuals in group B. Hooker then submitted the results to a

blind panel of experts to rate the questionnaires. The results concluded that there was no relationship between homosexuality and psychopathology or maladjustment.

### **Significance of the Study**

The aforementioned circumstances and discriminatory living conditions of homosexuals in both Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US are emblematic of the struggles that this minority group has experienced in historical and geographical contexts marked by reactionary social movements. However, at the same time it cannot be asserted that these two national contexts have always exhibited the level of intolerance and bigotry that marks these two historical periods. Consequently, it is instructive to consider and analyze the vehicles and conditions through which hatred and homophobic actions become normalized and tolerated in specific contexts. My thesis is that in both the US and Nazi Germany, the ideologies characterizing these periods, reproduced in both social policy and state action that criminalized non-heteronormative sexual identity and behavior, were normalized through a deliberate program of rhetorical strategies involving spoken and written discourse.

In this study, I explore and compare the strategies through which, during both of these eras, homosexuals came to be reviled and pathologized by sufficiently large segments of their respective societies that their persecution and eradication became tolerated. I also analyze the different linguistic strategies used in the US and Nazi Germany to legitimize the dehumanization of the *Other* (homosexuals) through spoken and/or written rhetorical devices. Furthermore, I explicate the textual arguments that institutions used in both contexts to isolate a citizen group from compassion and empathy.

In addition, understanding more about how homosexuals, as a sexual minority, were dehumanized and segregated during the Holocaust could serve as a reminder to present and

future generations that we live in a society which made it possible for the Holocaust to happen and did nothing to stop it (Bauman, 2002). In this manner, the Holocaust should not be viewed as an isolated historical event but rather one that could be brought about through seizure of the apparatus of the state and manipulation of public consciousness through the discursive construction of hate.

This study attempts to make a contribution to three areas of research: critical discourse analysis, social justice education, and sexuality studies. With regard to critical discourse analysis: this project aims to provide an analysis of the linguistic features— in politics, education, and the media—characterizing the discursive strategies used to create and perpetrate hatred against a minority group in two historical periods. The study examines the various lexical, syntactical, and semantic constructions and the rhetorical strategies used to create a context where homosexuals came to be regarded as subhuman and evil (van Dijk, 1993) in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US. The study informs social justice education by documenting and establishing a public record of similarities and divergences in the manipulation of public consciousness with regard to a minority in two historical contexts where the pathologization of homosexual practices was most extreme. I also show how homophobic discourse is consistent with other discourses of hate in the production of inequality and discrimination. In terms of sexuality studies, this research investigates the extent to which, through strategic manipulation of language, different sexual practices are normalized or rendered illicit.

The two eras are comparable because in both cases the accompanying homophobic discourses were based on religious, medical, and heteronormative arguments expressed and revealed through discourse (Altman, 1982; Carter, 2004; Weeks, 1981). While homosexuals were not systematically murdered in the US as they were in Nazi Germany, in both cases

homosexual men were considered sinners, pederasts, mentally ill, and lacking in masculinity (Berube, 1990; Carter, 2004; Weeks, 1981). In both contexts, as well, elements of discrimination were institutionalized because societal institutions ignored, perpetrated, and perpetuated the physical and psychological abuse inflicted on homosexuals (Bauman, 2002; Carter, 2004).

### **On the Use of Terminology in This Dissertation**

In this study, I use the term *homosexual* (from the Greek root “*homo*” meaning “same” (as in *homogeneous*) and not the Latin *homo* meaning “man”) to reference “someone who accepts the desire for members of one’s sex as valid in itself, rather than merely a poor substitute for heterosexuality, and involves the recognition of emotional as much physical attraction” (Altman, 1982, p. 45). This said, in different parts of the dissertation I also discuss another historical connotation of this word, referencing a clinical condition considered by some to be pathological. Indeed, German psychologists coined the word *homosexual* in the late 19th century in an attempt to understand behavior that they considered to be abnormal.

Because of the historical circumstances surrounding the word’s etymology, many scholars advocate the use of the term *gay* instead of *homosexual*. *Gay* was introduced as a gender-neutral term and Sedgwick (1990) advocates the use of the term as such. Furthermore, the American Psychiatric Association (APA) has also suggested the use of the term *gay* instead of *homosexual* for the reason that *homosexual* carries a pathological connotation.

An additional clarification: the term *homosexual* has been used to describe and refer to both sexual and emotional relationships of the same gender for men and women. Because the term *homosexual* was rarely used in Nazi Germany or in the pre-Stonewall US to refer to women, for the purposes of this study I use the term *homosexual* to refer only to homosexual men (and not women) and to denote men who engage in sexual acts with other men, even though

the term may have carried other connotations for the various actors referenced in this thesis. *Gay* is used as a non-pejorative and non-pathology-infused term to refer to an individual who has erotic contact with individuals of their same gender, as suggested by the APA and Sedgwick (1990).

Another important term used throughout this dissertation is *hate speech*. While Weber (2009) states that there is no universal definition of hate speech, I use *hate speech* as an umbrella term to refer to any type of verbally, psychologically, or emotionally abusive behavior (which can eventually turn into physical violence) justifying discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, ethnic or geographical origin, financial status, age, or disability. However, it is important to delineate the minimum considerations to understand hate speech and its implications. Hate speech comprises any overt or covert type of behavior including, but not limited to, government and health policies, media reports, educational texts, political speech, casual conversations, graffiti, visual and written advertisements, and physical violence (Whillock, 1995). Considering that this study focuses on discursive forms of discrimination, I use Gilreath's (2011) premise that states that speech causes harm because words do not operate on their own— language is inherently part of its social context. Similarly, it is worth noting that the term *homophobic discourse* is used in this study to designate a form of hate speech aimed at harming male homosexuals. Therefore, *homophobic discourse* is understood in this dissertation as “any type of written text or spoken discourse invoking disdain, disgust or hatred towards homosexuals enabling stigma, heterosexism and sexual prejudice” (Leap, 2010, p.181). I attempt to understand how homophobic discourse is consistent with other types of discriminatory discourse (e.g., racism, anti-Semitism, transphobia, Islamophobia). Specifically delineating what hate speech or homophobic discourse entails is not possible, because any discursive type of

discrimination is dependent on the context where these words are uttered (Gilreath, 2011; Leap, 2010; van Dijk, 2011).

One final term is *perversification*, which I use in my research to describe how dominant groups have been able to trigger hatred in their citizens and encourage violence against vulnerable minorities through the use of discursive strategies and rhetorical practices. The online *Oxford Learner's Dictionary* defines a perverse individual as one who shows “deliberate determination to behave in a way that most people think is wrong, unacceptable or unreasonable” (Perverse, 2018). However, the concerning aspect of *perversification* that I focus on in this study is the one in which individuals are discursively encouraged to be *perverse* and to behave perversely while believing that their behavior is indeed justifiable. This behavior, as evidenced in discriminatory, intolerant, and sometimes violent actions, resulted in the justification and normalization of hatred against certain minority groups in Nazi Germany and, in certain historical periods, in the US. In my study, I explore how this *perversification* process and normalization of hatred occurred and was directed against a specific vulnerable minority group, homosexuals.

The term *perverse* has been historically and generally associated with the notion of sexual deviation. In his *Three Essays*, Freud discusses sexual deviances, although he does not treat them as perversions; as a matter of fact, Freud sexualizes the child and infantilizes the pervert. Freud also defines perverse sexuality as normal, stating that “not only there is something innate lying behind the perversion, but there is something innate in everyone” (Freud, as cited in Schaffner, 2012, p. 139). Furthermore, Freud challenges the notion of perversion as a pathology and suggests that perversion is not a deviation “but is in itself the original state: it is the universal predisposition of the human sexual drive, from which, ideally, normal sexual behavior develops

during the maturation process” (Freud, as cited in Schaffner, 2012, p. 139). However, in this research, the term *perverse*, as explained earlier, refers to the discursive process of transforming and converting every citizen into an intolerant and cruelly dispassionate individual fueled with hatred towards a disenfranchised minority. Consequently, I use the theories of Bauman (1993, 2002) and van Dijk (1993) as the lens through which I examine how this *perverse* process is made possible through different discursive and institutional strategies in the two historical contexts. The term *perverse* has also been commonly used by bigots and right-wing extremists to describe homosexuals. In other words, male homosexuals have been historically portrayed as perverts who lure children and teenagers into homosexual acts. While there might have been and still are individuals who sexually abuse minors, I will not use this term to refer to homosexuals. The term *perverse* is specifically used in this study to describe how dominant groups have been able to foster hatred in their societies to justify violence against homosexuals through the use of different substantive strategies and rhetorical practices.

### **Summary and Dissertation Outline**

In the first chapter, I have provided a sociopolitical and historical contextualization of homosexuality in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US. I have also included relevant terminology that I use throughout this research. Chapter 2 discusses the relevant theories that serve as guiding principles in relation to discourse analysis and the understanding of the *Other* (e.g., homosexual). Chapter 3 sheds light on relevant literature that informs the analysis in chapters 5 and 6. This literature review focuses on hate speech, homophobic discourse, stereotyping, and discourse analysis. In Chapter 4, I describe the research methodology used for this dissertation including research questions, data collection, data analysis, analytic framework, and description of the texts collected for analysis. Chapters 5 and 6 analyze the collected data in

Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US, focusing on two substantive and rhetorical axes.

Chapter 7 summarizes the findings in this dissertation and discusses the theoretical implications in the fields of language, sexuality, and social justice.

## CHAPTER 2

### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS

This study is theoretically grounded in Teun van Dijk's approach to discourse analysis and informed by theories about the normalization of genocidal practices as well as the dehumanization of the *Other* proposed by Zygmunt Bauman. In this chapter, I provide a description of these theoretical foundations and explain their relevance to my research.

#### **Discursive Construction of Hate**

Teun van Dijk is a discourse analyst and linguist who has worked on various research studies related to discourse and its relationship with ideology, knowledge, racism, and history, among other sociocultural and political elements of discrimination and dominance. In one of his studies, van Dijk (1993) analyzed different spoken and written texts of white elites who not only took advantage of their status and positions as scholars, journalists, politicians, and lawmakers but were also able to rationalize many strategies of racial discrimination. This study of elite discourse and racism provided a systematic categorization and approach to discriminatory texts in order to enhance our understanding of the complex phenomenon of racism. This categorization (see Chapter 4) has informed my research process from the perspectives of approaching, collecting, and analyzing homophobic discourse texts. Furthermore, theoretical elements of racism and discourse analysis in van Dijk's (1993) study are relevant, appropriate, and applicable to my research because they provide a conceptual scheme that will allow me to approach, analyze, compare, and understand discriminatory texts. Homophobia, racism, sexism, anti-Semitism, and any other expressions of marginalization and discrimination share psychological, social, political, and even religious components that are interchangeable across theoretical analyses of these various issues.

I would underscore here that discourse analysis serves concurrently as both a theoretical framework and a methodological approach in my dissertation study. Thus, the chapters on theoretical framework and methodology reveal a mutually constitutive relationship that cannot be disaggregated. While this is an original feature of my dissertation, the focus and subject matter of my study wholly indicate its suitability.

### **Discursive Discrimination and Elite Discourse**

Homophobia and other types of discrimination can take place as overt phenomena, as displayed in right-wing tabloids. However, they can also manifest themselves in more subtle ways that are often difficult to categorize as tangible acts of discrimination. In terms of racism, blatant racial discrimination includes white supremacist ideologies and violent acts of repression, whereas subtle discrimination can happen in humorous interactions and informal conversations in different social, political, or academic fields and contexts (van Dijk, 1999). The same considerations can be applied to blatant homophobia and homophobic hate crimes and outspoken legislators and religious leaders who are opposed to equal rights for LGBTQ individuals (Whillock & Slayden, 1995), on the one hand, and subtle forms of discrimination in everyday conversations, comments, opinions, media advertisements, attitudes, and other marginalizing acts against homosexuals. This clarification is relevant because, as we will see, overt homophobic discourse and violent acts against homosexuals were evident in Nazi Germany; however, in the US, homophobia has taken various forms across a spectrum of subtle homophobic remarks to more tangible displays of hatred (Carter, 2004; Eskridge, 2008). Van Dijk (1993, p. 6) explains:

Many of both the subtly and blatantly racist events that define the system of everyday racism are enacted, controlled or condoned by white elites, that is, by leading politicians, professors, editors, judges, officials, bureaucrats, and managers. If whites are not involved in these modern forms of segregation, exclusion, aggression, inferiorization, or marginalization, then their involvement in the problem of racism consists in the passivity, their acquiescence, their ignorance, and their indifference regarding ethnic or racial inequality.

Media also play a vital role in the reproduction of hate towards minorities. This is evident in the prevailing political support for anti-minority ideologies, which translates into the dissemination of news targeting immigrants (van Dijk, 1993). The effects of this top-down discriminatory approach are inevitably negative for targeted minorities and individuals, as this thesis will reveal with regard to the propagation of hatred and inducement of hate crimes around lack of tolerance for different forms of sexual expression.

One last characteristic that is important to take into consideration when approaching elite discriminatory texts is how much of this discourse does not actually appear to be discriminatory. Van Dijk (1993, p. 8) explains: “It is this kind of racism that most elites reject. . . . That is, their denial of racism presupposes a definition of racism that conveniently excludes them as part of the problem.” In my theoretical analysis, I focus on the links between this at times opaque homophobic discourse and related social and cultural systems of discrimination, by situating each individual text within the broader social system of discrimination which it informs and in which it functions.

Just as it was one of the salient goals of van Dijk’s research (1993, p. 9) “to explore how elite racism enables the very reproduction of racism throughout society, namely, by what we call the preformulation of popular forms of racism,” I explore in my research how in both historical contexts, processes of homosexual dehumanization and pathologization were justified and normalized through discursive constructions of the *Other*. Considering that the majority of

manifestations of discrimination (e.g., homophobia, racism, sexism, anti-Semitism) are mostly discursive, my analysis focuses on the reproduction of hatred and discrimination through different types of text and talk within the broader sociopolitical and religious contexts of both Nazi Germany and the US in the 1950s (van Dijk, 1993). It is van Dijk's (1993) contention that elites have easy access to venues for popular discourse and, consequently, can create a mainstream consensus that, in the end, reinforces minority vulnerability and marginalization.

I would clarify here that the term *elite* refers to groups (e.g., social, political, state, military) that hold special power resources that influence decisions and ideological positionings of members of mainstream society regarding income, knowledge, expertise, rank, status, prestige, respect, and influence (Bottomore, 1993; Stanworth & Giddens, 2001). Van Dijk (1993) further differentiates between *elites* and *symbolic elites*. Symbolic elites (e.g., clergy, the press, academics) may not play as great a role as elites in the decision-making process (or the legislature) in a society. Nevertheless, symbolic elites do play a fundamental role in accessing and controlling public discourse across domains of influence, a role that could prove dispositive in swaying public opinion and abetting or obstructing the reproduction of hatred. Elite social groups can influence the actions and minds of other people through implicit actions or more concrete discursive speech acts of commands, orders, persuasion and advice (Austin, 1974). It is therefore important to acknowledge that these social elites have a great amount of power as a result of the access they have to venues of public discourse. This dominance of the public conversation allows control and reproduction of discriminatory personal beliefs and social ideologies against minorities as well as the manipulation of people's minds (van Dijk, 1993). All of this can and will be evidenced in excerpts from German and US policy texts and press publications.

## Theoretical Dimensions of Discrimination

For the type of analysis required of the various texts considered in my research, my theoretical framework is informed by different academic fields such as discourse analysis, history, cognitive and social psychology, linguistics, political science, and sociology. Hatred and discrimination based on race, gender, religion, and most especially sexuality are complex, and as a result they need to be analyzed from different academic perspectives, as a significant aspect of their hateful nature is that they do not operate within narrow pre-established paradigm boundaries of discrimination (van Dijk, 1993).

Categorization, stereotyping, and prejudice towards minorities are common elements in homophobia and other types of discriminatory practices. Categorization presumes that the targeted individual belongs to a different group, the *Other* (Bauman, 2002; Fone, 2000). The *Other* is often seen and portrayed with negative characteristics that are then used to generalize about all minority groups (Bauman, 1993). For racists, elements of cognition, psychology, geography, culture, society, and physiology serve to categorize and segregate whites from non-whites. For homophobes, these same discriminatory elements are applicable, in addition to features of masculinity or femininity related to the various individual, social, sexual, and professional attributes that men and women respectively were expected to display and perform in their societies (Boswell, 1980; Eskridge, 2008). While these prejudices and societal standards are still evident in our contemporary societies, this study focuses only on how masculinity was defined, embodied, symbolized, and represented during two specific historical eras. Prejudice and discrimination are linked together as sociocultural norms and values of the dominant groups. Consequently, van Dijk (1993) suggests that for this type of theoretical framework it is necessary

to study how the reproduction of ideologies, attitudes, values, and norms takes place in and through group practices.

Group power can be considered as a form of control. Being part of the dominant group implies that its members can have control over the *Others*. Power and control are defined by social elements such as privilege, income, education, better housing, and access to better jobs. It is fundamental to look at the discursive practices of dominance and control used by Nazi and US political leaders in order to understand how it was possible for these dominant individuals and groups to control the minds of others through persuasive discourse and how those societies allowed the dehumanization and pathologization of homosexuals, in particular (van Dijk, 1993).

The reproduction of racism is intended to keep white individuals and groups in power so that they can exert control and dominance over other social groups. Preventing homosexuals from achieving access to power was vital for both Nazi and US power elites (Eskridge, 2008; Giles, 2002). Control is evident through “forms of oppression, suppression, exclusion, or marginalization of out-group members by in-group members” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 24). Moreover, discriminatory actions perpetuate racist power if they are informed by prejudiced ideologies and attitudes leading to negative actions and consequences against minorities.

### **Linguistic Strategies of Hate**

The notion of reproduction implies the “duplication of existing objects” (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). This means that social reproduction involves the continuation or multiplication of certain sociocultural structures as active processes. With regard to discrimination, its reproduction is a social process that continues to be implemented with the same or stronger (negative) beliefs and prejudices. Van Dijk (1993, p. 26) considers micro-macro (bottom-up) and macro-micro (top-bottom) aspects where “dominant group members acquire prejudices and learn

to discriminate because of their knowledge of the social system of ethnic or racial inequality. In other words, this system of inequality is being reproduced by all arrangements, structures, social cognitions, and actions that contribute to its historical continuity.” This means that those dominant group members with access to power and control also have the opportunity to contribute to, oppose, or reproduce hatred.

My theoretical framework aims to explore how German Nazis and US individuals with access to greater power and mechanisms of dominance perpetrated the social and cognitive reproduction of homophobia through the use of discursive strategies aimed to persuade an entire society to criminalize and pathologize homosexuality. However, the reproduction of hatred is not solely dependent on the macro-micro structures because it is also influenced by shared group norms, values, ideologies, and attitudes (social cognition):

It is at this crucial point where social cognition establishes the important missing link between individuals and society, between individual opinions and social attitudes, and hence between discourse and racism. Thus, the reproduction of the system of racism presupposes the reproduction of its social cognitions, for instance, through processes of inference, learning, and sharing with the group. These socio-cognitive processes are essentially implemented by public discourse and communication. (van Dijk, 1993, p. 27)

Thus, at the same time as I will undertake to elucidate the strategies of the oppressors in perpetrating these hateful ideologies, I will also seek to explore how the hideous beliefs that undergirded their ideologies became palatable, absorbed into the commonplace zeitgeists of their times.

### **Mental Structures, Beliefs, and Ideologies**

Personal beliefs are relevant aspects of how a speaker or a writer can choose to express themselves about particular minority individuals or groups with whom they may not identify or against whom they may want to discriminate. The beliefs of a speaker/writer can be manifested

in the lexical, syntactical, or semantic choices in which they express their ideas. In other words, an idea can be uttered in several ways, with an implicit or explicit discriminatory message depending on the linguistic choices and beliefs of the speaker/writer (van Dijk, 1993).

Another strategy is positive self-presentation (see Chapter 3) as a way to avoid negative inferences (Arkin, Appelman, & Burger, 1980; van Dijk, 1999). In this case, speakers use a double strategy in which a positive self-presentation is followed by a negative other presentation (e.g., “I have nothing against homosexuals but . . .”), creating a positive image of the speaker and immediately introducing a negative comment about a minority. There are other textual and contextual elements that can signal the beliefs of speakers such as intonation (which can signal dislike or sympathy, for example), word choice, body language, and facial expressions. At a semantic macrostructural level of discourse analysis, it could be possible to understand how such beliefs are organized into memory. Macro structures (themes and topics) reveal how propositions are ordered in terms of hierarchical level of importance and relevance (van Dijk, 1993). The structure of a narrative, for example, reveals how a sequence of events is organized, presented, and represented by the teller. Argumentation, which is often associated with the press, reveals the social beliefs and attitudes of journalists. At a more superficial syntactic level, the way in which sentences and the lexicon are organized and expressed can show how a speaker feels and thinks about a specific topic. For example, in the sentence “Immigrants take away our jobs,” the placement of *immigrants* in the subject position reveals the high level of agency ascribed to the group in the production of the perceived societal problem, according to the speaker’s understanding:

Thus, many properties of the expression level of discourse may be interpreted as signals of underlying meaning, perspective, interaction strategies, persuasion tactics, and opinions or attitudes. This exactly what language users do themselves: Aside from their enormous repertoire of knowledge and beliefs, both personal and social, about the present

situation, context, or topic, they have only these expressions or surface characteristics as ‘data’ for the processes of interpretation. (van Dijk, 1993, p. 34)

Finally, at a broader level, ideologies play an important role in the construction of social norms, values, and attitudes because ideologies “represent the mental embodiment of the fundamental social, economic, and/or cultural goals and interests of a group” (van Dijk, 1993, p. 40). Homophobic ideologies have been present in different religious and political systems, and therefore, violence, condemnation, and disdain towards homosexuals have been common social principles associated with those particular groups.

### **Bauman: The Texture of Hatred and Dehumanization**

Zygmunt Bauman’s research on the notion of the *Other* and the *normality of evil* represents the second theoretical framework that will be used to analyze and understand the data I have collected. Bauman (2002) was a Polish sociologist who explored the simultaneous uniqueness and normality of the Holocaust and discussed its various sociopolitical consequences in modernity. Bauman also explored the notion of the construction of the *Other*, a useful term for excavating how governments and societies have distanced themselves from individuals who are different and who are generally viewed as inferior. Bauman suggested:

In dichotomies crucial for the practice and the vision of social order the differentiating power hides as a rule behind one of the members of the opposition. The second member is but the other of the first, the opposite in social order and power relationships, the opposite (degraded, suppressed, exiled) side of the first and its creation. (Bauman 2002, p.13)

*Others* are described, portrayed, and presented by powerful perpetrators as strangers and aliens who manifest qualities that are different from the elites, not conducive to the social fabric of society, and therefore not wanted. In the case of homosexuals, they are purported to lack masculinity, manifest mental illness, and display perverse practices (Weeks, 1981). In the context of my study, it is important to remember that Hitler promoted the Aryans as a superior

race, which also involved developing a prototype of a strong and masculine physical appearance for all German men. In this way, Nazi men (assumed to be heterosexual) were expected to resemble muscular, athletic, and virile male bodies as well as accentuate Aryan face features (Large, 2007). Men who did not fit these physical and psychological criteria were more likely to be classified as homosexuals.

### **The Normalization of Hatred**

Following Bauman (2007), the Holocaust was a normal phenomenon that was made possible for a variety of reasons, even though events associated with the Holocaust had not previously taken place in Germany. These events were not familiar—on the contrary, the Holocaust was novel and unfamiliar. The normality of the Holocaust refers to a situation “in keeping with everything we know about our civilization, its guiding spirit, its priorities, its immanent vision of the world—and of the proper ways to pursue human happiness together with a perfect society” (Bauman, 2002, p. 8). What is most concerning is that because of the Holocaust’s putative normality, Bauman claimed that such a catastrophe can happen again elsewhere given a similar constellation of circumstances. Bauman’s words serve as a warning to leaders, educators, and linguists about the importance of conducting research that will allow further understanding of the implications of hate discourse in modern societies. Failure to heed could potentially allow dominant groups, including elites, to once again *pervert*, through discourse, the minds of susceptible individuals to justify segregation, discrimination, and hateful acts towards homosexuals and other vulnerable minorities. For Bauman (2002), Auschwitz was a creation of humans just as was the project to land a human on the moon. Consequently, it is imperative to understand how discourse and language have been used against vulnerable

minorities in different historical periods where atrocities have been perpetrated, in order to prevent similar debacles from occurring in the future.

In our current era, one can still observe and witness the challenges of LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer) individuals around the world (M. L. Weiss & Bosia, 2017). For example, in the Republic of Chechnya in Russia, the hatred of Chechnya's leader towards homosexuals is evident in his ideology and discourse. Hence, the Chechen police and some homophobic citizens can justify their inhumane abuse of homosexuals in that country because their leader encourages and promotes homophobic violence through his speeches (Rainsford, 2017) Similar hateful atrocities are happening in Uganda where Yoweri Museveni, Uganda's president, signed into law a bill that criminalizes certain homosexual acts with a penalty of life imprisonment (Karimi & Thompson, 2014). This underscores the importance of continuing to research and analyze how the process of *perversification* of humans was—and still is—made possible, and, most concerningly, how hatred is normalized and justified through discursive practices of dominant groups.

Another important theoretical consideration that serves to explain the proliferation of crimes of hatred in Nazi Germany and the US pertains to the perpetuation of social, cultural, and political ideologies that allow violence to flourish without protection for vulnerable minorities. Blass (2009) maintains that moral inhibitions against the perpetration of violent atrocities are relaxed once three conditions are present singly or together: (a) authorization of violence by official orders; (b) routinizing of actions by the authorities, and (c) dehumanization of the victims of violence (Kelman, 1973). Milgram's research has shown that it is much harder to harm someone you touch than it is to cause pain in someone whom you see in the distance or whom you can only hear. Responsibility for pain is created when there is close contact between

the victim and the perpetrator. These findings by Blass (2009) were formulated theoretically as the inverse ratio of readiness to commit cruelty and proximity to victims. This was evident, at least in Nazi Germany, when Nazis distanced homosexuals and Jews from non-targeted German citizens. Targeted groups, such as homosexuals, were segregated and placed in camps, in part to create a void between the victims and the masses whose acquiescence was being cultivated.

### **Dehumanizing the *Other***

To achieve their despicable agendas, those perpetrating injustices against vulnerable or nonconformist individuals and groups need to initiate processes leading to the dehumanization and pathologization of the *Other*. Dehumanization is often associated with the humiliation of victims in concentration camps, in which human beings are reduced to the most basic levels of primitive survival, preventing them from having human dignity and displaying traits recognizable as human. Nevertheless, Blass (2009) suggested that although these manifestations of dehumanization are the most sensational and vile, it is more instructive to focus on the more universal and widespread manifestations of dehumanization in which bureaucratic actions are reduced to a set of quantitative measures (Blass, 2009).

In his text *Anti-Semite and Jew*, Sartre (1946) made a series of arguments that further explain how the notion of the *Other* is a necessary one to develop as a mechanism for creating an oppositional classification that allows one to elevate oneself as one subjugates another. For the anti-Semite, the Jew is necessary in order to feel superior. Without the Jew, anti-Semites would find themselves as concierges or shopkeepers in a hierarchical society. Their self-value as French citizens (in the case of Sartre's mid-20th-century society) would be depreciated because everyone else would possess these same mundane citizenship characteristics. As Sartre (1946, p. 28) puts it, "The anti-Semite is in the unhappy position of having a vital need for the very enemy

he wishes to destroy.” For the anti-Semite to be of superior value as a human, they must see themselves refracted in a being who is less than human. Sartre concluded:

We are now in position to understand the anti-Semite. He is a man who is afraid. Not of the Jews, to be sure, but of himself, of his consciousness, of his liberty, of his instincts, of his responsibilities, of solitariness, of change, of society, and of the world—of everything except the Jews. He is a coward who does not want to admit his cowardice to himself; a murderer who represses and censures his tendency to murder without being able to hold it back, yet who dares to kill only in effigy or protected by the anonymity of the mob; a malcontent who dares not revolt from fear of the consequences of his rebellion . . . Anti-Semitism, in short, is the fear of the human condition. (Sartre, 1946, pp. 53–54)

### **Defining the *Other***

For this section, and most specifically the definition of the *Other*, the reader is advised that personal pronouns (and also possessive adjectives) are used with the purpose of differentiating elites from vulnerable individuals. As previously explained, van Dijk (1993, 2010) suggests the use of pronouns as a discursive strategy to distance oneself from the minorities or the individuals that are often discriminated against. Thus, *I, we, my, me our* will refer to the elites; and *he, she, they, his, her, their, them* refer to the *Other*. Bauman (1993) uses these pronouns while keeping in mind this context of segregation and exclusion. The notion of the *Other* is appropriate to this research because it provides a theoretical understanding of how homosexuals were seen, understood, and treated in the historical periods studied. In this section, I discuss Bauman’s (1993) explanation of why homosexuals have been categorized as a separate group of individuals who do not conform to the societal heteronormative ideology and are therefore otherized.

The preceding implies that we take for granted the existence of others around us and we do not question their existence unless we *misunderstand* each other. In this manner, understanding is natural and normal, whereas misunderstanding is unnatural and abnormal. When misunderstandings occur over differences, we call for explanations to make sense of these

differences and to understand why the *Other* is not like us. These terms of normality and abnormality have been used historically to refer to heterosexual and homosexual men respectively (Fone, 2000; Weeks, 1981). Ussher (1955, as cited in Bauman, 1993, p. 147) claims that “the world as a world is only revealed to me when things go wrong.” This means that it is only when the *Other* behaves or looks oddly that we notice them and, consequently, need to think of their unusual existence in relation to our lives and spaces. This is a time when we are able to focus on the *Other* because their differences are set in relief—not ones that I am used to seeing, hearing, and experiencing. The awareness of these characteristics is knowledge that allows me to distance myself from the *Other*.

Bauman (1993) differentiates between the intimacy pole and the anonymity pole. The intimacy pole refers to the idea that I know the *Other* because I have been in proximity with them, although I do not necessarily interact with them. The intimacy pole assumes that I am aware of the existence of the *Other* and their proximity to me because I have experienced, seen, or heard them. Conversely, the anonymity pole reveals a truly anonymous *Other*, an outsider—apart, distant, almost unrecognizable: “The farther away they are from the intimacy pole, the more other humans become strangers” (p. 149). People who do not know what to expect from strangers do not want to engage with them, because of anxiety related to fear of the unknown.

### **Aliens Versus Neighbors**

Physical and social proximity overlap and are closely related to each other. Humans sharing social and physical spaces may claim a feeling of familiarity with one another. Familiarity refers to the knowledge we have of others, although it does not necessarily imply that we trust them, seek their friendship, or are ready to bond in a group of unity and loyalty. A *neighborhood* is a physical space where I may not know anyone, but I am aware of the existence

of the neighbors. In other words, a *neighborhood* is characterized by the absence of aliens, or strangers. These features of physical and social proximity are historical and political elements that have characterized the segregation, dehumanization, and criminalization of homosexuals in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US. Historically, homophobic ideologies have always attempted to separate homosexuals from their societies and keep them apart. This would explain, in part, why homosexuals have generally been socially hidden and have needed to *come out* to their friends, family, and colleagues to tell them who they really are (Wickberg, 2000). *Coming out* is a term that denotes the disclosure of an individual's sexuality because the norm is that men like women and women like men and, consequently, each one exhibits practices that are consonant with these prescribed preferences (American Psychiatric Association, 2018).

Others, then, can also be categorized as *aliens*. For an alien to enter our social and physical proximity, they have to be perceived as one of (a) an enemy to be fought and expelled; (b) a temporary guest to be confined to special quarters and rendered harmless by strict monitoring and isolation; or (c) a neighbor-to-be, in which case they have to be rendered like a neighbor, that is, to behave as neighbors do (Bauman, 1993, p. 150). However, humans have simplified the approach to others because humans have not internalized rules to deal with aliens. Because the distinction between neighbors and aliens is no longer possible, the distinction becomes a matter of humans versus aliens. Aliens are beyond any known rules and norms because humans cannot accept what they do not know, what does not behave in a way they are used to. Therefore, because aliens are not recognizable, they deserve no compassion (Bauman, 1993).

Compounding this problem is the circumstance that aliens are here to stay. Aliens do not want to go back to where they belong. They may seem approachable and do not look dangerous,

making it difficult to ascertain with certainty that they will not pose us any danger. However, aliens are not like our neighbors. Bauman (1993, p. 153) further explains:

The most striking and off-putting trait of strangers is that they are *neither* neighbors *nor* aliens. Or, rather—confusingly, disturbingly, terrifyingly—they are (or may be—who knows?) both. Neighborly aliens. Alien neighbors. In other words, *strangers*. That is, socially distant yet physically close. The aliens within physical reach. Neighbors outside social reach. Inhabitants of no man’s land—a space wither normless or marked with too few rules to make orientation possible. Agents and objects of an intercourse which for that reason is doomed to remain disconcertingly erratic, hazardous, with no assurance or success.

The only solution to this predicament is to be able to master the art of *mismeeting* (Martin Buber’s term, *Vergegnung*, as distinct from meeting, *Begegnung*). Mastering the art of mismeeting allows us to place the strangers in the background. This does not make them disappear and we know that they are still present in the background, but this does not impact the spaces we live in because the stranger may be conveniently disattended to or ignored. Mastering the art of mismeeting involves avoiding eye contact, and although we may eventually glance at them, our look should not invite them to look back: Looking does not justify reciprocity (Bauman, 1993). According to Bauman, cities are places where mismeetings happen all the time because it is impossible to live without aliens surrounding us:

The problem of modern society is not how to eliminate strangers, but how to live in their constant company—that is, under the condition of cognitive paucity, indetermination and uncertainty. . . . The endemic uncertainty which the presence of strangers cannot but keep galvanizing finds its outlet in the continuous efforts to gain control over social spacing—that is, to confine and regiment freedom of the strangers and altogether “keep them where they belong.” (Bauman, 1993, p. 159)

Moreover, the stranger stereotype suggests that they are negligent, sexually promiscuous, dishonest, and emotionally unstable, that they lack objective judgment, and that they are unpredictable in the manner in which they will react to us, making them a danger to society that must be contained to the extent permissible: “If only they could be confined to the outer fringes

of social space, perhaps the outsiders could take all the rest of ambivalence, scattered all over the place, with them . . .” (Bauman, 1993, p. 162). In my dissertation, I study one such containment strategy, rendered exponentially more lethal by the repressive ideologies that characterized each of the historical periods in which the respective reprehensible actions that constitute my thesis data were embedded.

### **Summary**

This chapter discussed the theoretical underpinnings of my research study, which focuses on the discursive construction of hate and the normalization of hatred. The discursive construction of hate refers to the different rhetorical strategies that are common in the reproduction and dissemination of discrimination and the justification of homosexual pathologization and criminalization (van Dijk, 1993). The other component explains the normalization of hatred and sheds light on how the *Other* (homosexual) is defined, understood, and dehumanized (Bauman, 1993).

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first section provides definitions of terminology related to hate speech and homophobic discourse and lays out implications of hate speech within a broader sociocultural setting. Considering that stereotypes were a salient substantive strategy used by Americans and Nazis in their diatribes against homosexuals, the second section examines the negative sociocultural consequences of stereotyping and how its use instigates discrimination and marginalization in relation to societal gender and sexual orientation norms. Finally, the third section discusses how different discursive practices are closely related and have served as a way to discriminate and disseminate hatred against minority individuals and groups. Collectively the literature discussed in this chapter serves to situate my research within a broader historical, sociocultural, and political context.

#### **Hate Speech and Homophobic Discourse**

This section explains the ways in which hate speech and homophobic discourse are defined and evidenced at sociopolitical, cultural, and rhetorical levels.

#### **Hate Speech: Definition**

Hate speech can be broadly defined as offensive speech directed against minorities in overt or subtle forms. Overt hate speech can include vulgar expletives based on race, gender, or religion whereas subtle forms can be found in television, books, media, or other images that degrade minorities (Wolfson, 1997). Another definition proposed by Whillock (1995, p. 32) suggests that “hate speech seeks to move an audience by creating a symbolic code for violence. Its goals are to inflame the emotions of followers, denigrate the designated out-class, inflict permanent and irreparable harm to the opposition, and ultimately conquer.” Weber (2009) points

out that there is no universally accepted definition of hate speech, but suggests the definition provided by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers:

Hate Speech shall be understood as covering all forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin. In this sense, hate speech covers comments which are necessarily directed against a person or a particular group of persons. (Weber, 2009, p. 3)

It is worth noting that the previous definition does not consider gender or sexuality explicitly as an expression of hate. For this reason, it is important to consider homophobic discourse as part of the umbrella term of hate speech (see Homophobic discourse below).

### **Implications of Hate Speech**

For Whillock (as cited in Whillock & Slayden, 1995) there are several rhetorical strategies that orators can use in their political speeches to effectively transmit, and persuade their followers to adopt, their hatred towards a specific minority group. One of the reasons to use hate in political discourse is that politicians, seeking victory in their campaigns, appeal to hateful strategies to win the support of people against minorities. However, the use of hatred as a political discursive tool has myriad consequences for the minority groups who are put in vulnerable and oppressed positions. Hate speech psychologically harms its victims by dehumanizing, humiliating, and diminishing their existence, as dehumanization inexorably transforms someone into something and finally into nothing (Gilreath, 2011). It can also encourage haters to physically abuse minorities and, most importantly, it reawakens the struggles that certain groups of people experienced in the past as if those struggles are still present. According to Delgado and Stefancic (1997), hate speech has more serious consequences than stereotyping because of its psychological, sociological, and political effects. As mentioned

before, hate speech actually harms its victims. Hate speech not only acts as a social poison that threatens the peace of society, but also intensifies the power of hatred until gradually it starts to become a normal, day-to-day practice (Waldron, 2012). Hate speech puts people's dignity at risk and when they go into the streets of their communities attempting to carry on with their lives, interacting with other members of society and making use of the same public spaces, the oppressed find that they are treated differently: "A person's dignity is not just some Kantian aura. It is their social standing, the fundamentals of basic reputation that entitle them to be treated as equals in the ordinary operations of society" (Waldron, 2012, p. 5). It is here that hate speech plays a significant role in undermining people's dignity. It often associates individuals with degrading ethnic, religious, racial, or gender characteristics, disqualifying them from being treated as equal members in society (Waldron, 2012).

### **Homophobic Discourse**

*Homophobia* is a culturally contingent term that can be cross-culturally applied only in Western communities (Wickberg, 2000). In this way, *homophobia* expresses more about the people who have created and used the term than about the people whom the word describes (Wickberg, 2000).

George Weinberg defined homophobia as "the dread of being in close quarters with homosexuals" (Altman, 1982, p. 63). Weinberg (as cited in Altman, 1982) entertained the following reasons for homophobia: (a) the concept of repression as articulated by Freud, or in other words, the secret fear of being a homosexual; (b) a perceived threat to established values; and (c) the inability to accept individuals living outside the norms of traditional family and procreation. Homophobia has led people to justify different physical, social, and psychological forms of discrimination against homosexuals (Kantor, 2009; Sedgwick, 1990). A common

argument of homophobes is that homosexuality is a disease and that it is their moral obligation, as heterosexuals, to protect their children from this illness (Altman, 1982). Leap (2010, p. 180) defines homophobia as “expressions of disdain, disgust or hatred for persons who are homosexual or are believed by others to be homosexual.” The preceding definition acknowledged the idea that homophobia is the result of three interrelated themes that were proposed by Herek (2004, as cited in Leap [2010], p. 180): stigma, heterosexism, and sexual prejudice. Leap (2010, p. 181) proposed that “the use of homophobic invectives in any type of written text or spoken discourse to invoke disdain, disgust or hatred towards homosexuals enables stigma, heterosexism and sexual prejudice.”

The main concern with the use of homophobic invectives is that they can be accompanied by physical violence or they can be used as part of a broader context of discriminatory practices related to gender, race, ethnicity, or nationality (Leap, 2010; Provencher, 2010). Murray (2009, as cited in Leap, 2010, p.182) argued that homophobia is not caused by irrational fear of homosexuals but rather is a “socially produced form of discrimination located within relations of inequality” which is deeply embedded in broader terms of discourse (Leap, 2010). In that context, some authors have maintained that homophobic discourses can sometimes be considered and read as neutral discursive materials due to processes of *entextualization*. The process of *entextualization* suggests that the given meaning of homophobic messages is dependent on how messages are associated with particular narratives and which participants make these associations (or not) during the linguistic moment (Leap, 2010). Consequently, Leap (2010, p. 183) concluded “that homophobic messages have to be studied as messages that are in formation” because the interpretation of these messages is formed by the linguistic text at sites that are not limited to the details of the text.

Another important element in homophobic discourse is the misconception that words do not harm individuals. If language is used effectively in combination with kinesics, discrimination and hatred can be delivered with a smile or a soft voice (Gilreath, 2011). Gilreath explains that “first, there is an innuendo set buzzing by the powerful. Then, there is targeted propaganda. Mere words developed into physical violence. First, the victims are robbed of their humanity—that is essential—and, finally, they are robbed of their lives” (p. 115). This highlights the importance of underscoring how words and language can have dehumanizing, segregating, and violent effects on marginalized individuals as well as the relevance of my research in understanding how language served as a channel to normalize hatred and dehumanization in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US. All of this is to acknowledge that words are not isolated. Words can become ideologies and be instantiated into defamation laws, that could justify hatred and violence against homosexuals or any other minority group:

Conceptualizing speech as harm—understanding that words do not operate in a vacuum—is paramount importance to any egalitarian theory of speech that matters. Words do not operate in a vacuum but rather are inevitable by plugged into a social context. That context is often determinative of when words are words *only* and when they move beyond *mere words* to constitute actions—dehumanization, degradation, and subjugation. Social context is inseparable from power hierarchy that everywhere operates in and through that same context. (Gilreath, 2011, p. 129)

To contextualize and understand the discursive consequences of homophobic discourse, Provencher (2010) describes a critical political event in France that illustrates homophobic discourse more specifically in the context of discourse analysis, media, and politics. During the celebrations of the *Nuit Blanche* (Sleepless Night) in Paris on October 5, 2002, Bertrand Delanoë, mayor of the city, was seriously injured after Azedine Berkane stabbed him in the abdomen. Although Mr. Delanoë was publicly known to be gay, the French media and other politicians did not refer to this incident as a homophobic attack or a hate crime. Berkane said that

he “disliked *politicians* and *homosexuals*” and was described by the media as a pathetic guy or an unemployed webmaster who still lived with his parents at the age of 39. The incident was overwhelmingly covered from the perspective that Berkane attacked a politician. However, little attention was given to the fact that the aggressor also stated his disdain for homosexuals (Provencher, 2010). It was also suggested that the way the media and the government reacted to this incident did not reflect a genuine concern for the fact that Berkane expressed his hatred towards homosexuals. Provencher (2010, p. 292) wondered whether the order in which Berkane syntactically organized his sentence had any effect on the way hearers interpreted his crime: “Would it have caused the same effect if Berkane had said: I dislike homosexuals and politicians?” For others, it seemed that the two words (*homosexual* and *politician*) were not necessarily related for carrying out this hate crime. Halliday (1978) stated: “Any unspoken utterance or silence represents a message that the hearer decodes pragmatically—based on an established semiotic system—at the moment of the exchange.” Similarly, Butler (1997) suggested that to measure the perlocutionary effects of an utterance, it is important to focus on the hearer’s interpretation. In other words, Provencher (2010, p. 293) entertained the idea that “homophobic formation operates at the intersection of co-participants in speech acts and intention emerges cooperatively from how others read and respond to Berkane’s message.” Homophobic discourse, in this specific case, was represented by silence, denial, and lack of condemnation. These are rhetorical strategies that can be used by elites and symbolic elites (in van Dijk’s terms) to discriminate against, dehumanize, and criminalize vulnerable minorities.

To conclude, homophobic discourse does not necessarily have to be expressed through blatant comments against homosexuals. The unfortunate incidents in Paris as well as the persecution of homosexuals in Nazi Germany and the US serve as proof that powerful societal

and political institutions play a critical role in the construction of discursive hatred against homosexuals (or any other minorities) and, most importantly, that words have power and can harm people.

### **Masculinity and Stereotyping**

This section discusses research on stereotyping, masculinity, and gender performativity. Stereotyping was a salient substantive strategy used to categorize and understand homosexuals in the two historical contexts about which the data were collected.

#### **Stereotyping**

The notion of masculinity has shaped and legitimized homosexual stereotypes. Stereotypes are oversimplified ideas, notions, and concepts that are believed to be true and that serve to group and categorize individuals, places, or things based on particular physical, religious, ethnic, economic, sexual, or other sociocultural characteristics (Fone, 2000). Cook and Cusack (2010, p. 9) present another definition, suggesting that stereotypes are “generalized views or preconceptions of attributes or characteristics possessed by members of a particular group such as women, gays or adolescents.” This view presupposes that members of these groups perform specific roles or possess particular attributes. It does not matter if members of these groups perform in such a predetermined way or not or if they have these characteristics or not, because stereotypes generalize attributes to everyone who is part of a determined group. The word *stereotype* comes from the Greek words *stereos* (solid) and *typos* (mold). Categorization is a human process that has been used to simplify the understanding and processing of the various aspects surrounding us as well as the classification of the many complex characteristics and attributes that people have. Similarly, stereotypes have been used as a way to categorize individuals in heterogeneous groups based on gender, skin color, age, language, religion, and

sexual orientation, among other sociocultural and physical criteria (Cook & Cusack, 2010; Fone, 2000). The problem with stereotyping is that stereotypes do not consider the needs and characteristics of a particular individual. A common stereotype is the idea that men are strong and that women must naturally become mothers. These stereotypes assume certain attributes and predispose expectations that certain individuals might not be able to satisfy because not every single man is strong and not every single woman desires to be a mother. Stereotypes can create a sense of not belonging because that particular man or woman does not fit these stereotypical criteria; therefore, they are ridiculed, discriminated against, bullied, and sometimes physically harmed. It is true that not all stereotypes are negative; however, they are stereotypes and function as such in terms of societal expectations.

According to Westwood (2000), there are many reasons why people use stereotypes. As mentioned earlier, stereotypes are used to define a category of people so as to make it easier to predict and understand individuals and their behavior. Differences make it challenging to process and understand human individuality. Therefore, stereotypes have been used as a way to simplify those differences and to group individuals with similar characteristics in large categories with the purpose of predicting behavior. The second reason for stereotyping is to define and assign difference (Westwood, 2000). Labeling allows us not to think of people's individual differences. Finally, people stereotype to dictate and script individuals' identities, prescribing attributes, roles, and behaviors to which men and women are expected to conform (Cook & Cusack, 2010). Prescriptive stereotyping is evident in government policies, laws, education, religion, and culture. The state's influence on sexuality suggests predetermined role expectations for men and women in order to codify them into static definitions and classifications of gender roles (Mac An Ghail, 2000; Westwood, 2000).

## **Discourse, Identity, and Categorization**

One salient element related to identity and language is categorization. Categories have been frequently used to group people and it was a common approach used in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US to classify homosexuals (Fone, 2000). However, categories are often largely related to the identity of an individual or a group of individuals. In addition, categorizations and identity can generally be the result of stereotyping. In the US, for example, people are categorized as Hispanics, Whites, Asians, among others. Categorization is relevant because it allows researchers to focus on the attributes and criteria used by institutions and governments to categorize individuals (De Fina, 2011). Language plays a vital role in conveying what kind of people we are, where we belong, or what our moral and ethical views are. Furthermore, language not only serves in the process of identifying ourselves but also in the process of identifying, judging, classifying, and aligning with others based on our similarities or differences (Bayley & Schechter, 2004; De Fina, 2011).

Identity is defined as “a property of the individual or as something that emerges through social interaction; it can be regarded as residing in the mind or in concrete social behavior; it can be anchored to the individual or to the group” (De Fina, 2011, p. 265). Identities are complex and plural as they can be individual, collective, social, or situational. Individual identities are concrete and specific (e.g., John Smith). Collective identities can be related to national or religious communities. Social identities involve large categories of belonging in regard to race, gender, and political affiliation (e.g., Latinos, Muslims, Liberals). Finally, situational identities are related to a specific context of interaction such as teacher/student or doctor/patient (Bayley & Schechter, 2003).

Language is closely related to identity and a big part of identity work is done through associations. Linguistically, sounds, words, expressions, and styles of discourse can be associated with qualities, ideas, situations, social representations, and entire ideologies (van Dijk, 2011). This is a phenomenon called *indexicality* in which linguistic and non-linguistic symbols *index* or identify social elements. Similarly, individual and collective identities are negotiated through dialogical processes, which suggests that identity is negotiated in opposition or complementarity with others. In other words, a person is not defined for who he or she is but for who they are not or who they are similar to (De Fina, 2011).

### **Gender Stereotypes**

Gender stereotypes are mostly interested in categorizing men and women from a social and cultural perspective based on their physical, social, biological, and sexual functions. Research has focused on the difference between sex and gender and its implication for identity. On the one hand, sex refers to biological constitution; on the other, gender is culturally constructed. Butler (1990) has argued that the binary conception of sexes should not dictate a strict binary understanding of genders because gender may not be restricted by sex. Consequently, gender is to be assumed as a free-floating artifice independent of sex, which Butler (1990) describes as gender performativity. Individuals often act and behave within the context of social norms; however, they can choose which norms and whether to break them, shift them, or reinvent them. Gender stereotypes also attempt to script how individuals should physically look, the professional occupations they should have, their social roles, their personality traits, and their sexual practices (Cook & Cusack, 2010). Nevertheless, as with general stereotypes, the problem with gender stereotyping is that it ignores the needs and the individuality of men and women. It is important to note that gendered identities are based on

social constructs of what it means to be a man (i.e., masculinity) and what it means to be a woman (i.e., femininity).

### **Homosexual Stereotypes**

During ancient times, there were certain notions of masculinity and femininity attributed to men and women based on their biological sex (Fone, 2000). There are many stereotypes that might describe the behavior of homosexuals. However, the most basic and popular stereotype associated with male homosexuals is the idea that they are effeminate (Altman, 1982). This stereotype was widely used by Nazis and Americans in the data I collected. It is worth noting that feminine traits in men were mostly seen as a threat to the notion of masculinity. Homosexual sex between men presupposes that idea that the individual who is penetrated will be in a position of submission, which is often the position that women are expected to have in a heterosexual sexual relationship (Martino, 2012). This is perhaps why effeminacy is commonly associated with homosexual men.

Another common stereotype that has been attributed to homosexual men is promiscuity. This stereotype has served for many homophobes as an excuse to justify their hatred of homosexuals by asserting that homosexuals are immoral, perverted pederasts who are doomed to lonely adulthoods (Altman, 1982). Another stereotype associated with homosexual men is that men tend to find random sexual partners in parks, toilets, movie theaters, and bathhouses. While there some truth to this stereotype, it is important to note that this behavior cannot be generalized to every single homosexual man. Crompton (2003) suggests that random sexual encounters can also lead to long-term relationships even though these relationships might not follow heteronormative ideas of partnering. The heteronormative view suggests that a man marries a woman, they have children, and they spend their lives together in marriage until one of them

dies. This concept of monogamy has served to stereotype and discriminate against homosexual relationships: in addition to the idea that homosexual men are promiscuous, two men cannot biologically have children and in many countries they cannot legally marry. Finally, homosexual sex is also associated with kinky sex, sex in public, and the use of illicit substances before, during, or after sex. These associations are often used as ways to judge gay men from the perspective of a heterosexual morality.

Once the nature and origin of these sexual stereotypes is understood, why they cannot be summoned to define homosexual or heterosexual relationships and practices becomes clear. Stereotypes were prominent discursive strategies used by Nazis and pre-Stonewall Americans, as will be illustrated in chapters 5 and 6.

### **Discourse and the Construction of Hate**

This section discusses research on the importance of discourse as a fundamental element in the construction of hate and discrimination against minorities. In particular, this section describes in more detail the theory necessary to understand and analyze the rhetorical devices that were more salient from the data in my dissertation: metaphors, presuppositions, and legitimizing strategies.

#### **Metaphors and Hate Speech**

Metaphors were a prominent linguistic device in the collected data from Nazi Germany. According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003), metaphors are linguistic elements that are pervasive in everyday life because they can influence language, thought, and action. In 1945, Burke (as cited in Cameron & Maslen, 2010, p. 3) defined a metaphor as “a device for seeing something in terms of something else.” According to Cameron and Maslen (2010, pp. 3-8), Burke’s definition is a good starting point, although metaphors need to be considered from different dimensions: (a)

*linguistic*: metaphors constitute language used by people in different social interactions; (b) *cognitive*: metaphors connect two different concepts through cognitive processes; (c) *affective*: metaphors often carry evaluations, values, attitudes, and beliefs so that they can express how people feel; (d) *sociocultural*: metaphors are the result of social interaction; and (e) *dynamic*: metaphors are selected, adapted, and used in conjunction with changes in society.

Lakoff and Johnson (2003) discuss the relevance of metaphors in discourse, claiming that concepts in our thoughts are not only part of our intellect but also part of our everyday functioning. Concepts help individuals to interact with others, to understand what is perceived, and to navigate around the world. Lakoff and Johnson claim that human thought processes are largely metaphorical. In the following examples of structural metaphors, it is evident how basic human and life concepts are translated into daily life functions: Argument is *war* (e.g., your claims are *indefensible*; he *attacked* every weak point in my argument; I never *won* an argument with him) or time is *money* (e.g., you are *wasting* my time; I don't have time to *give* you; you need to *budget* your time). These sentences show how money, for example, is presented and used as a commodity or how argument is seen as a linguistic battlefield. In the example of argument as war, individuals are not physically involved in a fight. However, arguments are understood, in many cultures, as something that one wins or loses with strategic remarks, comments, examples, evidence, and opinions. The same can be said about time as a commodity, because time is a limited resource that has been quantified (in Western cultures). Therefore, there are hourly wages, daily hotel room rates, 30-second television commercials, and annual loans. In addition, Lakoff and Johnson (2003) used Michael Reddy's metaphorical concept called the *conduit metaphor* to explain how language is structured by a complex metaphor in which ideas are objects, linguistic expressions are containers, and communication involves sending. In other

words, ideas (objects) are put into words (containers) and are sent to other hearers who will eventually take the ideas out of the containers.

According to Lakoff and Johnson (2003), metaphors are also orientational. This means that concepts and ideas are linked to spatial orientation such as up-down (e.g., prices are going *up*; I feel *down*), in-out (e.g., you are *out* of the game), front-back, on-off, central-peripheral. These ideas are influenced by cultures—for some cultures the future is in front of them whereas for others, the future is in the back. Furthermore, ontological metaphors allow individuals to understand concepts that are not necessarily spatial ideas (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Ontological metaphors allow individuals to experience and view events, activities, and ideas as entities and substances. For example, mind as machine (e.g., I'm a little *rusty* today; I have been working on this problem the whole day and I'm *running out of steam*), or *inflation* is an entity (e.g., inflation makes me *sick*; inflation is *lowering* our standard of living). In this way, Lakoff and Johnson (2003, p. 61) suggest that “structural metaphors allow us to do much more than just orient concepts, refer to them, quantify them, etc., as we do with simple orientational and ontological metaphors; they allow us, in addition, to use one highly structured and clearly delineated concept to structure another.” In other words, metaphors in general play a fundamental role in shaping the way people speak, experience, conceptualize, and function in daily life and with others. The authors claim that there are many concepts that need to be understood and defined metaphorically because concepts are more than simple words. People understand and experience words in terms of *systematic* metaphors. To exemplify their claim, the authors state that dictionaries can define terms such as *love*, for instance, as a feeling of fondness, infatuation, or affection. Nevertheless, the term is not defined metaphorically because, in general, people claim that *love* is madness or a journey:

What this suggests to us is that dictionary makers and other students of meaning have different concerns than we do. We are concerned primarily with how people understand their experiences. We view language as providing data that can lead to general principles of understanding. The general principles involve whole systems of concepts rather than individual words or individual concepts. We have found that such principles are often metaphoric in nature and involve understanding one kind of experiences in terms of another kind of experience. (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003, p. 116)

### **Identifying and Analyzing Metaphors**

Theories on metaphors and how to analyze them have been used in several research studies in order to understand how people who use metaphors think about their lives, because metaphors can help people express difficult or uncommon experiences. Metaphor analysis sheds light on how concepts reflect and shape thought patterns of individuals or communities (Cameron & Maslen, 2010). According to Cameron and Maslin, it is advisable to identify metaphors used to talk about a specific topic in order to postulate the underlying conceptual metaphors that are presumed to motivate their use. To identify metaphors, Cameron and Maslen (2010, p. 104) recommend that researchers (a) familiarize themselves with the data; (b) look for possible metaphors; (c) check each metaphor for its meaning in the discourse context, the existence of another, more basic meaning, an incongruity or contrast between these meanings, and a transfer from the basic to the contextual meaning; and (d) if these metaphors satisfy these requirements, code them as metaphors.

According to Cameron and Maslen (2010, p. 237), metaphors can be deliberate (i.e., clear metaphor), conventionalized (i.e., not prominent and possibly used as an idiomatic expression), clusters (i.e., two or more metaphors used in a short space of time within one text), and narrative (i.e., metaphors used as a way of conveying a storylike narrative). This analysis also allows the researcher to understand what metaphors hide and what is made evident. Identifying the topics that metaphors refer to is important because sometimes the topic is evident (Lakoff & Johnson,

2003), however, in many cases metaphors are used in such a way that the topic is not explicit.

The use of metaphors to convey hateful speech as means of implicit discourse is a common linguistic strategy for orators (Leap, 2010). The following serve as guiding questions for deciding the importance and relevance of metaphors (Cameron & Maslen, 2010, p. 129):

1. Which participants used these metaphors? All of them? Or only particular individuals?
2. Do all participants use the metaphors in the same way? Or do some disagree or resist the metaphors?
3. Do the metaphors singly or in combination carry evaluation or attitude? E.g., are they positive or negative? Are they highly emphatic?
4. What the nature of the metaphor trajectory? Did the metaphors all occur at a particular point in the discourse or are they scattered about?
5. How do the connected linguistic metaphors change with different uses?

Most specifically in the field of hate speech, it is important to note that there can be certain metaphors that are denigrating, insulting, or discriminatory, or that can be constituted as such (Leap, 2010). In Chapter 5, there are various examples of how Nazis used these rhetorical constructions to achieve such purposes. Some examples of such metaphors are the following in which homosexuality is considered to be *vermin* and a *poison*:

*I myself would appreciate if furthermore all crimes committed before entering the SS or the police would be covered by that new law as well. Such an action would be helpful for keeping away homosexual vermin from those Institutions.* (Policy Document 6, 1941)

*Their danger exceeds the imagination. 40% abnormal people, who we can afford to cast aside, are, if given the freedom, able to poison 2 million.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

### **Presuppositions**

In this study I found that presuppositions and the use of questions were salient rhetorical devices used by elites and symbolic elites to *perversify* people against homosexuals.

Presuppositions are propositions uttered by a speaker or producer of a text that the hearer or reader will take for granted. In other words, the truth of the utterances is implicitly assumed by the hearer or reader of the text (Fairclough, 1992). To illustrate Fairclough's definition, consider the following interaction between speaker A and speaker B. Speaker A asks speaker B (who is a male): "Are you here alone or with your wife?" This question suggests that speaker A assumes (or presupposes) that speaker B (being a man) is heterosexual. Some presuppositions are evident when they are introduced by the conjunction *that* preceded by verbs such as *regret*, *forget*, *realize* (e.g., "I forgot that you are unemployed"). Other presuppositions are introduced by the definite article *the*, making these presuppositions existential in meaning (e.g., the rain). A more socially psychological account defines presuppositions as shared knowledge—part of the common ground of participants (van Dijk, 2014).

Presuppositions have been historically used for different reasons in public, media, political, and discriminatory discourse because presuppositions can be manipulative. A speaker might choose to present a proposition with dishonest and manipulative intent (Fairclough, 1992). Presuppositions can give power to the producer of text if the message is received as intended (either sincere or manipulative) or it can give power to the hearer/reader if they are able to interpret the intention of the uttered proposition (Fairclough, 2001).

Some presuppositions are embedded in questions and rhetorical questions because the question itself often contains antecedent texts that the hearer already knows (or is assumed to know), with particular texts depending on the specific context (Fairclough, 2001). According to Searle (1970), questions are assertions that suggest four different aspects: (a) the speaker knows; (b) the speaker believes that the recipient does not know; (c) the speaker wants the recipient to know; and (d) the speaker believes that the recipient wants or needs to know. In addition,

questions have a more directive nature than requests do. This means that in questions speakers want information from the recipients that they do not have, suggesting that the speakers assume that the recipient has the answer to their question (van Dijk, 2014). However, questions are often used in political, media, and academic discourse because they may presuppose knowledge (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 2014). Furthermore, rhetorical questions presuppose knowledge from the recipients given that rhetorical structures do not elicit responses from the recipients (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1987).

### **Legitimizing and Coercive Rhetorical Strategies**

Chilton (2004) has identified several linguistic devices useful for analyzing political discourse that uses legitimizing and coercive strategies. According to Chilton (2004):

A relatively informal analysis . . . can highlight possible inferences that the hearer may draw or assumptions that the hearer may make, though not of course all of those are possible. What also emerges is that the non-explicit meanings, as well as, or possibly even more than explicit ones, have functions that in the context of political communication can be seen as legitimizing or emotionally coercive. (p. 111)

Legitimizing strategies can be *epistemic* or *deontic*. Epistemic legitimizing means that a speaker will claim to have a more objective understanding of the real. This information is often supported by statistics or sources that the hearer is expected to accept as authoritative. Deontic legitimizing suggests that the speaker is not only cognitively objective but right from a moral perspective. The speaker may want to ground these claims in feelings that cannot easily be challenged (Chilton, 2004; Chilton & Schäffner, 2011).

Speech acts (Austin, 1975) can be understood as the effect of an utterance on a listener's perspective defined by the intention of the speaker. Speaking a language, then, is a complex process in which an individual needs to master and engage in a rule-governed form of behavior (Searle, 1970). Austin made a distinction between locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary

acts. A locutionary act is an act that is asking or answering a question, giving some information or an assurance or a warning, announcing a verdict or an intention, pronouncing a sentence, making an appointment, or giving a description. An illocutionary act is the performance of the intent of the locutionary act. Illocutionary acts may, for example, warn, comment, order, request, criticize, apologize, censure, approve, welcome, promise, object, demand, and argue. A perlocutionary act suggests the result of the performance of the illocutionary act:

We first distinguished a group of things we do in saying something, which together we summed up by saying we perform a *locutionary* act, which is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which again is roughly equivalent to meaning, in the traditional sense. Second, we said that we also perform *illocutionary* acts such as informing, ordering, warning, etc, i.e. utterances which have certain (conventional) force. Thirdly, we may also perform *perlocutionary* acts: what we bring about or achieve by saying something, such as convincing, persuading, deterring, and even, say, surprising or misleading. (Austin 1975, p. 109)

Following Chilton (2004), coercing strategies can elicit two kinds of responses: emotional and cognitive. Cognitive coercion can be evident in considering perlocutionary speech acts proposed by Austin (1975). Emotional coercion can happen when certain propositions are linked to mental representations which are also related to emotion centers in the brain (Chilton & Schäffner, 2011). Words such as *evil*, *urgency* or *national danger* can elicit fearful responses in the hearers.

After analyzing the “Rivers of Blood” speech given in 1968 by Enoch Powell, Chilton (2004) presented several examples of legitimizing and coercive strategies. Powell was a famous British politician who spoke against immigration in the UK. In terms of legitimizing strategies in the *Rivers of Blood* speech, Chilton (2004) described how Powell appealed to the feelings of anger, sense of security, protectiveness, and loyalty that were directly related to the fear of invasion and domination. In his speech, Powell made the following claims that Chilton (2004,

pp. 111–116) considered examples of fear of imminent threat, domination, and invasion when referring to refugees and immigrants in the UK:

As times goes on, the proportion of this total . . . will rapidly increase (fear of invasion). Already by 1985 the native born [descendants of immigrants] would constitute the majority (fear of numerical domination). It is this fact above all which creates the extreme urgency (fear of imminent threat) of action now. (emphasis in Chilton)

In terms of coercive strategies, Powell’s language could be considered coercive because he made a series of true claims intended to create fear in his audience (Chilton, 2004). Coercive strategies are often identified through perlocutionary effects (Austin, 1975)—that is, the possible effects of the speaker’s utterances on the hearer. For example, Powell made predictions and warned his audience about the imminent threat of immigration and the damaging events immigration would cause in the UK. In addition, emotive coercion is commonly linked to specific vocabulary that could create mental representations associated with emotion centers in our limbic system (centre of the brain). Such words—*evil*, *danger*, *urgency*—can trigger fearful responses in the hearer, as was the case of the words that Powell used in his speech with reference to immigrants. Chilton (2004, p. 118) concluded that “it seems reasonable to refer to coercion here because emotional effects that certain uses of language might induce are not necessarily under the control of the hearers affected, and because the speaker can in many instances be reasonably assumed to know that certain emotional effects are possible or probable”.

Both legitimizing and coercion are potential strategies that can be found in the analysis of the collected data of this study. A more detailed description of the analysis of the use of legitimizing and coercive rhetorical strategies may be found in chapters 5 and 6.

### **Summary**

This chapter discussed different theoretical concepts relevant to my dissertation. The first topic is related to understanding the concepts of hate speech and homophobic discourse as well as their implications at a sociopolitical level. Additionally, the chapter explicates gender stereotyping and its relation to hate speech. In terms of discourse, this chapter discusses metaphors and presuppositions as the two salient rhetorical strategies used by elites in the pre-Stonewall US and Nazi Germany to discriminate against homosexuals.

## CHAPTER 4

### METHODOLOGY

This section describes the analytical and methodological strategies including frameworks that I used to collect, compare, and analyze the data. I indicate my research questions that served as guiding principles between the data collection and analytical processes. I describe in detail the data collection process in both Germany and the US. Furthermore, relevant theories on discourse analysis, and most specifically critical discourse analysis, are discussed to situate my study. In addition, I provide a contextualization of relevant individuals, locations, and institutions from the collected texts that are frequently referenced in my analysis chapters.

#### **Research Questions**

This study explored the following question

1. How were homosexual dehumanization and pathologization justified and normalized through discursive constructions of the *Other*?
2. What institutional strategies were used to separate a broad citizen group from compassion and empathy?
3. What were the most salient linguistic strategies commonly used by orators and legislators to *perversify* or prejudice citizens into perpetrators against homosexuals?
  - a. How did the linguistic strategies used in each historical context differ?

#### **Study Design**

In terms of study design, it was important to identify a set of spoken and written texts both in Nazi Germany (1933–1945) and in the United States before Stonewall (1940–1969). These two historical contexts are comparable because in the proposed times and places, both

Nazi and US governments persecuted, abused, discriminated against, and criminalized homosexuals. Furthermore, during these periods, the Nazi and US governments used various spoken and written texts with the purposes of dehumanizing and justifying the prosecution of homosexual inequality. By comparing these contexts, it has been possible to explore how similarly or differently theoretical language, including rhetorical devices, was used to pursue sociopolitical agendas against homosexuals.

I have used van Dijk's (1993) broad analytic framework to organize and analyze the data I collected. This process involved classifying data into three large categories: media, academic, and policy texts. These categories were used in van Dijk's research on racism, described in the analytic framework below. This data classification not only informed and guided my data collection process in a systematic way, but it is also relevant because my study focused on historical contexts in which race and sexuality were elements of discrimination (van Dijk, 1993).

### **Data Collection**

To analyze authentic texts, I collected data in archives, libraries, and online sources both in Germany and in the United States. For both the US and Germany, I visited libraries, educational institutions, and museums where I found copies of written texts and spoken discourse related to education, politics, and media. These texts, presented in a public medium, do not raise any ethical issues identified by the Human Research Participant Committee (del-Teso-Craviotto, 2006).

#### **Data Collection in Germany**

My data collection took place during one year in Germany as a Freie University research PhD fellow. This opportunity allowed me to spend significant time in Berlin where I accessed different federal archives and other museums. The majority of the documents were retrieved

from the *Schwules Museum* (Gay Museum) in Berlin. This museum presents various exhibitions related to LGBTQ issues throughout the year and also has a large library and archival collection. The documents found in the *Schwules* archive were relevant copies from federal archives and homosexual concentration camps during the Holocaust. The documents could not be taken out of the archive room, although it was possible to make digital copies. They were organized and listed in an index catalogue which was accessible only at the *Schwules* archive (no online or digital copies were available) and was only available in German. I translated the index to find out which documents were more relevant to my research and made digital copies of the documents accordingly. By translating the titles of the index catalogue, I was able to anticipate the content and relevance of what the documents contained. I should note that I am not a proficient German speaker. Once I accessed the documents, I made copies of the whole documents and I later decided what parts were relevant with the help of a translator. I was required to sign a confidentiality agreement in which I acknowledged that the content of these documents should not be made public in order to protect the privacy of the victims. However, I had permission to use excerpts and translations where specific names or places are not disclosed.

During the collection process, I visited other archives in Berlin, although I was not able to find relevant documents that were useful to my study. These places were the Berlin's *Bundesarchiv* (Federal Archives), the archives at the Berlin's *Bundespoleizei* (Federal Police), the Berlin's *Landesarchiv* (National Archives), the Jewish Museum, the Museum of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, and the archives at Auschwitz and Birkenau in Poland. For the most part, these museums did not hold any documents related to my research: that is the case of the Jewish Museum, the Museum of the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, and the archives at Auschwitz and Birkenau in Poland. However, I had the opportunity to meet with Mr.

Szymon Kowalski, Deputy Head of Archive at the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum. In our meeting, he explained that the archives they hold are no more than 4% of what existed before Auschwitz was destroyed by the Russian Army. Mr. Kowalski also explained that Auschwitz and Birkenau did not hold many homosexuals during the Holocaust; however, he noted that the homosexuals sent to this concentration camp were mostly Aryan individuals from Germany. The few documents kept in these archives were not useful for my research because these contained only lists of names of victims who were categorized as homosexuals without any substantial texts for analysis.

To be able to see the *Bundes* (federal) and *Landes* (national) archive collections in Berlin, one is required to present a letter explaining the reason to access confidential documents. I presented a letter from Dr. Uwe Gellert, my supervisor at Freie University, which allowed me to look at some of these documents. However, the online catalogue was in German and I would have needed advanced German proficiency to select appropriate and relevant documents.

Once all the documents were gathered, I hired a translator who had research experience in racial discriminatory practices in Germany and who is knowledgeable regarding the Nazis' use of language. I explained the research I was conducting and the types of hate speech and homophobic discourse I was looking for. The translator provided me with insights about the documents that allowed me to decide which needed to be translated and which excerpts were more appropriate for my research goals. Evidently, translation services are expensive, which prompted me to be cautious with the texts and excerpts that needed to be translated—most especially considering the large amounts of available documents. More than 500 pages were collected.

My supervisor at Freie University suggested that I visit Dr. Günter Grau, a Freie University professor whose research and publications focused on homosexuality during the Nazi era. Dr. Grau kindly invited me to his apartment in Berlin where we discussed my research. He suggested a variety of articles and books that he had published and that would be of use for my study. Dr. Grau explained that many of the documents I was looking for had already been translated in his books. Dr. Grau guided me to gather other data at the *Schwules* Museum explaining why it would be the best place to find such documents. A total of 29 documents were collected:

- 12 policy documents;
- 9 media documents;
- 1 political speech; and
- 7 academic reports.

### **Data collection in the United States**

During the year that I spent in Berlin, I continued my data collection process in the US: I decided to visit three different cities in order to have a more extensive sample of historical documents. I selected New York City, Washington, DC, and San Francisco for various reasons. New York and San Francisco are quintessential cities where the gay movement and the fight for gay rights has generally taken place in the US, with Stonewall in New York and Harvey Milk, the first openly gay elected official in the US, in San Francisco. In addition, Washington, DC, holds large collections of historical documents in federal archives.

In New York City, I looked at documents at the LGBTQ Center in Greenwich Village and the New York Public Library Archives; in San Francisco at the GLBT Historical Society; and in Washington at the Historical Society of Washington DC and the US National Archives.

Similarly to Germany, there were some places—the LGBTQ Center in New York City, the GLBT Historical Society in San Francisco, and the Historical Society of Washington DC—where I did not find any relevant documents to my research, mostly because LGBTQ archives and historical organizations in the US hold primarily homophile documents. In other words, the documents that these archives keep do not contain hate speech or any other type of homophobic discriminatory discursive elements.

In New York City, the Public Library branch located in Bryant Park allowed access to its large online newspaper database. Its digital tools facilitated a narrow search that focused on key words such as *homosexuality*, *perversion*, *pedophile*, and *security risks*. The search also permitted me to narrow down the publication dates of newspapers from 1940 to 1969. Once different results emerged, I took digital copies of various articles in order to read them and select the ones closest to the types I needed for my research.

At the National Archives in Washington, DC, I was directed to Ms. Sara Waitz, a specialist archivist, who guided me in the process of accessing and navigating the archival online system. Ms. Waitz and I had a conversation about the types of documents I was looking for which prompted her to suggest a large collection of confidential documents that were part of the US Senate and Congress collection. Based on the online catalogue and Ms. Waitz's suggestions, I requested 20 large folders (each one holding up to 1,000 pages) containing confidential minutes, reports, bills, and correspondence during the historical period on which my research focuses. To select relevant texts, I decided to make digital copies of all the files because of the large number of documents in each folder. This allowed me to later familiarize myself with the documents, read them, and select relevant ones for data analysis.

Based on the literature review, I learned about Atascadero State Hospital and the Inglewood Police Department in California, which did not allow me to collect any data. Atascadero was a psychiatric facility in the 1950s where doctors and psychiatrists conducted different types of psychological and physical experiments on homosexuals with the purpose of finding a cure and understanding more about homosexuality. When I was in San Francisco, I wanted to visit this medical institution, which still exists today as a state hospital. When I phoned, I was directed to the public relations officer to see how I could access its archives and probably some of the texts that were produced during that historical time. The officer advised me to contact the doctors who worked there during that time because the documents in the hospital archives do not have any relation to that period. However, the officer did not provide a way to contact the doctors and it is unlikely that the doctors are still alive. Similarly, I contacted via email the Inglewood Police Department in California. This police department supported the creation of a TV commercial with Inglewood High School in the 1950s to warn citizens of the dangers of homosexuals in their city. I emailed the community affairs officer requesting access to their archives and any other types of relevant documents. The officer responded with the following email which shows that she still believes and supports what the TV commercial promoted and what this government institution stood for in the 1950s:

Mr. Guerrero,

This is a great video. I will find out if this is true. But, I have to say that the picture of the PD is our old department and Monroe Jr. High is in the city of Inglewood. I actually attended Monroe in the early 80's.

The criteria to select texts for data analysis depended on the style of document available in both Germany and the US. In other words, I did not select texts based on whether they would respond directly to my research questions, but rather based on the content and style of the texts:

that is, the texts that showed elements of hate speech or homophobic discourse. A total of 22 documents between the 1940s and 1967 were collected:

- 12 media documents;
- 9 policy documents;
- 1 TV commercial.

### **Analytic Framework**

Teun van Dijk (1993) conducted a research study with the purpose of exploring societal racism against minorities in Europe. This study analyzed different spoken and written texts of white elites who had been able to justify racism because of their status and positions as scholars, journalists, politicians, and lawmakers. The author gathered and analyzed data from different countries (US, Germany, France, The Netherlands, and the UK) focusing on several types of text. These texts were transcripts of political speeches, samples of educational textbooks, and academic and media documents.

Van Dijk (1993) underscored the importance of understanding the difference between overt and subtle racism. Overt and blatant practices of the extreme right are not the types of strategies that are generally used by the elites. On the contrary, most elites tend to deny racism, which motivated van Dijk's analysis to focus on moderate mainstream politicians, newspapers, managers, scholars, journalists, and textbooks in education that represent the white dominant groups.

The study was carried out at the University of Amsterdam during the 1980s and 1990s. Some of the textual features that were considered in the analysis were: intonation, stylistic variations on word selection or syntax, coherence, discourse topics, rhetorical devices (metaphors, hyperbole), speech acts, and persuasion (van Dijk, 1993). Van Dijk suggested that

for a study of this dimension it is fundamental to use a multidisciplinary theoretical framework that involves notions from linguistics, discourse analysis, psychology, ethnography, political science, sociology, and history, among other disciplines. The data of van Dijk's (1993) study comprised a large corpus of different written and spoken texts. The texts were interview transcripts, newspapers, textbooks, parliamentary records, scholarly publications, letters, and informal everyday communication in Europe and North America (van Dijk, 1993, p.12). Data were subsequently divided into five different categories: (a) political discourse, (b) corporate discourse, (c) academic discourse, (d) educational discourse, and (e) media discourse. As mentioned earlier, for the purposes of my study, I collected data related to three categories: policy or political, educational, and media discourse. Below I explain the kinds of texts these categories entail.

### **Policy or Political Discourse**

Political discourse plays an important role as it both influences and reflects the concerns of popular culture. For this category, I found in my data samples of law bills and correspondence between politicians and other symbolic elites (e.g., doctors, journalists, researchers, scientists) as well as political speeches that justified homosexual discrimination. In political rhetoric, speakers used many argumentative strategies and rhetorical devices including carefully selected lexical items that in many cases tend to stereotype. Following are some of the features and linguistic strategies that were frequently found in the political discourse that van Dijk (1993) analyzed:

- *Positive Self-Presentation: National Rhetoric*: a common strategy used to show that the Party, the Country, and their People are kind, tolerant, hospitable, and humane.
- *Disclaimer and Denial of Racism*: self-praising parties and countries and not acknowledging that racism is an issue.

- *Negative Other Presentation*: explicit derogatory comments towards minorities are not necessarily used by elites; instead more subtle ways are used in political discourse. For example, in a political speech in 1990, the Dutch Prime Minister suggested that immigrants are not used to the fast-paced lifestyle of the Dutch, implying that they are lazy and ignorant.
- *Firm but Fair*: In terms related to immigration it is common to hear comments such as: “we have nothing against minorities but . . .” or “There are also very intelligent blacks but . . .” (p. 93). Another common phrase is “firm but fair” or “tough,” implying that the country or laws are legitimate and objective but they need to be tough and firm with refugees and immigrants.
- *The Numbers Game*: The elite presents statistics in such a way that, while they are not exaggerated, the information is used to scare and to make false conclusions. For example, it is common to hear politicians use language such as: “many immigrants come every day, week, or year” . . . or “thousands of refugees arrive every month . . .” (p. 107).

### **Academic Discourse**

Academic discourse plays an important role in the reproduction of discrimination, having a crucial influence on society and elites in the decision-making process and the creation of laws related to housing, refugees, employment, education, and culture. In this category, relevant academic texts included in my data are excerpts from medical reports on experiments, psychological and psychiatric evaluations, and academic research on the topic of homosexuality. Much of this research has been ethnocentric and heteronormative, sometimes supported by pseudoscientific evidence (van Dijk, 1993). Academic discourse is important because it has, in

many cases, informed views on how a specific topic is disseminated in the media and how it is presented by politicians to their constituents.

### **Media Discourse**

Media discourse is perhaps one of the most powerful tools to influence ideologies and perceptions: the representation of politicians, scholars, and education is understood through the lens of journalists in radio, press, and television. Mostly these journalists lack sufficient knowledge of the struggles that minorities experience (van Dijk 1993, pp. 244–245). The media present topics in a way that marginalizes minorities and puts them in a negative position in their communities or societies. Addressed topics often include immigration (illegality, fraud), crime (ethnic crimes such as drug trafficking, violence, prostitution, or theft), cultural differences (religious fundamentalism), ethnic relations (affirmative action, racial attacks) (van Dijk, 1993, pp. 248–249). In this way, I collected relevant written excerpts from newspapers and magazines as well as television advertisements that promoted discrimination against homosexuals and supported the criminalization and medicalization of homosexuality.

In sum, van Dijk showed the different linguistic devices and rhetorical strategies that have been commonly used by elites to justify inequality. Van Dijk's work is relevant to my study because of its multidisciplinary framework as well as its methodology, which serves as the foundation for my own research related to the use of various types of spoken and written texts in justifying sexual and racial inequality.

### **Data Analysis**

The process of analyzing data in this research study follows the principles of discourse analysis (DA) and most specifically, critical discourse analysis or CDA. In this section, I explain what it means to analyze academic, political, and media texts through the lens of CDA. For this

study, I have integrated ideas from different approaches to discourse analysis from Gee (1996), van Dijk (1993, 1999, 2011), Fairclough (1995, 2001), and Wodak (2015).

### **Discourse Analysis**

Discourse analysis addresses how the meaning of words works in extended stretches of spoken or written texts. Gee (1996, p. 116) defined text as “any stretch of oral or written language such as conversation, story, argument, report and so forth.” For Gee (1996, p. 115), *discourse* involves parts of language (even if it is just one single word) which “hang together and make sense to some community of people, such as contribution to a conversation or a story.” Discourse is one aspect of social identity and its relationship to status and solidarity. Speakers make use of different styles of communication and make various lexical or phonological choices. These linguistic variations in spoken and written interaction can index different social identities and assist in determining people’s socioeconomic status.

*Discourse*, with capital *D*, means that when linguistically interacting with other people, we are communicating more than language. For the content of one’s communication to hold referential meaning to others, one also needs to communicate who one is—that is, a socially situated identity. Being in Discourse suggests that a speaker engages in a particular *dance* with words, values, feelings, technologies, other people, places, and time. Being able to understand a Discourse is being able to recognize such dances. Gee (1996 p. 156) argued: “Discourses are not units or tight boxes with neat boundaries. Rather they are *ways of recognizing and getting recognized* as certain sorts of *whos* doing *whats*”.

## Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The terms *discourse* and *critical* need to be distinguished in order to understand CDA. Discourse is an “analytical category describing the vast array of meaning-making resources available to us” (Fairclough, Mulderrig, & Wodak, 2011, p. 357). Based on this definition, discourse involves various verbal, nonverbal, and visual ways of communication. This research is interested in analyzing discursive practices and rhetorical devices at a verbal, syntactical, morphological, and lexical level. In this sense, discourse involves a dialectical relationship between a discursive event and situations, institutions, and social structures; that is, discourse is socially constitutive and socially shaped. The term *critical* implies “the use of rational thinking to question arguments or prevailing ideas” (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 358). Scholars do not unanimously agree on the definition of critical discourse analysis. For the purposes of my research I use a definition proposed by van Dijk (2011):

CDA is a critical perspective on doing scholarship: it is, so to speak, discourse analysis with an attitude. It focuses on social problems, and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse and domination. Wherever possible, it does so from a perspective that is consistent with the best interests of dominated groups. It takes the experiences and opinions of members of such group seriously, and supports their struggle against inequality. (p. 96)

The types of discrimination and dehumanization practices that homosexuals experienced in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US were justified and reproduced through various rhetorical strategies perpetrated by elites and symbolic elites (as described by van Dijk, 1993). It is through these discursive practices that the dehumanization of homosexuals took place. My analysis sheds light on the relationship among social power and control, discourse, dominant groups, and discrimination against homosexuals. I have used linguistic and intertextual analysis in my study to triangulate my findings with the genre analysis performed following van Dijk’s (1993) framework. I have performed two critical discourse analyses: one of the dehumanization

and pathologization of homosexuals in Nazi Germany and a second of parallel strategies evidenced in the early and mid-20th century in the United States (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough et al., 2011; van Dijk, 2001). At the same time, I acknowledge that the perspective of the researcher, who is admittedly an interested party, plays a role in the analysis of these qualitative data (Dörnyei, 2007).

### **Purpose of CDA**

Critical discourse analysis serves as a systematic tool to analyze discourse in the types of the research that involves social and cultural change connecting social practice, language, and properties of language texts. The aim of CDA is to make visible the relationships between the properties of the text and social processes such as ideologies and power that might not be evident to the producers of those texts (Fairclough, 1995, pp. 96–97). According to Wodak and Fairclough (1997), “Discursive practices may have major ideological effects: that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the way in which they represent things and position people.” CDA also aims to create a form of intervention in social practice and social relationships that does not compromise its objectivity and scientific validity but positions itself on the side of the oppressed and abused.

### **CDA’s Methodological Approach**

While CDA does not have a normative methodology, many researchers suggest starting with a research topic in which abuse of power, inequality, and unjust sociocultural, economic, and political practices could take place against minorities (e.g., racism, homophobia, Islamophobia, sexism). Once a topic is identified, CDA methodology is informed by relevant theoretical frameworks that allow the process of analysis to further refine the objects and goals

of the research (Fairclough et al., 2011, p. 358). My analysis of texts benefits from the eclectic nature of CDA. Focusing on societal, historical, political, and linguistic factors makes possible a holistic approach to discourse analysis. I understand that CDA has been generally criticized for this unsystematic approach; however, this feature has also been considered as a strength due to the plurality of methodologies that have served the interests of social justice (Wodak, 2012 as cited in G. Weiss & Wodak, 2003, p. 124).

### **Critical Discourse Analysis and My Dissertation**

In my research, the relationship between discourse and hatred is central to the understanding of how social and cognitive discrimination, racism and most especially homophobia are reproduced. Van Dijk (1993) proposes a systematic process of discourse analysis that is interdisciplinary and considers various social, cultural, and cognitive dimensions: graphic and phonetic features (writing and speech); phonological features of talk (intonation); syntactic structures (how sentences are organized); lexicalization (what types of words are used); semantics (emerging topics, themes); illocutionary functions and pragmatics referring to commands, orders, requests, or politeness (Austin, 1975); stylistics; rhetorical devices (metaphors, hyperboles); overall structures of talk or schemata (narrative, argumentation, news, institutional discourse); interactional structures of talk (turns, moves, strategies); cognitive processes such as knowledge or beliefs (van Dijk, 1993, 2003, 2011); and communicative events and situations (relations between participants, communicative goals, interests, settings, circumstances).

The above approach to discourse analysis guides the way I approach the different homophobic texts that have been collected for the purposes of my research. However, due to space constraints, the length of the texts, and the large amounts of collected data, not all of the

previous aspects of discourse analysis are evident and only portions of the texts were analyzed (van Dijk, 1993). One last clarification is that the discourse structures I have described are not necessarily specific to discriminatory discourse. These structures work in combination with *context* to create strategies for discrimination and marginalization; and so, in my dissertation I constantly move between structures and context to represent the discursive constructions of hate in the specific historical period (van Dijk, 1993, 1999, 2011).

### **Analyzing Political Discourse**

Wodak (2015) examines how anti-Semitic, xenophobic, homophobic, and nationalistic rhetoric have become normalized due to the politics of fear, which frightens citizens about change due to effects of globalization, loss of welfare, evolving gender roles, and even climate change. All of these fears are presented in a way that creates divides between Us and Them.

Identifying discriminatory utterances has become the subject of various research studies, since racist, anti-Semitic, homophobic, and sexist attitudes are often implicit. Using such discriminatory language requires speakers to code these utterances so that their speeches or texts are not considered exclusionary. Instead, certain discursive and rhetorical devices are used to avoid criticism and sanctions. These discursive practices are “pragmatic devices such as insinuations, implicatures, repetitions, inferences or presuppositions which are frequently comprehensible only to insiders” (Wodak, 2015, p. 50):

It is therefore important that we attempt to understand and explain *how* right-wing populist parties continuously *construct fear* in order to address the collective common-ground as well as their reasons and (rhetorical and communicative) means. This is necessary in order to understand *why* and *how* right-wing populist parties are achieving ever more success across Europe and beyond, especially in recent national and European elections. (Wodak, 2015, p. 4)

Grice's work on syntax and semantics has shed light on the understanding of logic and meaning in discourse. The Cooperative Principle allows individuals to communicate truthfully based on the implicit idea that speakers cooperate with each other to interchange meaning (Grice, 1975). Under such a principle and expectations, humans seem to communicate (for the most part) under a reciprocal altruistic linguistic expectation of truthfulness. However, as humans, we have the ability to detect lies because not everything that is said can be considered real or true (Sperber, 2000, as cited in Chilton, 2004). This principle, nonetheless, provides a vehicle for individuals, and most specifically politicians with discriminatory agendas, to deceive, misinform, and mislead their audiences (Chilton, 2004).

Hitler, Himmler, and other political leaders were effective orators because they were able to transmit their hatred through their speeches and convince other citizens so that they would support discrimination against minority groups. Effective orators look to elicit a reaction from their audience. Often the desired reaction is represented by applause. However, van Dijk (1985), based on his research study of a famous British politician, suggested that a successful orator might be able to refuse applause from their audience in order to hold the audience's attention. Unlike conversations, these types of discourses (public speeches, sermons, lectures) give little to no chance to the audience to interact with the orator. The audience's opportunity to respond is through collective displays of approval (clapping, cheering, laughing) or disapproval (booing, jeering, heckling). The orator makes use of different rhetorical devices to signal to their audience the appropriate time to react and applaud. These devices can include paralinguistic cues (intonation, rhythm) and kinesics or body movements (Birdwhistell, 1970). These devices are evident when the orator makes an assertion that is intended as a criticism directed at their opponent.

## Analyzing Newspaper Texts

Discursive practices are part of the process of text production and consumption. Consequently, discursive practices in journalism are “the processes through which journalists produce texts, and readers use and understand them” (Richardson, 2007, p. 75). News discourse can be analyzed with the same linguistic categories used to analyze other types of discourses, but it is important to note that news discourse is indeed a different genre. The level of influence newspapers can have on their audiences holds power. The audience can be seen as a public with rights to be informed but it can also be considered a victim because the audience relies on what the journalists write and express in a newspaper. Audiences can be categorized by age, gender, ethnicity, or any other sociological characteristic (Richardson, 2007).

Journalism is, in theory, governed by professional practices. Ethics, for instance, is the “consideration of what journalists should or ought to be doing” (Richardson, 2007, p. 83). Objectivity is another element associated with news stories, requiring journalists to distance themselves from the truth claims of the report. This involves neutrality or, in other words, the setting aside of value-laden assertions in the delivery of the news.

Richardson (2007) has conducted research on the linguistic style in which newspaper texts are written. This style is not arbitrary because journalists choose a specific stylistic variation that can inform the identities of both the journalists and audiences and their relationship. Some examples of stylistic variation texts in newspapers involve the use of swear words or obscenities, hyperbole accents of foreign words. Intertextuality and internal intertextuality are two other elements in news text analysis. Intertextuality refers to the idea that a text cannot be studied on its own and, for its analysis, should be considered within a broader social context. Internal intertextuality can be observed through the use of reported speech

considering the following linguistic elements: (a) *direct quotations*; (b) *scare quotations*, used to emphasize a word or sentence (e.g., he admitted the “murder” of his son); (c) *indirect quotations*, which provide the content of what was said or written but other words are used to express the same idea; (d) *ostensible quotations*, where “the structure of the clause entails direct speech but it is conceptually different from direct quotation” (Richardson, 2007, p. 105).

Van Dijk (1999) notes that most everyday conversation is based on what people have seen or read in the media. More conservative media focus on how minorities are the reason for social problems (e.g., housing, schooling, unemployment, crime) whereas more liberal media focus on the problems that minorities have in regard to poverty and discrimination. In theory, there are no explicit racist newspapers in Europe or North America, and all of them are against any form of racism (van Dijk, 1999). Van Dijk (1999) conducted a study where British, French, German, and Dutch media were analyzed for their disposition towards racism. He found the following elements to be present:

1. *Positive self-presentation* presupposing that journalists consider their group and society to be tolerant towards minorities. This discursive strategy of positive self-presentation can be seen as argumentative denial of racism.
2. *Denial and counterattack*, suggesting that a positive self-image of a white society involves attacking those who oppose the principles and values of that society.
3. *Moral blackmail*, implying the pretense of censorship where the journalist disregards the truth and wants to hide it from their readers.
4. *Subtle denials*, where a racist discourse is not always explicit and is often presented through the voice of others. Sometimes the use of certain verbs (e.g., *claim*, *allege*) or the use of quotation marks can suggest doubt on the part of the writer.

5. *Mitigation*, implying the use of euphemisms or other downtoning linguistic devices to minimize the racist message.
6. *Defense and offense*, presupposing positive self-presentation and an attack on anti-racists.

One final concept to consider in the analysis of media discourse is *propaganda*, which was a relevant and popular strategy used during the Holocaust. To clarify its intended meaning in this research, the term *propaganda* suggests deception, lies, and manipulation, although this term did not have such a negative connotation during the historical period studied. At the beginning of the 20th century, propaganda was used to promote a particular goal and elicit a “popular response as desired by the propagandist” (Kallis, 2008, p. 1). Propaganda is broadly disseminated through mass media and the press. It has become an effective tool in delivering a point of view and manipulating perceptions through entertainment and leisure outlets (e.g., television, radio, newspapers, and more recently the internet) that people generally use in their daily lives. Separating factual information from mass entertainment is a daunting task, making propaganda an effective tool. Thus, cinema and most especially newspapers (such as *National Zeitung* or *Schwarzes Korps*, among others, in Nazi Germany) were effectively used to promote Nazi ideology, racism, hatred, and homophobia. The *Schwarzes Korps*, for example, was a newspaper in my collected data that was free and was made available to all German citizens. Propaganda became popular because it allowed Nazis to prioritize, organize, and disseminate information to the interested public. Evidently, mass media offered Nazis a platform to propagate homophobic and anti-Semitic information to every citizen. State propaganda legitimized information that would support the government’s political agenda (Kallis, 2008). The Nazis depended on “saturation propaganda to motivate, coerce, terrorize and proselytize” (Gilreath,

2011). However, propaganda not only provided citizens with media information but was also intended to accomplish other objectives with regard to its readers: (a) *integrate* or provide individuals with a sense of belonging to their society by specifying clear and common social goals; (b) *correlate* these goals with readers' societal belonging; (c) *guide* individuals towards a specific hateful predisposition against Jews and homosexuals; (d) *motivate* recipients by providing a justification for internalizing the propaganda message and *mobilize* them into accepting this social message; (e) *adapt* individuals to anticipated changes by constantly reminding them of the greater government and social interests; and (f) *divert* attention, allowing propagandists to control information that the audience has access to (Kallis, 2008).

### **Collected Data: Historical Texts**

I have organized the collected data under three categories following van Dijk's (1993) approach to categorization of historical texts: academic and scientific, media, and policy documents. Each category is briefly summarized for the purposes of contextualizing the analysis. This section also includes a description of the types of documents that were collected as well as a short commentary about their content. All the collected documents are confidential in agreement with the different archives' guidelines. The German files were translated from German into English: in my thesis I refer only to the English translations. In Appendix A (Nazi Germany) and Appendix B (the US), the reader may find excerpts from the specific texts that I refer to. The original texts are not shared in this study to honor the confidentiality agreement requested by the archive officers and, most importantly, to protect the dignity of the victims of the Holocaust.

## Academic Texts and Scientific Reports

In Germany, the seven academic documents that were collected constitute the majority of the correspondence that Dr. Professor Karl Astel sent to Himmler to request funds, approval of projects, and research samples of *real* homosexuals. Dr. Astel, to whom I refer in Chapter 5, was the president of the Thuringia Regional Bureau for Race Affairs in Weimar, Germany. He was also professor and director of the University for Breeding Theory and Heredity research. Finally, in 1934 he led the Hereditary Health Supreme Court (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995).

Other documents related to the Nazi Germany context include correspondence between Himmler and Dr. Carl Värne. Dr. Carl Värne, who reported directly to Himmler, was a Swedish doctor who conducted experiments on homosexual prisoners at Buchenwald with the purpose of finding a cure for homosexuality. Buchenwald was one of the largest concentration camps in Germany, located near the city of Weimar. This camp was mostly populated with homosexuals, physically ill prisoners, Roma and Sinti, and Poles. As mentioned earlier, Buchenwald became a favored prison camp to which homosexuals were sent because of the different experiments carried out. These experiments included castration and involved experiments with infectious diseases, causing death to many prisoners (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995). The documents from Buchenwald are mostly reports from Dr. Värne on his experiments with homosexuals. There is not much that can be said about these documents because they are by nature technical reports based on blood and urine samples. Most of the relevant analysis is based on the correspondence between Dr. Värne and Himmler, with a focus on the way Dr. Värne referred to homosexual men.

Another document is a medical and legal report addressed to army doctors with the purpose of standardizing procedures for identifying homosexual men in the Nazi army. This

document describes the types of homosexuals that doctors should know about and classifies them into *real* homosexuals, *fake* homosexuals, and *need* homosexuals. The document also provides a description (Paragraph 175) that criminalizes homosexuals and reminds doctors of the respective punishments for homosexual men and women who engage in this criminal behavior.

In the US, the collected data for this category were mostly found in media articles. While the documents were found in press outlets, the nature and content of the documents correspond to this category. The majority of these documents focus on the topic of medicalization of homosexuality. In general, authors and academicians cited the findings of the Kinsey Report (Kinsey et al., 1963) that claimed that sexual orientation could be categorized in various gradations from exclusive heterosexual to exclusive homosexual.

Another document presented preliminary findings on how to cure homosexuality with the use of a specific drug called *Metrazol* that was used for a small group of homosexuals. *Metrazol* was a drug used to treat schizophrenia and split personality cases. In addition, Dr. Charles W. Socarides, from the National Institute of Mental Health, claimed that homosexuality was an epidemic, suggesting that homosexuality was an illness that required treatment. Dr. Socarides's findings were disseminated in the media as a way to explain to readers the importance of understanding and monitoring homosexuality.

### **Media Documents**

The nine documents collected from Nazi media belong to two prominent far-right newspapers during the Nazi era: *National Zeitung* and *Schwarzes Korps*. These, among other newspapers, were popular media that Nazis used as propaganda platforms to influence and *perversify* the minds of ordinary citizens.

The *National Zeitung* (National Newspaper), similar to the *Schwarzes Korps* (Black Corps), was a far-right extremist newspaper. What distinguished the *Schwarzes Korps* is that it was the official SS organ. Both newspapers criticized and condemned minority groups, including homosexuals. The articles in these newspapers were hostile, intimidating, and harmful, with the purpose of not only informing Aryan heterosexual Germans about Nazi ideology but also shaming, humiliating, and dehumanizing homosexuals and Jews who would have read these articles (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995).

The collected data from this newspaper presents different articles attempting to raise awareness of the dangers of homosexuality. Some articles present and describe Paragraph 175, which criminalizes homosexuality (see Chapter 1). Other publications address doctors in the Army informing them how to recognize homosexuals and reminding them of the punishments that homosexuals deserve. The newspapers also presented cases of child sexual abuse and condemned what they called homosexual behavior always bringing Paragraph 175.

In the US, the data were sourced from 12 different newspapers, providing a rich sample for discourse analysis. These newspapers included the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, along with others such as the *Baltimore Afro-American*, *Newsday*, the *Atlanta Constitution*, and the *New York Herald Tribune*.

The *New York Times* is probably one of the most influential newspapers in the US and the world. It was founded in 1851 and has historically been considered a publication reflective of transparency and objective journalism. The documents found in my data reflect a variety of styles and content related to policy and the medicalization and criminalization of homosexuality. The *Washington Post* was founded in 1877 and it is another influential US newspaper. *Esquire Magazine* is a men's magazine that was founded during the depression era in the US. *Esquire*

*Magazine* presented an extensive report with the putative aim of preventing men (mostly heterosexual men) from falling prey in a racketeering scam in which the victim was blackmailed by fake police officers for allegedly being a homosexual.

The only news piece recorded on television is the commercial that was created with the support of the Inglewood Police Department and Inglewood High School in California in the 1950s with the purpose of warning Inglewood residents of the dangers of homosexuality. The commercial is narrated by a police officer who explains how homosexuals target young high school male students. The video attempts to inform how homosexuals operate and how to prevent one's children from falling prey to homosexual men. The video can be retrieved from YouTube.

### **Policy Documents**

The collected data in this category are legal government documents that aimed to stipulate different guidelines for the police and medical doctors to identify homosexuals. In Germany, the 12 documents are relatively detailed in terms of how to physically identify homosexuals, where to find them and how to deal with them. In general, the language is pseudo-scientific and promotes discriminatory practices for government agencies and individuals. Some texts also make reference to the criminal code of Germany and the different legal paragraphs on how to prosecute homosexuals.

In the US, the nine policy documents were all found at the National Archives in Washington, DC. The majority of these documents constitute correspondence between high-ranking officials in the Army or Navy, physicians, and senators. One salient individual in these documents was Francis D. Flanagan, who was Chief Counsel for the Senate Investigations Subcommittee. Letters from doctors and other Navy/Army officials were sent to Mr. Flanagan in

regard to homosexuality, its medical consequences, and the possible security risks for the country.

### **Summary**

This chapter discusses the research questions that served as guiding principles for my dissertation. In addition, it describes the data collection process in both Germany and the US. In this chapter, I also explain the analytical framework and the methodological considerations used to analyze the data. Finally, the chapter concludes with a description of the different types of texts that were collected.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF HATE IN NAZI GERMANY

This chapter presents the findings of the data collected in Germany. I engage the discursive construction of hate in this chapter along two complementary axes: *substantive* and *rhetorical*. Consequently, the data presented in this chapter have been organized into two major categories that involve the analysis from a social and philosophical standpoint (e.g., constructing the argument against the other, stereotypes, definition/understanding of the *Other*) and analysis from a linguistic perspective. Please note that I have underlined the specific terms, phrases, or expressions that I wanted to emphasize in each of the excerpts.

#### **Substantive Axis: Constructing the Argument Against the *Other***

My research is framed by the theory of construction of the *Other* as proposed by Bauman (1993). Othering was one of the methods that Nazis used to create antagonism towards the existence of homosexuals and a proved useful strategy to *perversify* heterosexual citizens against homosexuality. The construction of the *Other* relied on different homosexual stereotypes that presented a more compelling understanding of how Nazis imagined, considered, defined, and portrayed homosexuals as well as how the process of *perversification* (of many German citizens) allowed Nazis to legitimize the criminalization and dehumanization of homosexuals. In this section, the *Other* and *homosexual* are used interchangeably.

#### **Stereotypes**

As noted in Chapter 3, stereotypes have been commonly used to define and categorize homosexual men based on their social interactions and their physical, sexual, psychological, and emotional characteristics.

Nazis heavily relied on the use of these discursive strategies to stereotype homosexuals. Based on the collected data, Nazis used stereotypes to define homosexuals' physical appearance and social and sexual behavior and to understand the difference between, in their own words, a *real man*, a *real homosexual*, and a *fake homosexual*. These definitions were intended for heterosexual citizens, academicians, medical doctors, and police to identify homosexuals and prevent them (e.g., *real men* and weak German citizens such as children and adolescents) from getting in contact with homosexuals and from getting the homosexual *disease*.

The following is a list of the most salient adjectives that Nazis used with the purpose of labeling homosexuals. I have grouped the terms under five different categories that illustrate the ways in which these terms under different social contexts were used. I have also provided excerpts where it can be seen how these terms were used to refer to homosexuals:

**Biological/ physical stereotypes.** *Real homosexual*, unnatural, abnormal, effeminate, sweetish, girly, and lustful:

*Their manner is sweetish and effeminate, their moves are prancing and their body shapes often resemble those of women.* (Policy Document 2, 1937)

**Sociopolitical stereotypes.** Perverted, depraved, disgusting, dangerous, enemy, stranger, inappropriate offenders, corrupters of the youth, state criminals, child abusers, strange, cowards, indulgent, unmarried, exhibitionists, and hyper hedonistic:

*The depravity of the perpetrators must be considered even worse because they did not act as single persons, but as a whole.* (Media Document 4, 1934)

**Medical stereotypes.** Perverted, sadist, poor sick people, mentally ill, and inverts.

*The homosexual sadist does not even shy away from murder.* (Policy Document 2, 1937)

**Criminal stereotypes.** Abusers, degenerated, blackmailers, corrupters of the youth, perpetrators, convicts, child abusers, and delinquents:

*They behave themselves towards homosexual men as pederasts and offer fornication out of self-interest* (Policy Document 2, 1937)

**Religious/moral stereotypes.** Fornicators, unnatural, indecent, inappropriate, abnormal, and immoral.

*Unnatural fornication is death worthy!* (Media Document 3, 1935)

Based on the previous stereotypes used to describe homosexuals, it can be inferred that Nazis used different social, historical, religious, medical, and political ideas to legitimize and bring into the mainstream hatred towards homosexuals. I take up each of these categories in turn:

### **Biological/Physical Stereotypes**

From a biological point of view, Nazis viewed homosexuals as effeminate individuals who dressed, resembled, and behaved as women. The idea of men dressing as women and the thought of men behaving in such an effeminate manner have been commonly associated with the male homosexual (Altman, 1982). As mentioned in Chapter 3, the theory suggests that stereotyping provides an easier way to categorize individuals based on, generally, false physical attributes (Cook & Cusack, 2010). As noted earlier, stereotyping served as a faster and simplified way to identify homosexuals for those Nazis who did not have the same types of prejudice against homosexuals or who could not intuitively understand what it meant to be a homosexual. Consequently, stereotypes became an easy strategy to inform the Nazi police how to identify and arrest homosexuals. In the following example found in a policy document, Nazis suggest that homosexuality is not something abstract and can be easily observed if someone knows what physical attributes to look for in a homosexual man. Therefore, homosexuality was a manifest behavior that could not be hidden:

*Those homosexual men who are, because of their appearance and their acting, not able to hide their homosexuality do often offend public decency and are; therefore, easily recognized as homosexuals.* (Policy document 2, 1937)

Physical attributes are the most prominent characteristics that people can notice in any given human being. Hitler had very well-defined heteronormative physical expectations for heterosexual men: he expected men to be tall, athletic, strong, masculine, muscular, and with accentuated Aryan face features (Large, 2007). For example, during the Olympic Games in Nazi Germany in 1936, Hitler was interested in promoting not only the Aryan race but also the physical superiority of German men. These physical features were attributed only to white, cisgender, and athletic looking men in Nazi Germany. The physical preparation for the games was also a similar expectation for men who would eventually become Nazi soldiers.

It is not easy to estimate how many homosexuals did not fit these criteria and were able to escape the cruel punishments. However, physical stereotyping did serve as an effective approach to not only identify homosexuals (or at least what Nazis considered to be the physical characteristics of homosexual men) but also to spread hatred and segregation and justify violence against homosexuals.

Another important stereotype that served as a way to distinguish homosexuals from other male individuals was the notion of *real* homosexuals. For Nazis, there were different ways of understanding men who had sex with other men. First of all, the *real* or *pure* homosexuals were individuals who were unnatural, mentally ill, pederasts, and hedonistic. The term *homosexual* was meant to be uttered only to refer to *real* homosexuals as was established in the guiding principles for Army doctors identifying homosexuals:

*The term "homosexual" must only be used for real homosexuals. (Media Document 1, 1944)*

In academic and medical reports, Dr. Astel, for instance, used the term *pure* to request homosexuals in order to conduct his research and experiments:

*In a first meeting it was arranged to screen five real homosexuals, who seemed appropriate for a testing of his theory. (Academic/ Scientific Document 4, 1944)*

It was not clear in this excerpt, nonetheless, what specific criteria these men had to satisfy to be considered *real* homosexuals. This illustrates the relevance of stereotypes for Nazis in the process of classifying homosexual men.

In contrast, while *fake* homosexuals were men who had sex with other men, they did not have homosexual tendencies and were involved in homosexual activities because of external reasons (e.g., financial reasons). *Fake* homosexuals were often identified as male prostitutes:

*Fake homosexuals above all are those men who, without having a homosexual urge or tendency, let themselves be abused by homosexuals or perform homosexual actions at the request of homosexuals (purpose homosexuals). (Media Document 1, 1944)*

The guiding principles for doctors were concise when it came to identify *real* versus *fake* homosexuals. This suggests that Nazis wanted to separate *real* homosexuals from other individuals who, in their view, could be infected or corrupted with what Nazis considered the disease of homosexuality:

*The field doctor must recognize those confusions of puberty especially if he is dealing with members of the air force who mainly are in that certain critical age. He must always keep in mind that even alarming signs in that age do not necessarily mean that he is dealing with homosexual urges or tendencies. (Media Document 1, 1944)*

To some extent, Nazis implied that *real* homosexuals were able to manipulate the minds and behavior of younger males in order to convert them into *real* homosexuals. Perhaps this explains why the criminal code was less rigid with *fake* homosexuals. This categorization and stereotypical definition of homosexual men were critical in scripting homosexual behavior and their role in the Nazi society, and most importantly in the process of turning people against the so-called *real* homosexuals. Paragraph 175a condemned *fake* homosexuals to up to ten years in prison whereas *real* homosexuals were imprisoned for life:

**§ 175a**

*With prison up to 10 years, under attenuating circumstances not less than 3 months prison, will be sentenced: . . .*

*4. A man who professionally practices fornication or professionally lets himself be abused by men or offers himself to prostitution. (Media Document 9, 1935)*

Himmler also believed that the law had to be more lenient with *fake* homosexuals. He claimed there should be the possibility of pardoning those male individuals who were induced to homosexuality or who were seduced by *real* homosexuals. This is an important differentiation because it shows the level of loathing towards homosexuals and the pseudoscientific understanding of who and what a homosexual truly meant:

*Furthermore, I consider it to be right that, even within the SS and the police, according to Abs. II § 175 RstGB, the possibility must exist, to pardon those young men who did not act out of homosexual tendencies but have been seduced, so that they can be recovered for the national community. Especially I think about those cases in which young, respectable men have been seduced by their superiors or any other person they depended on. Heinrich Himmler. (Policy Document 6, 1941)*

**Sociopolitical Stereotypes**

The second stereotypical category is based on social, political, and policy constructs. Homosexuals, through these stereotypes, were considered one of the major problems of the German state, its citizens, its future, and, most importantly, its children and youth. Homosexuals were enemies, dangerous, inappropriate, degenerated, exhibitionist, hedonistic, and lustful individuals who would sexually abuse children and would destroy the future of Germany. One of the goals of Nazi propaganda was to provide Germans with information that would allow them to develop a sense of belonging among them, but at the same time, a sense of hatred towards those *enemies* of the state (Kallis, 2008):

*Those [homosexuals] are enemies of the state!* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

It is possible to infer that the sociopolitical stereotyping was used to legitimize the hatred towards homosexuals through the use of collective fear. This collective fear aimed to alarm everyone about the dangers that homosexuals would bring to German society:

*Their danger exceeds the imagination. 40,000 abnormal people, who we can afford to cast aside, are, if given the freedom, able to poison 2 million.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

Homosexuals were also suspected of being potential opponents of respectable German society. Different from women, homosexual men were likely to access high-ranking government positions within the Third Reich. This was a major concern for Himmler. The idea of homosexuals in high-ranking positions was something that neither Hitler nor Himmler could afford. This would have meant a Nazi government tainted with the *sickness of homosexuality* that would have allowed homosexuals to corrupt the whole German state (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995c). The following is an excerpt from an article in the *Schwarzes Korps* in which this topic is discussed. In this excerpt it is possible to see that the author does make a distinction between the *sick homosexual* versus the *subversive* or *enemy of the state homosexual*. Homosexuals were also defined from a medical perspective suggesting that these individuals were sick (see Medical stereotypes below). Nevertheless, from this sociopolitical stereotypical categorization it was clear that a sick homosexual could be cured (e.g., reeducated, castrated) whereas an *enemy of the state* could not be forgiven for the betrayal of the Third Reich and therefore total homosexual annihilation was justified. A *subversive* homosexual, based on this article, needed to be exterminated as soon as possible before homosexuals could permeate the government. Homosexuals were supposed to interact only with their own kind—based on the assumption that one homosexual would bring more homosexuals around him and this would forecast the decay of the Third Reich and the end of the Aryan race:

*They [homosexuals] are state criminals because they do surround themselves with people like themselves not just because of their tendencies but, as soon as they are in a position of power and as soon as people do rely on them, they create a state within a state, a secret organization which interests run counter to the interests of the nation, therefore they are subversive. There are no “ill people” to be “treated,” but enemies of the state to be eradicated. (Media Document 8, n.d.)*

## **Medical Stereotypes**

The third category of stereotypes was based on medical and psychiatric concepts. It is important to acknowledge that Nazis funded academic and medical experts (with Nazi ideology) with the agenda of investigating the causes of homosexuality. Let us note that the terms *real* and *specific* are used interchangeably to refer to *pure* homosexuals. All of their conclusions regarding homosexuality suggested that homosexuals were mentally ill. Homosexuals were associated with sadism, pederasty, and perversion:

*They behave themselves towards homosexual men as pederasts and offer fornication out of self-interest. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

The medical and psychiatric perspectives on homosexuality have often been decisive scientific evidence that has been used to justify the criminalization and dehumanization of homosexuals throughout the history of humankind as well as the passing of many laws around the world (Fone, 2000). Therefore, it is not surprising that the Nazis used medical and psychiatric evidence to support their homophobic agenda, as has been the case in current governments. The following excerpt is taken from the RMBliv (or *Reichsministerialblatt der Inneren Verwaltung*), which was a journal of the Interior Ministry that published new laws. In this excerpt, Nazis claimed that homosexuality was a *plague*. The term *plague* compares homosexuality to a bacterial disease that rapidly spreads and kills people. This medical comparison to homosexuality legitimizes the need to create anti-homosexual laws (or antibiotics following this metaphorical reference) and the need to exterminate the *plague* (i.e., the homosexuals):

*Subject: Fight against homosexuality and abortion*

*The population policy and the people's health is endangered by the still high numbers of abortion. Abortions runs counter to the ideological principles of the National Socialism. The not insignificant numbers of homosexual activities as well are considered a grave endangerment as well, especially for the youth. An effective fight against that plague for the masses is necessary more than it has been hitherto. (Policy Document 4, 1936)*

It was clear that the evidence provided to Himmler and Hitler was academic, psychiatric, and medical research conducted on individuals who met their criteria of *pure* homosexuals (e.g., effeminate, pederasts, unmarried, feminine); and most importantly, it was evident that Nazi scholars and scientists, conducting these studies, were already biased against homosexuality.

The following is a short note from Dr. Vaernet to Himmler. From this letter it is possible to understand how a medical doctor referred to homosexuals in the process of pathologically qualifying homosexuality. First of all, Dr. Vaernet uses the stereotypical notion of *pure* homosexuals, implying that these individuals were sent to Buchenwald (concentration camp). In addition, Dr. Vaernet requested *pure* homosexuals with the purpose of conducting medical experiments to *cure* their homosexuality. The references to collection of blood and urine samples instantiated a pseudoscientific conclusion that homosexuals were a *plague* and that their disease could be found in their blood or urine—as with other diseases. The full range of cures for homosexuality is not clear from this text. However, castration was considered a viable option:

*Carl Vaernet SS*

*Prague IX 23/11/44*

*Deutsche Heilmittel (German Medicine)*

*Weimar—Buchenwald*

*It would be convenient if I could get to the surgeries of the next patients on Friday 1/12. I would like to the surgeries on the castrated patients of whom you sent me the urine. As well I would like to do surgeries on 4 or 5 pure homosexuals. Especially of those men I need collected urine before I can get to surgery. If possible, I would like to measure the amount of lime and creatine in the blood of those new patients before I get to surgery. I hope that I will get the opportunity to talk about those matters with Sturmbannführer Dr. Med. Schüler during my stay.*

*If I don't receive any messages, I will arrive at the camp on Friday morning.*

*Heil Hitler. (Academic/ Scientific Document 6, 1944)*

From an academic research perspective, Dr. Karl Astel exchanged correspondence with Himmler for similar purposes as Dr. Vaernet. They both requested *pure* homosexuals to conduct experiments. Their rationale, typically, references the breeding of a higher race and the laws of nature:

*Our message is: to always serve the finer, healthier and more capable, species appropriate life.* (Academic/ Scientific Document 1, 1937)

Dr. Astel showed great interest in providing scientific evidence to Hitler about illegitimate children, criminals, and the genetic inheritance of criminal activity. He wrote about sex offenders and considered them as especially dangerous suggesting that the best solution was to castrate or even kill them. In his letter, he devoted some time to ask for funds and specifically requested a group of 100 *real* homosexuals for the purposes of experimenting:

*For the work on that paper I need the addresses of at least 100 specific homosexuals from Thüringen and kindly ask for their prompt submission.* (Academic/ Scientific Document 1, 1937)

To this request (Academic/ Scientific Document 1), Himmler responded:

*Concerning the objective part, I will, regarding 1.) arrange that the Secret State Police send you the names of at least 100 specific homosexuals from Thüringen.* (Academic/ Scientific Document 2, 1937)

From the text we can infer Himmler's interest in understanding homosexuality as a disease.

Consequently, this understanding was intended to legitimize the idea that homosexuals were mentally ill:

*You [Himmler] already described the first of these pieces as utterly welcome. It relates to the research on homosexuality, that means the hereditary condition of homosexuality, the possible accumulation within the tribe of homosexuals, the frequent occurrence related to certain physical or mental characteristics and attributes etc.* (Academic/ Scientific Document 1, 1937)

In general, Dr. Astel understood homosexuality as a hereditary mental and physical disease. Unfortunately, the records of the report were not found in my data documents. Most of the other letters included the budget of the experiment. However, the term *hereditary* in this text suggests that homosexuality could not be cured, and the only solution was to eradicate all homosexuals from Germany. In this stereotypical category falls the eugenic concepts that Nazis were concerned about. Eugenics refers to the idea of improving the race. One of the perceived major threats was homosexuality because the eugenic aim was to “eliminate every possible unhealthy and undesirable blocking of reproduction of inferior blood” (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995, p. 4).

Another salient term to describe homosexuals in this medical category was the idea of homosexuals as *inverted* men. The term *inversion*, from a medical point of view, implies that an organ has been turned inside out (Inversion, 2019). However, from a psychological and psychiatric perspective, inversion refers “to the adoption of the sex role and introjection of the psychological identity of the opposite sex” (Brown, 1957). This notion of inversion was widely accepted and used by the Nazis to define and understand homosexuality. Please note that the term *invert* is collocated with the term *clutches*. The author attempts to intimidate the readers of this newspaper with pseudoscientific facts about homosexuals. It is suggested that innocent youngsters were at great risk of falling victim to sick individuals who could potentially infect them with the disease of homosexuality:

*They just stood and watched as the youth movement more and more fell into the clutches of the inverts.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

## Criminal Stereotypes

The fourth category of stereotypes is associated with criminal behavior. Under this category, homosexuals were seen as abusers, degenerated, blackmailers, corrupters of youth, perpetrators, convicts, child abusers, and delinquents:

*The state police must take action if the behavior of the perpetrator shows an endangerment of population policy, the people's health, the youth or if it is considered to be a violation of ideological principles of National Socialism. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

All of these terms implied that homosexuality was not only an illness, but also a crime. It is important to note that Nazi Germany was not any different from other countries in criminalizing homosexuality. Homosexuality had become a synonym for sodomy, as was the case in the US. In this way, homosexual sex was viewed as a threat to the future of the German state and it reinforced the idea that homosexuality was best understood as a crime against nature (Eskridge, 2008). Hitler and Himmler were looking to accelerate the rapid increase of the Aryan population and were concerned that with every homosexual there was the potential loss of an Aryan child. This justified the criminalization of non-procreative sex. Public morality was endangered by homosexual sex because this, according to the Nazis, impaired the senses of shame and, consequently, encouraged the undermining of a heteronormative Aryan society (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995c, p. 3):

*By Fornication every kind of fornication between males is meant, even if it is not related to actual sexual intercourse. This includes mutual onanism (e.g., masturbation) or unilateral onanism on the other person, possibly frisking or kissing of another body or letting the own body being frisked or kissed. Lustful staring at coincidentally naked bodies is not enough. The common sense of shame must objectively be violated. On a subjective foundation a lustful intention to attract each other or a third male must be obvious (Reichsger.-Entsch. 28, 77, resolution made in court). The mere attempt is unpunished, but in most cases completion is reached (e.g., if an orgasm is reached). (Academic/ Scientific Document 7, 1944)*

In the following examples, it is possible to see how homosexuals were portrayed as *criminals* prone to abuse children and adolescents:

*That is the ideology with which the criminals tried to convince the youth. The fact that they especially focused on the youth shows their criminal tendency just as much as their criminal intention. This intention turns itself against the continued existence of the nation. (Media Document 8, n.d.)*

*They are state criminals because they do surround themselves with people like themselves, not just because of their tendencies but, as soon as they are in a position of power and as soon as people do rely on them, also out of expediency. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

Consequently, homosexuals became equivalent to criminals and were to be treated as such. In other words, homosexuals were under severe social scrutiny by civilians and the police force. This explains why Himmler created very strict policy guidelines to be enforced by the SS. The following excerpt shows the extreme level of police norms to be enforced:

*The policeman who wants to fight homosexuality successfully must be in touch with every social class. He must be very attentive and check on every statement concerning abnormal behavior of men. In some cases, it is recommended to consult trustworthy informants. He must be able to get in touch with every person of his district which is considered abnormal. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

Similarly, it was expected that homosexual prostitution would also become an illegal practice. By criminalizing homosexual prostitution, Nazis expected to reduce the number of *fake* homosexuals and alienate even further *real* homosexuals:

*The files that contain the name of the homosexual, the place of residence, the crime and the time of the crime must be ordered properly. Young male prostitutes, blackmailers, corrupter of the youth must be marked as such. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

Other salient terms referring to homosexuals were related to the danger that they could cause to vulnerable Nazi children and adolescents:

*A degenerated educator is guilty of numerous atrocities towards schoolchildren who were entrusted to him. (Media Document 2, 1934)*

The use of these stereotypes is a legitimizing rhetorical strategy, in which homosexuals are shown, through public discourse, as criminals who are guilty of tainting German society. The following is part of a police record form (Policy Document 5, n.d.) for criminals in which the explicit language that government and police used to refer to homosexuals is evidenced:

*II. Relevant previous penalties:*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <i>1. Known as <u>corrupter of youth</u></i>            | <i>2. Known as young male prostitute</i>    |
| <i>3. Known as <u>blackmailer on a sexual basis</u></i> | <i>4. <u>Perpetrator</u> is a member of</i> |

One relevant clarification to make is in regard to the criminalization and the medicalization of homosexuality. In the previous medical category, it was illustrated that a group of Nazi physicians, psychiatrists, and neurologists were interested in defining homosexuality as a medical condition. In their professional opinion, they concluded that homosexuality was a degeneration of personality linked to brain damages. This implied that a homosexual was a sick individual who needed to be cured—and not criminalized—to stop the spread of the disease through contagion (e.g., seduction). However, in this criminal category, other Nazis, with more radical views, suggested that homosexuality needed to be considered as a natural predisposition—as is becoming a thief (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995c). With this in mind, Nazis justified the criminalization of homosexuality and strengthened Paragraph 175, thereby widening the concept of sex offense in the Third Reich. The revised Paragraph 175 equated homosexuality to any sex offence (e.g., prostitution, pederasty, rape), a criminal act, an addiction, and a natural predisposition.

The following is the revised Paragraph 175 which does not use stereotypical language to refer to homosexuals. This new law was widely publicized in the news and was used as a justification for segregation, discrimination, and violence against homosexuals. As a matter of

fact, the following was taken from the *National Zeitung*. Many newspapers published this law to inform and caution Germans of the dangers of homosexuals:

*Laws § 175 and 175a*

*1935: an aggravated version of the Paragraph was formulated by the fascist state*  
 § 175

*(1) A man who does fornicate with another man or lets himself be abused to fornication, will be sentenced to prison.*

*(2) If the participant has not reached the age of 21 at the time the act is committed, the court may refrain from punishment in particularly minor cases.*

*§ 175a*

*With prison up to 10 years, under attenuating circumstances not less than 3 months prison, will be sentenced:*

*1. A Man who forces another man to fornication by violence or threat to danger his life and limb or lets himself be abused by him.*

*2. A man who forces another man to fornication by abusing a dependent, employment or inferior relationship or lets himself be abused by him.*

*3. A man over the age of 21 who seduces another man under the age of 21 to fornication or lets himself be abused by him.*

*4. A man who professionally practices fornication or professionally lets himself be abused by men or offers himself to prostitution.*

*1945: This version was taken in the federal republic of Germany. Gay people were punished harder than they were before 1933 (Media Document 9, 1935)*

## **Religious/Moral Stereotypes**

The last group of stereotypes is based on moral concepts. Under this category, homosexuals were considered fornicators, unnatural, indecent, abnormal, and immoral. While many of these terms, as well as the understanding of homosexuality as an unnatural behavior, may be references found in different verses in the Bible, it is not possible to claim that these lexical choices were deliberately taken from any religious text. Nevertheless, Nazis did in fact use some biblical terms in their diatribe against homosexuals, which is one strategy that many politicians and other symbolic elites have historically used to legitimize the criminalization and dehumanization of homosexuality (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009).

There are various implications of these moral views in regard to homosexuality.

According to Eskridge (2008), a few biblical passages have defined homosexuality as a sin,

suggesting that homosexual sexual relationships are associated with incest, pederasty, and the act of bestiality (i.e., zoophilia). These considerations have historically enabled those who would: (a) claim that homosexuality is a harmful and sinful behavior; and (b) legitimize and create obscenity laws that would not only criminalize sodomy, bestiality, and pederasty but also suggest that these crimes are exclusively homosexual behaviors (Nussbaum, 2006). As an example, English and colonial laws followed Leviticus 20:13–16. These verses of Leviticus condemn anal sex between a man and a woman or a child; sex between a man and another man or a man and a beast (i.e., animal); and sex between a woman and a beast (Eskridge, 2008, p. 4).

Let us consider the following excerpts in which some of these terms were used in Nazi media and policy documents. The first example (Media Document 3, n.d.) is the title of an article in the *National Zeitung* newspaper in which it is explicitly stated that *unnatural fornicators* should die. The term *unnatural* has been used in some biblical passages to condemn homosexual sex. The Bible has often emphasized that sodomy and bestiality are crimes against nature because any type of anal intercourse (i.e., sodomy) and depraved sexual relations with animals (i.e., bestiality) are considered *unnatural* (Stone, 2017):

*Unnatural fornication individuals are worth dying.* (Media Document 3, 1935)

Another example is part of the guidelines for police officers with regard to arresting actors and artists who engaged in *unnatural* fornication. The term *fornication* has also been widely used in the biblical verses to refer to the act of having sexual relationships outside of marriage, implying the illegality and shamefulness of this act. It is worth noting that sexual immorality has been generally associated with the wrongdoers, the thieves, the slanderers, and the adulterers who will not be invited into the Kingdom of God. Nazi discourse and any other

types of homophobic remarks throughout history have found these associations to be a valid argument for disdain for and alienation of homosexuals:

*Subject: arrest of actors and artists for unnatural fornication*

*The Reichsführer of the SS and Head of the German Police at the ministry of the interior ordered, that every arrest of an actor or an artist because of unnatural fornication must base on an authorization given out by himself alone. Exceptions can be made if one of the named was caught in the act. (Policy Document 10, 1937)*

### **Defining and Understanding the *Other* in Nazi Germany**

Defining the *Other* [the homosexual] was an important aspect in the fight against homosexuality. Nazis needed a well-defined concept that would allow them to comprehend who homosexuals were, how they behaved and what they looked like. The previous section presented stereotypes as a salient substantive strategy to categorize and characterize homosexuals. However, in this section I explore in more specific detail how homosexuals were defined and understood.

The following is an excerpt from a confidential policy document titled “Guidelines for the fight against homosexuality and abortion” in which it is explained and specified how to recognize homosexuals:

*Those homosexual men who are, because of their appearance and their acting, not able to hide their homosexuality do often offend public decency and are therefore easily recognized as homosexuals. They often look pale and have an unsteady and piercing gaze. Their manners are sweetish and effeminate, their moves are prancing and their body shapes often resemble those of women. They like to put on makeup and perfume and to powder their faces. Also, they like to wear clothing for women. In their interaction with each other they often use girly nicknames. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

This description relied heavily on the assumptions that homosexuals were feminine and behaved in such a manner. This is a good example on how homosexuals were defined: not as men but as effeminate, womanlike, and unmanly. All men with homosexual tendencies or behaviors were considered *real* homosexuals. This fundamental understanding in the definition

of the *Other* is the most salient element of hatred, stigmatization, and differentiation between a heterosexual versus a homosexual man. In other words, even when the so-called *real* men engaged in homosexual relations, they were not considered *pure* homosexuals. The fact that these men (e.g., strong, young, and athletic) had any types of homosexual behavior excluded them from this categorization (e.g., *real* homosexual) and therefore the punishment was not as severe. Evidently, the feminine aspects in a man were what truly characterized a *pure* homosexual and what defined, in great part, a homosexual in Nazi Germany.

The following excerpt from the same guidelines for army doctors clearly states that a *real* homosexual is *effeminate*. *Real* men (e.g., young, strong, and sexually active) could potentially engage in homosexual sexual relationships because they are in financial need. Engaging in homosexual behavior does not make them homosexuals:

*There is absolutely no doubt that young, strong and sexual easily attracted young men in need act homosexual even though they are no homosexuals (Need 'homosexuals'). But that is almost exclusively the case if they are at the front or in an assignment that makes sexual contact to females impossible. (Media Document 1, 1944)*

The understanding of homosexuality was an imperative task for the Nazis because this would allow Nazis to predict how a homosexual would behave with them or other healthy German citizens (Bauman, 1993). To that end, several medical experiments on homosexuals were carried out. In the following excerpt, the level of interest and professionalism that Dr. Värne invested in his research is evidenced in the mention of the specialized equipment and laboratory used to carry out medical trials on homosexuals. Part of the process of understanding the *Other* involved the cruel dehumanization of homosexuals. Medical trials already implied that homosexuals were ill and a contagious disease. In addition, the medical laboratories in which homosexuals were taken for experiments were simultaneously used to run tests on rats, rabbits,

and chickens. Testing homosexuals as if they were another breed of animals exemplifies how homosexuals were dehumanized:

*On the evening of 26.7.1944 SS-Sturmbannführer Dr. Värne came to the concentration camp Buchenwald to inform himself on the possibilities concerning his experiments that have been authorized by the Führer. In a first meeting it was arranged to screen five real homosexuals, who seemed appropriate for a testing of his theory. To measure the hormone level, a urine sample must be taken before the surgical procedure. It has been tried to take that sample here at the camp, but we learned that that will not be possible, especially in regard of the procurement of test animals like rats, rabbits and chicken. Therefore, this should take place in Prague, the current residence of the Sturmbannführer, in an institute especially equipped for this purpose. (Academic/ Scientific Document 4, 1944)*

Himmler was particularly interested in funding various academic research studies that would allow a better understanding of homosexual behavior as well as the causes and spread of homosexuality. Dr. Astel also worked on different studies trying to prove that homosexuals were mentally ill, and that homosexuality was contagious:

*If you provide the necessary funds, I will publish three greater papers, out of my everyday research, that might have a meaning for you in various respects.  
1.) You already described the first of these pieces as utterly welcome. It relates to the research on homosexuality, that means the hereditary condition of homosexuality, the possible accumulation within the tribe of homosexuals, the frequent occurrence related to certain physical or mental characteristics and attributes etc.  
For the work on that paper, I need the addresses of at least 100 specific homosexuals from Thüringen and kindly ask for their prompt submission. (Academic/ Scientific Document 1, 1937)*

Other aspects that served the purpose of understanding homosexuals had to do with their predictable behavior dictated by what Nazis considered to be their sexual desires and depravations. The following excerpt from a policy document contains specific details on how Nazis understood homosexual behavior. Understating homosexual behavior was key in scripting new policies that would prevent homosexuals from corrupting and harassing victims. The document clearly suggests specific places where homosexuals would gather, and most

importantly, it instantiates that the *Other* is a clandestine individual who is prepared to hurt harmless Germans (Bauman, 1993):

*They [homosexuals] are to be found at the main traffic roads, at the train stations, in the gardens, at public baths, at sports grounds, at light- and air baths and especially around those comfort stations (e.g., public restrooms) where they look for their suitors. They also reside near the employment offices where they make those submissive, who are in search for work by offering easy jobs (at offices for example) or money. They socialize at those coffee houses and bars which they know are as venues of homosexuals. The owners of those premises often have homosexual tendencies themselves. They often linger at health resorts and baths where they take the chance to associate themselves to "strangers."* (Policy Document 2, 1937)

This understanding of homosexuals exemplifies what Bauman (1993) described as characteristics of the *Other*. Bauman suggests that the *Other* is generally seen as negligent, sexually promiscuous, dishonest, emotionally unstable, and without objective judgment. Based on this policy text, homosexuals are portrayed as predators who are looking for their next victim. The text suggests that the conclusions about homosexuals have been made after careful observation and analysis of their social and sexual behavior. This said, it is possible that some homosexual individuals visited public spaces (e.g., bathrooms, parks, train stations) to meet with other homosexuals and that they evidently preferred to gather with other homosexuals in public establishments because of safety concerns or because that was the only opportunity to meet other homosexuals who could relate to them (Todd, 2018). Nonetheless, it has been stated by many queer researchers in our current era that homosexuals do gather in specific places, such as bathhouses, for the purpose of seeking a hedonistic experience that would not be harmful or dangerous to men (Altman, 1982). In contrast, Nazis presented homosexual social and, most specifically, sexual behavior as a threat to German society, claiming that homosexuals would visit such places to infect and convert *real men* into *real homosexuals*.

## The Stranger Within Us

To recapitulate, homosexuals were synonymous with unmarried individuals who looked effeminate, were mentally ill, criminals, state enemies and, in Himmler's terms, *corrupters of youth* (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995c). However, Himmler knew that this definition was not enough to identify and prosecute all homosexuals. In other words, some homosexuals were able to hide their homosexuality, thereby preventing the government, physicians, the SS, and other civilians from properly identifying them. This confirms the notion of the stranger within *us* that Bauman (1993) discussed. This idea was particularly troubling for the Nazis: the perceived strange presence and dangerous behavior of homosexuals within German society was experienced as a threat that was pervasive in Germany. As Himmler claimed, some homosexuals were easily identifiable, although others were able to hide. For Nazis, it was a terrifying and intimidating experience to know that *aliens* or *strangers*, in Bauman's (1993) terms, lived within German society. The following excerpt from a policy text illustrates the level of concern that Nazis had regarding the notion of the stranger within their space. Nazis knew that homosexuals were hiding and that their imminent threat was present in the Third Reich. This document explains that Nazis were preoccupied with the idea of homosexuals in their cities, communities, and classrooms, as well as the danger of individuals with whom they interacted on a daily basis. It is important to note that the following text discusses homosexuality and abortion in the same policy document. While the relationship was not explicitly delineated, it is possible to infer that both homosexuality and abortions were seen as ways that would prevent the Aryan race from growing:

*There are homosexuals in every city, every profession and at every age. Among the arrested homosexuals there are workers, craftsmen, civil servants, lawyers, actors, educators, friars. Some homosexuals feel a preference towards men in uniform . . . Because homosexuals are not just active in the big cities and because abortion is, to our*

*experiential knowledge, especially common in the countryside, it is important that the fight against homosexuality and abortion is executed strictly in the countryside as well.* (Policy Document 2, 1937)

The implications of the *Other* in a place where they are not welcomed served as a justification to hate, criminalize, and convict the *Other* because homosexuals were seen as an imminent danger to German children. Nazis did not want to share their space with homosexuals because, even though they looked like Aryan individuals, they did not deserve to live with healthy Germans. During my visit to Auschwitz and through the conversation I had with the archivist, I learned that the majority of the homosexual prisoners at Auschwitz and Birkenau were Aryan German citizens. Bauman (1993) would claim that this phenomenon made Nazis uncomfortable. Knowing that Aryan individuals would contaminate their own race and that these individuals were inside their society was unsettling:

*When it comes to intermarriages between strange races we found our way back to old Germanic opinions. And just like that we need to find our way back to the guiding northern principles of eradicating the degenerated when it comes to the judgment of the race damning degeneration called homosexuality. Germany stands or falls by keeping its race clean.* (Media Document 3, 1935)

One final aspect regarding the *Other* is the physical proximity and the metaphorical notion of neighborhood described by Bauman (1993). For German Nazis, sharing social and physical spaces involved a feeling of familiarity with the *Other*. This meant that Nazis were aware of the presence of homosexuals around them. However, this realization did not mean that they trusted or wanted to develop any type of bond with homosexuals.

### **Rhetorical Axis: Nazi Homophobic Discourse**

This section analyzes the different rhetorical devices that Nazis used to legitimize their homophobic agenda. The following are the linguistic strategies that were most salient in the data I collected: metaphors and legitimization of hate.

## Metaphors of Fear

Metaphors were salient discursive devices used by German Nazis. I have identified the most relevant metaphors in my data, classifying them within three different subcategories: homosexuality as disease, homosexuality as impurity, and the struggle against homosexuality.

**Homosexuality as disease.** Nazis commonly referred to homosexuals and to homosexuality as a *disease*. Historically, metaphors have been used in political discourse to demean minorities by exemplifying the terror and danger posed by minority groups (Musolff, 2016). Jews, for instance, were seen as parasites, and similarly, homosexuals were considered vermin, a disease, an infection, dirty and poisonous individuals, and a plague.

The concept of *infection* was a common fear perpetrated by the Nazis. An infection suggests that an individual is sick and carries a virus or bacteria. In Nazi discourse, a homosexual individual carries the infection and could transmit it to a healthy individual (e.g., a German citizen). However, Nazi propaganda went further with the use of these metaphors, using fear, as a vehicle to *perversify* other German citizens, claiming that homosexuals would target only minors:

*Again and again they are able to tempt and infect adolescents by their art of seduction. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

*When sexual instincts first appear, the opposite sex is not yet the conscious object of desire. And unfortunately, the experience shows that those who carry the disease tend to approach especially young people who are that age. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

In the first example, homosexuals are presented as contagious people who were purposely looking to *infect* teenagers. Infection implies that homosexuals had a disease that was not curable. In this example, homosexuals were presented as purposefully criminal in that they *infect* teenagers by their *art of seduction*. The art of seduction suggests a predetermined ritual in which homosexuals lure innocent adolescents and children. The art of seduction also implies that

homosexuals would take advantage of weaker men (in Nazi terms) who were probably in financial need or who had not yet explored their sexuality and could be turned into homosexuals as can be seen in the second example. The term *art* was collocated with the term *infection* indicating that homosexuals were deliberately contaminating healthy individuals. Furthermore, the term *infection* presupposes that a contagious homosexual needed to disclose his infection to the respective authorities or to the person who would be at risk of getting infected to prevent the spread of the disease, although homosexuals who chose not to disclose their infection. To better illustrate what homosexuality as disease meant during the Holocaust, let us compare it to the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), for instance, a virus that has indeed killed many individuals around the world since the 1980s. This comparison is relevant because it shows how people thought of homosexuality—a virus that infected and killed thousands of people and therefore justified eradication.

In addition, in these two previous examples, infection also refers to pederasty, in which it was assumed that all homosexuals were child molesters. This is evidenced when it is suggested that homosexuals only targeted younger people:

*Those who carry the disease tend to approach especially young people who are that age.*  
(Policy Document 2, 1937)

Targeting younger people means that homosexuals took advantage of the weakest and most vulnerable Germans, positioning homosexuals as a significant risk for German society.

Another salient metaphor used by the Nazis refers to homosexuality as a deadly *epidemic*. Related metaphors included terms such as *plague*, *poison*, *vermin*, and *danger*. The following are examples of such metaphors that referred to body-based and illness-death scenarios and that were used by Himmler both in written and spoken texts. According to Musolff (2016, p. 75), terms like *plague* and *vermin* are prototypical examples of Nazi discourse that were taken from a

biological to a social domain to dehumanize homosexuals. In the first example, Himmler's speech presented homosexuals as a *plague* that would eventually *destroy* the state. Collocating the term *plague* with the term *destruction* suggests that such irreparable damage would result in the end. It also implies that a *plague* must be eradicated as soon as possible before it spreads, and it is too late to stop. In this way, Himmler justified his homophobic agenda of exterminating homosexuals:

*Assuming one to two million homosexuals, the result is that roughly 7-8% of men in Germany are homosexual. If that is how things remain, our nation will fall to pieces because of that plague. A nation will not for long bear such a destruction of its sexual economy and equilibrium.* (Speech Document 1, 1937)

The second example, also from Himmler and contained in a policy document, compares homosexuals to *vermin*. The comparison in this example is with a different term and in a different context (i.e., the SS as an institution). However, the equivalent metaphorical meaning of homosexuality was the same as the previous example in which it was suggested that such vermin would need to be eradicated before tainting the SS:

*I myself would appreciate if furthermore all crimes committed before entering the SS or the police would be covered by that new law as well. Such an action would be helpful for keeping away homosexual vermin from those Institutions.* (Policy Document 6, 1941)

In the following excerpt from an article in the *Schwarzes Korps* the author describes homosexuals as both abnormal and as individuals who are able to *poison* others. Metaphors can often soften the content of the message (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003); however, in Nazi Germany, metaphors were used in a cruel and blatant manner to dehumanize homosexuals and further the Nazi political agenda against homosexuality (Bauman, 1993; Musolff, 2016). The way in which media were used to further the state's homophobic agenda is a feature of Nazi discourse that allowed the *perversification* of views of German citizens against homosexuals:

*Their danger exceeds the imagination. 40% abnormal people, who we can afford to cast aside, are, if given the freedom, able to poison 2 million.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

In the same article by the *Schwarzes Korps* (Media Document 8, n.d.), the author also discusses the causes of homosexuality and makes reference to Magnus Hirschfeld to suggest that homosexuality is a deliberate choice. Hirschfeld was a German Jewish sexologist who advocated for homosexuals. His studies suggested that homosexuality was an inherited or congenital disease or anomaly. Far-right media targeted Hirschfeld to contradict his findings. There are two points that the author of this article attempted to convey. On the one hand, the author suggested that homosexuals were not innately sick and that they needed to be monitored, punished, and criminalized. On the other hand, the author mentioned two million people being in danger of being *poisoned*. These two million people referred to those weak men (also known as the *seduced* or *fake* homosexuals) in danger of becoming infected with homosexuality. To differentiate *seduced* from *real* homosexuals, the author added:

*Only the two percent of the really abnormal remain. Those who were the origin of the disease outside in life, now become the concentration of disgust, which separates the wheat from the chaff.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

The German proverb *to separate the wheat from the chaff* was used to reference separating the *real* homosexuals from those who have been *seduced*. The 2% constituting *pure* homosexuals or *abnormal* were considered the real danger. It is important to distinguish between those 2% and all the other homosexuals (who were not *pure* homosexuals but *seduced*). The author emphasized that *fake* homosexuals were weaker individuals at risk of being poisoned:

*One will argue, that those two million probably lack character to let themselves be poisoned.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

Another metaphorical reference is the one of homosexuality as *bacillus*. *Bacillus* (a form of bacterium) is a prominent far-right term that has been used to dehumanize homosexuals and

Jews. The following excerpt portrays homosexuality as *bacteria* resistant to their antibiotic because this term is collocated with the term *indestructible*. An *indestructible bacillus* during the Third Reich was a major concern for everyone. Typhoid fever, for example, was a serious bacterial infection that killed numerous people in Nazi Germany and most especially spread in ghettos and concentration camps (Auschwitz-Birkenau, 2019). Therefore, the metaphorical reference to homosexuality as *indestructible bacteria* created fear in people who were not familiar with the phenomenon of homosexuality. Evidently, this was an efficient strategy to *perversify* Germans because these metaphorical *bacteria* would specifically attack the weaker ones (e.g., children and adolescents):

*One more reason to protect the weak. Just as one would not use hygienic progress to protect those who have an indestructible nature and resist every bacillus, but those who are vulnerable. (Media Document 8, n.d.)*

Throughout *Mein Kampf* (My Struggle), Hitler made use of metaphorical concepts alluding to minorities as “bacilli, bacteria, blood suckers, leeches, maggots, rats, viruses, or vipers” (Rash, 2006 as cited in Musolff, 2016, p. 79). This language was widely used in Nazi political documents and political discourse. Himmler advocated the passing of a law that would allow the Nazi government (and most especially the police) to sentence homosexuals to death. It was not surprising that government documents would use such pejorative language in official texts. This is how the law defined homosexuals:

*For keeping clean the SS and the police from homosexual vermin, the Führer defined in his decree from November 15, 1941, that every man who fornicates with another man or lets himself be seduced, must, without any consideration of his age, be sentenced to death. In minor cases prison sentence is acceptable, not under 6 months . . . But nevertheless, they must be prosecuted with immense strictness, because the Führer wants, that his SS remain clean and, must therefore, be kept clean from this dangerous and infectious plague. (Policy Document 7, 1942)*

In the example above, *vermin* is juxtaposed with terms such as *danger*, *infection*, *plague*, and *destruction*, suggesting that a government body must be kept *clean* or healthy. For the Nazi government, such a *plague* could only be dealt through complete extermination (Musolff, 2016).

**Homosexuality as impurity.** The second category of metaphors is associated with the *impurity of blood* and *genes* that homosexuals were supposed to carry with them. As has been mentioned, Nazis were concerned with the decrease of the Aryan population and the contamination of the so-called pure race and blood (Large, 2007). This meant that any individual or groups of people who could potentially taint Aryan blood needed to be annihilated. In one speech delivered by Himmler referring to homosexuals as a plague, he appealed to the dangers of allowing homosexuality to proliferate in Germany. He gave statistical evidence to suggest that with all of the possible homosexuals in the country, there was a risk of losing the procreation of more Aryan children. Without these children, he argued, the country could be doomed to be destroyed:

*I will make that known by order to the unit to which the person so affected belonged. Thereby, I hope to finally be done with persons of this type in the SS, so that at least the good blood, which we have in the SS, and the increasingly healthy blood which we are cultivating for Germany, is kept pure.* (Speech Document 2, 1937)

However, the metaphorical concept of the homosexual as racially impure was a feature in media, political, and public discourses. It was common to see such remarks in media articles in which racial purity was presented as a top priority for the Nazi state, suggesting that the only way to preserve Nazi Germany was through the nurturing of a healthy Aryan race:

*Germany stands or falls by keeping its race clean.* (Media Document 3, 1935)

The Nazi press and propaganda played an important role in *perversifying* German Nazis because the pseudoscientific facts that were presented to their readers heavily relied on blatant homophobic strategies that could have probably persuaded many of the risks of homosexuality.

The following press article explores the perception of other countries in regard to homosexuality and race. The metaphorical concepts suggest that a *pure* and *clean* racial nation should not include individuals who could threaten and taint the purity of the Aryan race:

*It is no wonder that the idea of race maintained most purely in the northern states . . . Therefore, it is no wonder that the French Revolution, which brought us milder treatment of homosexuals, brought us idea of Jew emancipation as well and therefore the danger of a complete degeneration of race. (Media Document 3, 1935)*

To maintain the purity of the Aryan race, the author used the Nordic states as an example on how Germany should tackle the issue of homosexuality. The Nordic states (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland) represented racial purity. In contrast, the author blames the French Revolution for provoking other nations to accept liberal ideas that resulted in the liberation of groups of minorities that would threaten the purity of the Aryan race. Note that the language used in this article is a good example of Nazi discourse because it was particularly blatant and deliberately discriminatory. In addition, the author's punitive lexical choices (e.g., *degeneration of the race*), which were collocated with specific minority groups (e.g., Jews and homosexuals) shows the level of abhorrence and disgust towards non-Aryans and homosexuals. This is just one of the examples of how Nazi discourse was particularly hateful. Nazis' most salient strategy was negative other presentation (van Dijk, 1993, 2005), because Nazis believed that they needed to be specific and clear when referring to the issues threatening their nation and race. In addition, the government and the society in general did not condemn this type of behavior. As a matter of fact, citizens were encouraged to hate (Bauman, 1993).

Further on in the same article, the author explicitly lists countries that were considered Aryan versus others that were more demographically diverse, suggesting that these northern countries had stricter laws regarding homosexuality:

*The Germanic States, including those under the influence of Germanic, culture consider homosexual activity a serious crime against morality. Just as in Germany homosexuality is punished with imprisonment in Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Greece, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Latvia, England (life imprisonment), English dominions and the United States of Northern America. (Media Document 3, 1935)*

On the contrary, southern states such as Spain, Portugal, Italy, and South American countries were presented by the author as more liberal on issues of sexuality. The author suggests that predominantly white countries understood the risks of homosexuality and, therefore, condemned and criminalized it. The author even mentions that Germanic Swiss cantons, because they were racially pure, punished homosexuality, whereas the French and Italian Swiss cantons did not. The second reference to racial impurity is supported with religious and historical information. In this excerpt, the author claims that, in the past, the church persecuted and killed homosexuals because they were considered heretics and not because homosexuals were impure and could taint the Aryan race. The author clarified that although the church had killed homosexuals for heresy in the past, it was not a significant reason as condemning them for their impure blood. The second historical reference was based on the idea that Voltaire and the French Revolution did not consider homosexuality as a perversion:

*Two times in history the northern Germanic view on perversity has been corrupted. At first by the church, when it regarded the killing of homosexuals not as eradication of the perverted for the purpose of keeping clean the race, but as eradication of heretics in honor of god. . . . Second under the influence of Western believes that considered homosexuality more as a variant of normal men and not as a degeneration. . . . This second infiltration of northern feeling started with Voltaire, it had its first highlight in the French Revolution and threatened to overrun Germany completely after the collapse of 1918. The death penalty was abolished, and homosexuality was equated to other crimes against morality. That led to a complete shift in the valuation standard. (Media Document 3, 1935)*

Himmler also used a similar reference in his speech in 1937. He collocated the term *pure* with positive adjectives such as *healthy* and *good*, implying that homosexuality was a risk to the purity of the Aryan race:

*Thereby, I hope to be finally done with persons of this type in the SS, so that at least the good blood, which we have in the SS, and the increasingly healthy blood which we are cultivating for Germany, is kept pure. . . . A people of good race which has too few children has a one-way ticket to the grave, for insignificance in fifty or a hundred years, for burial in two hundred and fifty years. (Speech Document 2, 1937)*

The main point of Himmler's speech emphasizes that the future of Germany and the preservation of the Aryan race depend on the actions that would be taken in the present. Hence the importance of cultivating a lifestyle where heterosexual Germans could procreate without any risks or threats that would taint the purity of the Aryan genes.

**Fight against homosexuals.** The third category of metaphors considered homosexuals enemies of the state who needed to be combatted. In a policy document, homosexuals were explicitly called *enemies*:

*Homosexual men are enemies of the state and must be treated as such. The healing of the German national body and the preservation as well as the strengthening of the German nation is at stake. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

The Oxford Online Dictionary (2018) defines an *enemy* as a person who is actively opposed or hostile to someone or something. This means that homosexuals were individuals who resisted the Nazi ideological and political infrastructure. There are many allusions to the *fighting* of homosexuals in policy documents, suggesting that the state was in charge of such missions. Following this metaphorical reference, homosexuals were to be fought because they were *enemies* of the state. Consequently, *enemies* are fought against with state institutions that were created with the purpose of keeping the sovereignty of a nation such as the police and the army. As an example, the following policy document titled "*Guidelines for the fight against homosexuality and abortion*" (Policy Document 2, 1937) listed the different guidelines and considerations in the effort to eradicate homosexuals. Here are some examples:

*In the future the police must reduce those cases of homosexuality and abortion, so that the loss of birth rates, that is a result of those misdemeanors, can be pressed down to a minimum. In that fight, one shall not stop before any profession or estate. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

*Members of the SS and the Police must pioneer in the fight for the eradication of homosexuality within the German nation. (Policy Document 7, 1942)*

In these examples, we see how language is used to cultivate a sense of fighting, removing, and eradicating homosexuality, which was justified by the constructed necessity to keep the Nazi state *safe*. Similarly, Himmler's speeches were also used to further this notion of the homosexual as *enemy* of the state. Himmler added that if Germany was not ready to fight homosexuality, the German nation would not have a future:

*Therefore, we must be absolutely clear that if we continue to have this burden in Germany, without being able to fight it, then that is the end of Germany, and the end of the Germanic world. (Speech Document 2, 1937)*

The previous excerpt from Himmler's speech reveals a cluster of metaphors. "*The burden of Germany*" refers to the heavy load that it has to eradicate homosexuality, since not being able to fight homosexuality would bring an end to Germany. This exaggerated view of how homosexuality would bring a nation to its demise illustrates the way in which homosexuality was represented in the Nazi era. Presenting homosexuals, hyperbolically, as enemies that threatened the very existence of the state served to *perversify* German citizens and normalize hatred.

### **Legitimization of Hate**

The process of legitimization and coercion was most salient in Himmler's speeches, although there were media and policy texts that relied on these strategies as well to claim objective understanding on the dangers of homosexuality. Legitimizing is a discursive strategy in which specific information is presented to the public with supportive data that provide a sense of authority (Chilton, 2004).

*When we took power in 1933 we also discovered the homosexual associations. Their registered membership was over two million; cautious estimates by offices dealing with the matter range from two to four million homosexuals in Germany. (Speech Document 1, 1937)*

In the speech of 1937, Himmler presented numerical data to emphasize the dangers of homosexuality. He started by informing his audience of the number of homosexuals existing in Germany. This information was presented at the beginning of the speech to warn his listeners that the threat of homosexuality was both serious and current. Homosexuals were implicitly presented as a threat because homosexuals were already considered as *enemies* of Nazi Germany. The next step in Himmler's speech was to talk about the total population of Germany, which he estimated to be 68 million people. Evidently, 68 million people in comparison to 2 million homosexuals represented a significant difference. However, Himmler reduced this number even further to half of the population, 34 million men in total, focusing on the *sexually capable men* (20 million *sexually capable men*) who were able to reproduce and procreate:

*Please think what that means. According to the most recent population figures, we have 67 to 68 million people in Germany—that is, taking raw figures, roughly 34 million males. So there are approximately 20 million sexually capable men (males above the age of sixteen). Perhaps this is wrong by a million, but that is of no significance. (Speech Document 1, 1937)*

It makes sense that presenting 2 million homosexuals willing to infect 20 million men represents a greater threat than presenting 2 million homosexuals versus 68 million Germans. The use of numerical calculations is carefully manipulated to show significant potential damage and threat to Germany. This manipulation of data lends credence to Himmler's assertion that that if nothing is done to *fight* homosexuality, Germany will cease to exist. Let us consider the way he presented this information:

*Assuming one to two million homosexuals, the result is that roughly 7-8% of men in Germany are homosexual. If that is how things remain, our nation will fall to pieces*

*because of that plague. A nation will not for long bear such a destruction of its sexual economy and equilibrium.* (Speech Document 1, 1937)

The previous excerpts are relevant examples on how legitimizing was used as a discursive strategy. This political and rhetorical strategy allowed Himmler to focus on two important aspects of his homophobic agenda. Statistical data were presented as scientific evidence and therefore authoritative (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 1993). In addition, Himmler appealed to emotive instincts such as fear and terror (Chilton, 2004; Chilton & Schäffner, 2011). This tactic is known as the politics of fear because it creates a sense of resentment and elicits negative feelings in ordinary citizens, ratifying homosexuals as *scapegoats* or enemies who can be blamed (Wodak, 2015)

In general, policy and media documents used similar legitimizing and coercive strategies in keeping with Nazi propaganda. Many of the texts relied on putative scientific data to lend a more authoritative tone to the homophobic argument. Similar to what Himmler did in his speech, the author of this *Schwarzes Korps* article presented annual birthrates as negative data, connecting this information to a need to condemn homosexuality:

*A nation that is facing the task to rise its annual birthrates by 1,5 million, cannot afford to lose a huge part of its fathers, just because they became victims of a tactic of attrition that is going on for decades and is directed against the German national body. With that the political task we need to master is outlined.* (Media Document 8, n.d.)

The following excerpt from a policy document presented scientific information as inaccurate. The way in which the author refuted the validity of Hirschfeld's findings on homosexuality was with non-specific arguments and contrasting them with pseudoscientific evidence. However, the claim was presented with authority because the argument came from a government institution. We note how the term *impeccable* was used to describe the findings made by the police whereas Hirschfeld's findings are collocated with the terms *Jew* and *wrong*.

Evidently, the term *Jew* already had a heavy negative connotation within Nazi literature, and therefore Hirschfeld's findings were not difficult to debunk (van Dijk, 1993):

*In 1933, 2 million men have been recorded as members in homosexual associations and clubs. The first years after the seizure of power had shown no drop, but an increase of homosexuality. No estate and no profession was spared that plague, especially the youth was highly at risk. The findings of Kraft-Ebing and of the Jew Magnus Hirschfeld which are based on the assumption, that homosexuality is a hereditary or an inborn anomaly, were proven wrong. Impeccable conclusions by the police have shown, that only two out of hundred men, who act in a homosexual way or feel homosexual, can be considered to have actual abnormal tendencies. (Policy Document 2, 1937)*

Nazis also appealed to strategies of *othering* that involved creating a sense of fear, terror, and danger of the *Other* for German citizens (Bauman, 1993). The language used in the following press article chose the term *clutch* to portray homosexuals as predators and to suggest that Nazi youth, most specifically, were at risk of falling prey to the homosexual evil. It is important to note how the article mentioned facts as *terrifying* without presenting reliable sources to claim that homosexuality was a *terrifying* evil that preyed on children and adolescents. The following example was found in a media document causing a saturation of propaganda that would allow Nazis to *pervert* the minds of ordinary German citizens against homosexuals (Gilreath, 2011):

*The bourgeoisie who wants to close his eyes and does not want to believe these terrifying facts, is not innocent. For decades the leading intellectuals tolerated the public propaganda of the homosexuals, maybe it was even seen as special achievement of democratic freedom. They just stood and watched as the youth movement more and more fell into the clutches of the inverts. (Media Document 8, n.d.)*

In the following *National Zeitung* article, a teacher who allegedly raped many of his students was accused of having violated §§ 174 (incest), 175 (homosexual relationships), and 176 (pederasty) of the StGB (German Criminal Code). Evidently, sexually abusing children was a punishable crime in Nazi Germany and would continue to be a crime anywhere else. However, this article exemplified different legitimizing and coercing strategies of terror because: (a) the

author supports the guilt of the homosexual with legalistic paragraphs to substantiate the blame (e.g., “17 cases according to § 174,175 and 176 of the StGB”) lending the claims of this article a sense of authority (Chilton & Schäffner, 2011); (b) the author’s lexical choices portrayed the teacher as unmarried, old, degenerate, and criminal, characteristics that were collocated with the homosexuality of the teacher; and (c) the last few lines of this article were the ones that may have served to terrorize other homosexuals (to prevent them from continuing to be homosexuals) because it explained the severity of the sentence which involved emasculation plus 10 years in prison. We cannot be sure if this teacher was, as a matter of fact, a person who may have sexually abused his students. Nonetheless, the equation of such a crime with homosexuality made the case useful in promoting homophobia:

*Ten years of prison and emasculation*

*A horrible picture was shown at the criminal division of the district court Bochum. A degenerated educator is guilty of numerous atrocities towards schoolchildren who were entrusted to him. Those tremendous moral misconducts took place from the time before 1929 until summer 1934, when they were finally discovered. It is about the 39-year-old, unmarried Ludwig Stader from Bommern, close to Witten. He was accused of sex crimes in 17 cases according to § 174,175 and 176 of the StGB. Over that long period of time, the atrocities took place in the apartment of the accused as well as in the classroom. It is not possible to portray the degeneration and the extent of those child abuses. The court sentenced Stader guilty as charged to the maximum penalty of ten years prison—ten years lost honor. No mitigating circumstances were permitted. Furthermore, the step of emasculation was decided. The Sentence brands the accused as a child abuser of the worst kind, who deserves the worst penalty. (Media Document 2, 1934)*

### Summary

To recapitulate, this chapter reveals how in Nazi Germany hatred against homosexuals was constructed discursively around two axes: *substantive* and *rhetorical*.

From the substantive axis it can be concluded that Nazis relied on the use of stereotypes to define homosexuals’ physical appearance, their social and sexual behaviors, and their medical conditions. These stereotypes suggest that homosexuals were classified according to physical,

sociopolitical, criminal, medical, and moral categories. Homosexuals were accused of being effeminate, enemies of the state, corrupters of youth, pederasts, hedonistic, mentally ill, criminals, and immoral. It is worth noting that there were two persuasive social and political arguments that served as a way to classify homosexuals in Nazi Germany: medical and criminal. Some Nazi physicians and psychiatrists defined homosexuality as a medical condition, concluding that homosexuality represented a degeneration of personality linked to damage in the brain which implied a need for a cure. However, criminal proponents suggested that homosexuality needed to be considered a natural predisposition, and therefore homosexuals needed to be criminalized, imprisoned, and even killed (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995). Part of the substantive axis also explored the definition and understanding of homosexuals. *Pure* homosexuals were defined not as men but as effeminate, womanlike, and unmanly. In addition, homosexuals needed to be understood with the purpose of learning how they behaved, acted, and thought in order to properly consider the level of danger they posed to the state. This understanding included several dehumanizing medical experiments and perpetrated ideas that homosexuals looked for their victims in public spaces and preferred younger, weaker men as their prey.

From the rhetorical axis emerged two salient discursive strategies: metaphors and legitimizing/ coercive strategies. Metaphors were classified within three different subcategories: homosexuality as disease, homosexuality as impurity, and the fight against homosexuality. As a disease, the concept of *infection* was a common fear perpetrated by Nazis suggesting that an individual is *sick* and carries an *infectious* virus or bacteria. The impure metaphor evoked the danger that homosexuals would bring to Nazi Germany and the ideal of a healthy Aryan society. The final metaphorical reference claimed that homosexuals were *enemies* of the state, and

therefore needed to be eradicated. Finally, the legitimization of dehumanization, criminalization, and annihilation of homosexuals was evident in the heavily saturated Nazi propaganda. As Gilreath (2011) explained, words can do harm and language can do harm. Words became converted into ideologies, and ideologies crystallized and were reflected in a systematic homophobic culture with institutionalized laws and violence against homosexuals. To that end, homosexuals were arrested, registered, segregated, reeducated, and castrated. If these strategies were thought unsuccessful, homosexuals were sent to camps and eventually annihilated (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995).

## CHAPTER 6

### THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF HATE IN THE PRE-STONEWALL US

This chapter presents the findings of the data collected about the US context during the 1950s and 1960s before the Stonewall riots in New York City in 1969. As with the previous chapter, the analysis of the data is organized along a *substantive* and a *rhetorical* axis. These two major categories afford a social and philosophical analysis with regard to the construction of antagonism against the other as well as a linguistic study of the texts, in line with the research questions reproduced in Chapter 4. Please note that I have underlined the specific terms, phrases, or expressions that I wanted to emphasize in each of the excerpts.

#### **Substantive Axis: Constructing the Argument Against the *Other***

Constructions of homosexuals as the *Other* was a salient substantive strategy that was used in the US in this historical period, allowing the American government and American society to characterize, define, portray, and understand this minority group as aliens. Othering served as a way to create antagonism between heterosexual citizens and homosexuals and as a useful strategy to *perversify* heterosexual citizens against homosexuality (Bauman, 1993). The construction of the *Other* relied on different stereotypes of homosexuals that, in sum, presented a compelling portrait of this group as perverse and through the process of *perversification* gave many American citizens licence to justify the criminalization and dehumanization of homosexuals. In this chapter, the *Other* and *homosexual* are terms used interchangeably.

#### **Stereotypes**

Stereotypes served as a popular substantive strategy used by American society to create a simplistic portrayal and characterization of homosexuals.

The following are six different categories that I have distilled from the stereotypes found in the data collected from 22 distinct texts. Americans stereotyped homosexuals based on their physical appearance, their social and sexual behavior, and their psychological and medical characteristics. I have grouped these stereotypes with representative excerpts to illustrate the way in which these terms were used:

**Biological/physical stereotypes.** Effeminate, queers, soft, curving, beardless, queens, eccentrics, feminine, masquerade, grossly effeminate, the drags of the invert world, queers, male prostitutes, and homos.

*This is true only of the obviously effeminate type.* (US-Media Document 4)

**Sociopolitical stereotypes.** Bad risks, blackmail perversion risks, poor risks, security risks, bad morale, undesirable employees, and unfit.

*Captain McDill explained that in his opinion perverts were in the same category with thieves and liars as far as being poor security risks.* (US-Policy Document 5, 1950)

**Medical stereotypes.** Mentally retarded, epileptic, ill, sick, mentally ill, they needed treatment, unfit, deviates, disturbed, inverts, mentally conflicted, emotionally unstable, and unmotivated.

*Ralph was sick. . . Ralph was a homosexual.* (US TV Commercial Document 1, 1961)

**Criminal stereotypes.** Sex offenders, sexual psychopaths, heinous sexual criminal, sexual psychopaths, menace, criminals, felony, thieves, liars, and dangerous.

*Washington's program to treat its public sex offenders as mental but instead of penal cases isn't paying off as a salvage operation, its operators agreed yesterday.* (US Media Document 2, 1950)

**Religious/moral stereotypes.** Moral perverts, guilty, sinful, sodomy, unnatural, and perverted.

*The practice is condemned as sin by Catholics, Protestants and Jews.* (US Media Document 7, 1965)

**Sexual stereotypes.** Fetishists, travesties, masochists, exhibitionists, indulgers, promiscuous, sex-twisted humans, neurotic, alcoholic sex perverts and sexually abnormal.

*The homosexual with promiscuous tendencies would be, I think, a poor security risk.* (US Policy Document 8, 1950)

### **Biological/Physical Stereotypes**

From biological and physical perspectives, homosexuals were seen as individuals who lacked the masculinity associated with manhood. Throughout history, homosexuals have generally been characterized with feminine features that would evidently be noticeable in their mannerisms, their voices, their clothing, and their behavior (Westwood, 2000). Based on the data, homosexuals in the US were effeminate with “soft, curving beardless appearance” (US-Media Document 4). In the following excerpt from *Esquire Magazine* (a men’s publication) published in 1950, Lloyd Wendt, the author, presented homosexuals in a more neutral manner when he said that many homosexuals “are built like professional athletes,” appealing to characteristics of a masculine body (e.g., athletic and built). This implies that the author chose to give a more positive and mainstream characterization of homosexuals, distancing himself from any stereotypical definition of a homosexual (van Dijk, 1993, 1999). However, he chose to emphasize that other people think of them as feminine. In discourse analysis, this a common rhetorical strategy used in hate speech, known as a positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation:

*Actually, many homosexuals are built like professional athletes, but the public thinks of ‘queers’ as soft, curving, beardless, effeminate fellows.* (US-Media Document 4, 1950)

*Queer* is an important term to review because its meaning has evolved and its connotation changed to positive (Leap, 2010). However, this term was used in the past as a slur to refer to homosexuals who lacked masculinity. This is precisely how the author introduced this term in the description of homosexuals. Currently, *queer* has been reclaimed by many scholars and activists as an umbrella term for the various expressions of gender and sexual orientation (e.g., gay, lesbian, transsexual, bisexual, intersexual, pansexual, queer, asexual). In the same article, the author suggests that *queers* are identifiable because of their physique, heavily relying on feminine features such as *soft* and *beardless*.

Another salient term that became more popular in the late fifties and early sixties was *queen*, in part due to the emerging culture of drag queens in gay establishments (Altman, 1982). Consequently, homosexuals were defined as *drag queens* in which the term *queen* served to emphasize the exaggerated femininity, eccentricity, and flamboyancy of homosexuals (Altman, 1982; Cook & Cusack, 2010). It is evident that the author has a negative assessment of homosexuality in the manner in which the term *queens* is collocated with the negative terms such as *painted*, *grossly*, and *effeminate*. The term *painted* suggests that homosexuals hide behind paint to accentuate their interest in being noticed as women. The term *grossly* shows the disapproval and disgust of the author regarding homosexuality; and the term *effeminate* is the stereotypical reference that has been generally used to define homosexuals:

. . . *the painted grossly effeminate "queens."* (US-Media Document 9, 1950)

In the same *New York Times* article, the author discusses some homosexuals who hide and live double lives to avoid social shame and discrimination because of their sexual orientation. A double life or a *masquerade*, according to the author, involved a homosexual who pretended to live a heterosexual life (with wife and children) with the purpose of hiding their

homosexuality. The term *masquerade* can be considered a negative term to describe homosexuals because, in its literal meaning, it implies that homosexuals represented themselves dishonestly to others about who they truly were. It also suggests that homosexuals had to repress and hide their sexuality. It is logical that this notion of hiding behind a mask would eventually lead to the common expression of *coming out of the closet* (American Psychiatric Association, 2018) for homosexuals who decided to disclose their sexual orientation to heterosexuals:

*Many homosexual men carry out a successful lifetime masquerade—with wives, children and entirely masculine appearance, he says. (US-Media Document 9, 1950)*

In a letter written to Mr. Francis Flanagan, Chief Counsel of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, the author of this letter claims that homosexuals in the government are easily *identifiable* because of the way they talk and behave:

*Mr. Mulliken stated that as general rule those that talk and act like homos generally are. (US Policy Document 2, 1950)*

The author chose to refer to homosexuals as *homos*. *Homos* is another derogatory term used to refer to homosexuals which became a more mainstream homophobic remark in the US in the fifties and sixties (Cook & Cusack, 2010). In addition, the author also describes homosexual behavior as *queer manner*, using quotation marks to highlight the oddness of the behavior. In this example, it is possible to see how stereotypes, based on physical appearance, were commonly used to describe homosexuals:

*Mr. Mulliken stated that as general rule those that talk and act like homos generally are. It is pointed out that the acting and talking are what is commonly ascribed to people who act in a "queer manner." (US Policy Document 2, 1950)*

### **Sociopolitical Stereotypes**

Americans were concerned that hiring or having homosexuals as employees in any federal government job represented a *security risk* for the country. In great part, this concern had

to do with the Lavender Scare's list of hidden homosexuals in the US government, but it was also related to American society's lack of understanding regarding the behavior of homosexuals. Consequently, the role of the press and the government, as active manipulators of public discourse, played a vital role in the process of *perversification* of the masses in the US (van Dijk, 1993). In the following excerpt from a newspaper article, the author wrote about a story of a federal judge who maintained that individuals engaging in homosexuality were *unfit* for any federal job. The ruling of the judge was supported with pseudoscientific arguments and physical stereotypes discussed in the previous section. The judge claimed that homosexuals were *immoral* and *effeminate* and for these fundamental reasons should not be part of the government:

*A Federal judge here yesterday reaffirmed the Civil Service Commission's right to consider a person who "actively engages in homosexuality" as unfit for Government employment. (US-Media Document 3, 1967)*

For Senator Clyde R. Hoey, homosexuals in the government were *undesirable employees* because they represented a *security risk* and were not *suitable* for these positions. These claims came from a survey that Senator Hoey represented in a letter. The language used in this survey is characterized by stereotypical language about homosexuals in which homosexuals were equated with *sex perverts*. Furthermore, homosexuals were considered *undesirable employees* because they lacked professional aptitudes for federal jobs and, most importantly, because they represented a security threat to the country (Stone, 2017). However, the questionnaire did not ask for specific reasons as to why homosexuals represented a security risk for the country; nor did the senator explain his reasoning for such a claim:

*Question No. 2: Does your Department consider a homosexual or sex pervert to be an undesirable employee on grounds of general unsuitability or for reasons other than security?  
Answer: Yes. (US Policy Document 6, 1950)*

Mr. Thomas Mulliken was Civilian Agent at the Office of Naval Intelligence and was considered the person in the Navy with the most knowledge on the handling of homosexuals. In his work, Mr. Mulliken claimed that homosexuals caused *bad morale* in the US Navy and any other organization in the country. In his reports, Mr. Mulliken referred to homosexuals as *sex perverts*, suggesting that people who would be surrounded by and work with homosexuals would be in danger of creating *bad morale* for other employees. Again, these remarks were not supported with any valid arguments. It is worth noting that the author of this report described Mr. Mulliken as a symbolic elite (van Dijk, 1993) based on his experience observing homosexuals and his eloquence on this matter:

*Mr. Mulliken is about 45 years of age, makes a good appearance and talks with authority on the subject. He gave the writer the impression that he was well conversant with the problem of homosexuals and had had considerable experience in the handling of such cases. (US Policy Document 2, 1950)*

In other words, the experience and observations made by a symbolic elite constituted sufficient criteria to validate these claims and, therefore, *pervertify* the minds of individuals who were not yet biased towards homosexuals:

*Mr. Mulliken also expressed the opinion that he felt that these sex perverts were a bad morale influence on any organization. (US Policy Document 2, 1950)*

The fight against homosexuals in the US government originated with the top-down elites. President Eisenhower declared homosexuality a national security risk, following which 5,000 homosexuals lost their jobs and were denied access to government services. Many of these individuals were sent to jails or to psychiatric wards where different dehumanizing experiments, with the purpose of curing homosexuality, were conducted (Stone, 2017). Simultaneously, the FBI Director published a list of 450 government employees accused of being sexual deviants, prompting several state-sponsored actions against homosexuals. This explains why these

stereotypical remarks became mainstream in American policy and media documents. Based on texts I collected, the arguments to justify such claims about homosexuals were based on pseudoscientific assertions that included observation of homosexual behavior as well as medical or psychiatric experiments on homosexuals. In the following examples in a newspaper article, homosexuals were seen as a *bad risk* allegedly due to their behavior. The author of this article cited the Kinsey Scale (see chapter 1) to suggest that the Senate's investigation would not follow the gradations reported by Dr. Kinsey. The author used the language in the Kinsey Scale to define *wholly* or *exclusive* homosexuals claiming that they were bad risks due to their behavior. Nonetheless, the alleged *dangerous behavior* of homosexuals is not discussed:

*Statistically, 21 Congressmen are wholly homosexual; 192 congressmen are bad risks because of behavior; 56,787 Federal workers are exclusively homosexual; 525,279 in Civil service are blackmail perversion risks. (US-Media Document 5, 1950)*

The author also suggested that one common risk of having homosexuals in the government is that of *blackmail*. This claim had to do with the Lavender Scare (Stone, 2017). Having homosexuals as senators or congressmen or in any other high-profile position would be considered disgraceful and, therefore, a risk for blackmail. Such public sensationalist scandals were among the *risks* the author cited. The author wrote:

*If one homosexual contact is enough for a Communist blackmailer's purposes, then, assuming again that Dr. Kinsey's figures can be applied to Civil Service employees and members of Congress, 37 percent of them are poor security risks for that reason . . . The investigation is being held because some members of Congress believe that employment of 'homosexuals and other moral perverts' is a security risk in that such persons might be subject to blackmail by Communists. (US-Media Document 5, 1950)*

## Medical Stereotypes

The US showed much interest in treating homosexuality as an *illness*, which prompted different elites and symbolic elites to emphasize the acknowledgement of homosexuals as

mentally ill, disturbed, emotionally unstable, and sick. As a matter of fact, the US Congress on June 8, 1948, passed the Miller Act, which was created to protect society from sex outrages through mental treatment instead of prison terms (US-Media Document 2, 1950). In a *New York Times* article, Michael J. Murphy, New York City's Police Commissioner, commented that New York City had many issues concerning police enforcement although homosexuality was, in his opinion, a medical and a sociological matter:

*Homosexuality is another one of the many problems confronting law enforcement in this city. However, the underlying factors in homosexuality are not criminal but rather medical and sociological in nature.* (US-Media Document 9, 1963)

There were scientists and institutions that were interested in treating homosexuality as an illness with the purpose of finding a cure. In a press article, it was suggested that Metrazol, a medication to treat schizophrenia, was also used to treat homosexuality. The conclusions from this experiment suggested that initial treatment with six patients aged 19 to 44 proved to have cured their homosexual desires. The experiments included shock therapy for insanity, showing the level of dehumanization of homosexuals and the understanding of homosexuality as a mental illness:

*Use of metrazol, a synthetic camphor to stop homosexuality in six persons, was reported here yesterday. . . . The physicians assumed that the cases are underdeveloped schizophrenias. . . . They used the usual method of treating mental troubles with metrazol, in which this chemical induces deep coma. It has the same effect as insulin, the medicine first tried in the new shock treatment for insanity. . . . The six patients had been afflicted for periods ranging from, five to many years each. Their ages were 19 to 44. In all cases, the report said, the desires were stopped, but added that the time is too short and cases too few to be sure about this treatment.* (US-Media Document 11, 1940)

Similarly, Dr. Socarides, psychiatrist and university professor at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine and specialist in the study of sexual perversion, focused his research on homosexuality. He concluded that homosexuality was an *epidemic* similar to mental retardation, epilepsy, and alcoholism:

*Homosexuality, he [Dr. Socarides] said, is a “condition of certainly epidemiological proportions” and one that calls for a pooled program of research and treatment, similar to those for mental retardation, epilepsy, and alcoholism. (US-Media Document 1, 1967)*

Dr. Socarides urged the study of homosexuality because he claimed that homosexuals did not have a safe space to express their illness and abnormality. This remark positions Dr. Socarides as a compassionate symbolic elite who showed concern for homosexuals’ well-being. However, Dr. Socarides also used pejorative language when referring to homosexuals—this is a common strategy in hate speech of using negative other presentation (van Dijk, 1999):

*There is no place—hardly any place, I would say, in the US—where a homosexual can go and say: I am a homosexual. I need help. (US-Media Document 1, 1967)*

The *Baltimore Afro-American* newspaper discussed homosexuality in the US Army, stating that soldiers generally need food and sex to survive their military duties. It is suggested that if soldiers cannot find *normal* sexual satisfaction (i.e., heterosexual sexual relationships), they could be considered mildly *disturbed*. The term *disturbed* is used in the psychiatric field regarding an emotional disorder and a mental illness. However, the author chose to hedge the term *disturbed* with the adverb *mildly* to imply that soldiers (commonly representative of heterosexual men) would indulge in a homosexual experience for lack of normative experience. The author adds that *normal* soldiers are the ones who are able to engage in promiscuous relationships without any type of aversion, although some weak-minded soldiers who witness the behavior of *normal* soldiers (i.e., those who engage in abnormal sexual practices without disgust) are to be considered *mentally disturbed* or *conflicted*:

*The man whose homosexuality develops for the first time in a situation where he cannot have normal satisfaction, may be only mildly disturbed. . . . The normal soldier who can indulge in promiscuous sexual activity without disgust may be an efficient soldier, but his loose talk and behavior may arouse the sexual needs of men who cannot resort to direct satisfaction without mental conflict. (US-Media Document 6, 1943)*

In a report to Mr. Flanagan, Chief Counsel of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, Mr. Robert P. Knight, director of the Austen Riggs Foundation and medical researcher, claimed that homosexuals were generally *unmotivated* to start their process of cure and healing to become *normal* and *healthy*. Mr. Knight expressed the view that the job of psychiatrists would not be enough unless the homosexual was truly *motivated* to change. In addition, *well-poised homosexuals* would not be able to be identified if they were not willing to disclose their abnormality:

*I would say that the homosexual can be diagnosed or detected by a competent psychiatric examination only if he is motivated to reveal himself.* (US Policy Document 8, 1950)

According to Mr. Knight, the only way to *cure* homosexuality was through the willingness of homosexuals to change. However, this implied that homosexuals would need to be aware of their perversion for psychoanalysis to be effective and help them find a cure:

*If a homosexual is not at peace with his perversion and has a strong desire to change, he can be treated successfully by psychoanalysis.* (US Policy Document 8, 1950)

Finally, homosexuality as an illness became a topic that was disseminated on television. An Inglewood, California, high school, with the support of the regional police department, created a TV commercial with the purposes of alerting families, teachers, and school-aged youth to the danger that homosexuality was an illness that was not visible to the eye but was just as contagious as smallpox. The comparison of homosexuality to a highly *infectious* disease was not only a common strategy to create a sense of fear in people about an illness that could well be passed on to their children but also served as an efficient way of dehumanizing homosexuals (Bauman, 1993; van Dijk, 1999). Note that the terms *friendly* and *nice guy* are positive self-presentation strategies to distance the narrator of the commercial from what follows—*sick*, *dangerous*, and *contagious* (van Dijk, 1999; van Dijk, 2011):

*He [high school student] didn't think anything was unusual. When the driver [the homosexual] struck up a friendly conversation, in fact, he seemed like a real nice guy but what Jimmy didn't know was that Ralph was sick—a sickness that was not visible like smallpox but no less dangerous and contagious. (US TV Commercial 1, 1961)*

## **Criminal Stereotypes**

For many other Americans, homosexuality was not an issue related to mental illness because it was argued that homosexuality was a criminal act that needed to be prosecuted. Some considered that classifying homosexuality as an illness was a mistake. This strategy was not going to solve the perversion problems in the US, claimed one author:

*Washington's program to treat its public sex offenders as mental instead of penal cases isn't paying off as a salvage operation, its operators agreed yesterday. (US-Media Document 2, 1950)*

Americans saw homosexuals as sexual criminals, sex offenders, and sexual psychopaths, making homosexuality a synonym for *sodomy* (Eskridge, 2008). Sodomy laws were created in the US to tackle the problems of homosexuality and the menace homosexuals were thought to represent for the American society and government. Many of these laws were influenced by the church and some by former English laws in the 19th and early 20th centuries (Eskridge, 2008):

*The case against such criminal laws was stated vividly Oct. 10 in an opinion entered in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. A prisoner, convicted in state courts of sodomy, sought his freedom under habeas corpus on the contention that North Carolina's law was unconstitutionally vague. While the federal court rejected this argument, the court made some observations that merit thought. North Carolina's statute, it was noted, was patterned directly after an English law of 1533. North Carolina in 1837 defined the offense euphemistically, as a "crime against nature, not to be named among Christians." (US-Media Document 8, 1964)*

The Senate and House of Representatives passed a law that regulated treatment of sexual psychopaths with the purpose of preserving the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia. The document defined what constituted indecent acts, indecent acts with children, sodomy, and sexual psychopaths. Under this law, different sexual acts were

criminalized. Evidently, the law aimed to protect children and vulnerable individuals from sexual abuse and harassment. However, homosexuality was listed as a sexual crime under the *sodomy* paragraph of this law, implying that homosexual sexual acts were bestial and *unnatural*. An offender was to be fined \$1,000 or imprisoned for up to 20 years:

*SODOMY*

*SEC. 104. (a) Every person who shall be convicted of taking into his or her mouth or anus the sexual organ of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sexual organ in the mouth or anus of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of having carnal copulation in an opening of the body except parts with another person, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding ten years. Any person convicted under this section committing such act with a of sixteen years shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding twenty years. And indictment for the commission of any of the acts, hereby declared to be offenses, it shall not be necessary to set forth the particular unnatural or perverted sexual practice with the commission of which the defendant may be charged.* (US-Policy Document 1, 1967)

Similar ideas on criminality were widely disseminated in press outlets. The *Baltimore Afro-American*, for example, claimed that having sexual relationships with a partner of your own sex was considered a felony named *sodomy* as well as lesbianism among females. It is important to note the syntactical organization of this sentence: *sodomy* is the first term after the definition of the *felony*. In other words, the author chose to emphasize *sodomy* (which is related to male-to-male sex) rather than *lesbianism*. Halliday (1978) claims that unspoken utterances or silence represent a message that the hearer can understand on their own. Provencher (2010) poses the question: Would this claim have the same meaning and connotation if the order of the words were different? That is, would the same negative association of male homosexuality be evoked if lesbianism had come first in the sentence? In fact, the rest of the article focused entirely on the menace that male homosexuals represented for American children, which suggests that the author's syntactical choice aimed to single out male homosexuals and not lesbians:

*It is also a felony to seek sexual partners from your own sex—termed sodomy among men, lesbianism among females.* (US-Media Document 7, 1965)

The language in the following policy text does not use the term *homosexual*. However, the personal pronoun *he* is used to imply that the homosexual's behavior was *dangerous* and *deliberate*. According to the text, sexual psychopaths would inflict pain and injure their victims. The definition of homosexuals as psychopaths also implies that homosexuals were, to some extent, promiscuous (Ali & Chamorro-Premuzic, 2010):

*TITLE II DEFINITIONS*

*SEc. 201. For the purposes of this title- (1) The term “sexual psychopath means a person, not insane, who by a course of repeated misconduct in sexual matters has evidenced such lack of power to control his sexual impulses as to be dangerous to other persons because he is likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury pain, or other evil on the objects of his desire.”* (US-Policy Document 1, 1950)

Captain McDill, Director of the Legislative Division at the United States Navy (USN), explained that in his opinion homosexuals needed to be seen as thieves and liars because they represented a safety issue for the institution and the country:

*Sexual perverts were in the same category with thieves and liars as far as being poor security risks.* (US Policy Document 5, 1950)

### **Religious/Moral Stereotypes**

As mentioned earlier, homosexuality has been historically condemned by different religions (Weeks, 1981), which serves as a fundamental justification for homosexual discrimination (Adamczyk & Pitt, 2009). Stone (2017) explains that in the Bible, *sodomy* or the crime against nature was defined as any type of sexual relations with unnatural procedures such as anal intercourse and zoophilia (also known as bestiality). This religious influence in America was evident in the understanding of homosexuality and in the creation of laws:

*Every person who shall be convicted of taking into his or her mouth or anus the sexual organ of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sexual organ in the mouth or anus of any other person or animal, or who shall be*

*convicted of having carnal copulation in an opening of the body except parts with another person.* (US-Policy Document 1, 1950)

In the same policy document, the language used to describe homosexual sexual acts suggests that they are *unnatural* and *perverted*. The term *unnatural* has been often used in biblical passages to describe homosexual sex (Stone, 2017). Let us note that the term *unnatural* is collocated with the terms *offense*, *perverted*, *sexual practice*, and *animal*:

*And indictment for the commission of any of the acts, hereby declared to be offenses, it shall not be necessary to set forth the particular unnatural or perverted sexual practice with the commission of which the defendant may be charged, nor to set forth the particular manner in which said unnatural or perverted sexual practice was committed but it shall be sufficient if the indictment set forth that the defendant committed a certain unnatural and perverted sexual practice with a person or animal.* (US-Policy Document 1, 1950)

In a press article, Charles Tobin, a Catholic spokesman, condemned the revision of the New York State Commission to exclude homosexuality from the penal code. It is important to note that in the article, homosexuality is collocated with the term adultery:

*The commission would exclude both adultery and homosexual practice between consenting adults from its proposed new penal law.* (US- Media Document 8, 1964)

Mr. Tobin appealed to Catholic family values, arguing that homosexuality is a threat to the structure and safety of a normal family. However, the author of this article shows a more positive view that refutes Mr. Tobin's homophobic perspective on homosexuality, suggesting that while homosexuality may be a sin, it should not be considered a crime. In this article, *sin* was a careful lexical choice that alluded to a religious concept:

*Tobin, in opposing the commission's bill, took the view that homosexuality "is an increasing threat to sound family life in our community." . . . Such sexual relationships, privately entered into between consenting adults, may be sin; I suggest that as a matter of law, they ought not to be crimes.* (US-Media Document 8, 1964)

The *Baltimore Afro-American* also claimed that homosexuality was a *sin*, adding that this practice was condemned by three major religions. These remarks serve as marginalization

strategies because religion has historically been a powerful tool to justify political or media discriminatory ideologies (Eskridge, 2008):

*That's the newest name for homosexuals. The practice is condemned as sin by Catholics, Protestants and Jews.* (US-Media Document 7, 1965)

The same newspaper discussed the sexual behavior of soldiers, suggesting that a sexually *abnormal* man may join the army, engage in homosexual sex, feel no shame or guilt, and still be an excellent soldier. Shame, disgust, and guilt are feelings that have served to justify the criminalization of homosexuality and have been used to stigmatize homosexuality (Nussbaum, 2006). In this excerpt, the author collocated the feelings of *guilt* and *shame* with *homosexuality* and *abnormality*, serving to exacerbate the processes of stigmatization of and discrimination against homosexuals:

*A sexually abnormal man who finds satisfaction only with other men, may get into the army. Some have no feeling of shame over their homosexuality. It is possible that they may even turn out to be excellent soldiers. The man whose homosexuality develops for the first time in a situation where he cannot have normal satisfaction, may be only mildly disturbed, but it is more likely that he will suffer strong feelings of guilt.* (US-Media Document 6, 1943)

## **Sexual Stereotypes**

In the US, homosexuals were often considered as *sexually promiscuous* exhibiting different expressions of sexuality or fetishes such as cross-dressing (e.g., *queens* or *drag queens*), masochism, or exhibitionism. Fetishism has been a taboo topic regarded as a mental disorder. In principle, a fetish is a sexual practice in which an individual finds sexual pleasure in objects other than the genitals. The Oxford Dictionary defines it, to some extent, as an abnormal practice “A form of sexual desire in which gratification is linked to an abnormal degree to a particular object, item of clothing, part of the body, etc.” (Fetish, 2019). On the other hand, Bass (2018) states that a fetish can only be considered a mental disorder if it impacts the individual’s life or if

the fetish has detrimental physical or psychological effects on the person or someone else. In a *Washington Post* article in which the author discusses the need to criminalize homosexuality, it is suggested that most homosexuals were *exhibitionists*:

*Under the present law, they stated in their report, the majority of cases received have been exhibitionists. (US-Media Document 2, 1950)*

Dr. Socarides, a clinical assistant professor of psychiatry at Albert Einstein College of Medicine and specialist in the study of sexual perversion, argued that homosexuality is rooted in early childhood. He also asserted that his findings hold up for other sexual perversions:

*The roots of homosexuality lie farther back into early childhood—in the ‘pre-oedipal’ stage before the age of 3—than generally accepted in classic theories on the causes of homosexuality. . . . He also thinks his findings may hold up for fetishism, travestitism, sexual masochism, and exhibitionism. (US-Media Document 1, 1967)*

Mr. Knight, director of the Austen Riggs Foundation and medical researcher, emphasized the idea that a *promiscuous* homosexuals is more likely to be subject to blackmail and a *poor security risk*. In this example, the assumption is that homosexuals who were promiscuous represented a risk to the government or other institutions. The text does not elaborate as to how homosexual promiscuity was a risk factor for any institution. However, this claim could serve as proof of how stereotypes were used to further discriminatory practices which lacked valid evidence:

*. . . whether he is one who practices promiscuous homosexuality with pick-ups. In the latter case any homosexual is liable to blackmail, and the homosexual with promiscuous tendencies would be, I think, a poor security risk. (US Policy Document 8, 1950)*

Similarly, the conclusions regarding homosexuals made by Mr. Thomas Mulliken, Civilian Agent at the Office of Naval Intelligence who, based on empirical observations, was considered the most knowledgeable on homosexual matters, serves as an example of how stereotypes were used for the purposes of discrimination and validation of pseudoscientific

claims. Mr. Mulliken suggested, based on his observations, that homosexuals would turn *neurotic* and *alcoholic* when they were under pressure, encouraging them to *indulge* more in abnormal or promiscuous sexual practices. In other words, Mr. Mulliken suggested that homosexuals under pressure would not perform their work duties as heterosexuals would because homosexuals would engage in sexual practices as a coping mechanism to deal with their issues:

*Homosexuals under pressure become neurotic and alcoholic and, in this state, indulge more in their practices. (US Policy Document 2, 1950)*

### **Defining and Understanding the *Other* in the US**

The observation that the *Other* (the homosexual) behaved, spoke, and thought differently from what American society was used to made it important to create a sociocultural definition of who homosexuals were in order to make sense of the differences that separated *normal* Americans from *abnormal* ones (Bauman, 1993). In general, it can be said that physical stereotypes served as linguistic tools to define homosexuals during the historical period analyzed in this study. Medical studies, laws, and fear of communism also played a decisive role in the definition and understanding of homosexuality.

Before Stonewall, homosexuals were classified based on medical studies—most specifically the gradations proposed in the Kinsey Scale (Kinsey et al., 1963). Consequently, Americans talked about *wholly* or *exclusive* homosexuals, referring to the highest level of homosexuality. These categorizations—*wholly*, *exclusive*, *true* homosexual—were common throughout media and other texts to emphasize the lack of appropriate masculinity: calling someone an *exclusive* homosexual was meant to be pejorative and discriminating. In the first example in a press article, the terms *wholly* and *exclusively* are collocated with the noun phrases *bad risks* and *blackmail perversion risks*. In the second policy text, the term *true* was used to

suggest that those men who were not actively engaged in homosexual acts were not necessarily a risk for the Navy:

*Statistically, 21 Congressmen are wholly homosexual; 192 congressmen are bad risks because of behavior; 56,787 Federal workers are exclusively homosexual; 525,279 in Civil service are blackmail perversion risks. (US-Media Document 5, 1950)*

*In the case of one who while in the naval service, has engaged in a homosexual act as a passive participant, expert opinion that such passive participant is not a "true homosexual" is material only if a contention is made that the participation was not voluntary. In other than clear cases of forcible invasion, this issue is likewise one which can normally be best resolved by a general court martial. (US Policy Document 3, 1949)*

Similarly, Dr. Socarides used his own research to differentiate between an *obligatory* and a *utilitarian* homosexual. His conclusions were similar to the more contemporary differentiation between nurture and nature in identifying the causes of homosexuality (Långström, Rahman, Carlström, & Lichtenstein, 2008). The difference is that Dr. Socarides assumed that homosexuality was caused by either childhood traumas or extreme situations such as those that occur to soldiers in war, whereas Långström et al. (2008) do not suggest that negative factors (such as the ones proposed by Dr. Socarides) could cause homosexuality:

*Dr. Socarides drew a careful line of distinction between "obligatory" homosexuality and "utilitarian" homosexual behavior. The "obligatory" homosexual, scarred by disturbances in early life, has to perform such acts to escape unbearable anxiety, but "utilitarian" homosexual activity is a far different thing. It may be an experiment or occur in barracks during war. (US-Media Document 1, 1967)*

Following the medicalization of homosexuals in the fifties and sixties, Americans needed a simplified way to define and identify homosexuals: this definition was most especially relevant for the purposes of keeping homosexuals away from federal jobs and other government institutions. The definition of homosexuals heavily relied on physical stereotypes, including their lack of masculinity, an attribute that historically has been associated with homosexual men (Altman, 1982; Westwood, 2000). Different texts and authors claimed that homosexuals were

easily *identifiable* because of their *effeminate* behavior, their mannerisms including their high-pitched voices:

*Homosexuals are identified by slacks, long hair, fancy furnishing and what is described as that lingering look in their eyes, short coats and preference for publications specializing in nude and seminude men.* (US-Media Document7, 1965)

As a result, as mentioned earlier, a new lexicon was created with the purposes of highlighting homosexuals' physical characteristics using referent such as *queen*, *queer*, or *introvert*:

*In any case, identifiable homosexuals—perhaps only half the total—seem to throng Manhattan's Greenwich Village, the East Side from the upper 40's, through the 70's and the West 70's. In a fairly restricted area around Eighth Avenue and 42d Street there congregate those who are universally regarded as the drags of the invert world—the male prostitutes—the painted grossly effeminate "queens," and those who prey on them.* (US-Media Document 9, 1963)

*They mentioned two non-sexual arrests, general descriptions of Scott as "effeminate" and an account of homosexual activity at Scott's home in which he wasn't a participant.* (US-Media Document3)

*It is pointed out that the acting and talking are what is commonly ascribed to people who act in a "queer manner."* (US Policy Document 2, 1950)

For Americans understanding homosexuality was important in order to predict behavior and to prevent the spreading of homosexuality (Bauman, 1993). However, positions on understanding homosexuals were divided between the elites and symbolic elites who believed it was a medical issue versus the ones who considered that homosexuals needed to be criminalized and prosecuted.

Various medical researchers and other scholars in this field were motivated to find answers to homosexuality, although their predispositions towards this topic seemed already pejoratively biased. In a press article, the author presented a publication of the first scientific text written to answer all questions about sexuality. This book was called *Encyclopaedia Sexualis*.

One of the topics discussed was homosexuality. However, the explanations were based on the work of Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld who concluded that homosexuality was an inherited or congenital disease or anomaly:

*THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS presents for the first time in an organized form the substance of man's knowledge of sex. It is a work of monumental proportions, covering the entire range of sexological subjects and including, in effect, a comprehensive library of concise information on every allied topic. . . .*

*Homosexuality by Magnus Hirschfeld. The author of this contribution has blazed new trails in the study of the most baffling subject. His patient research penetrated the cause of homosexuality and shed light on the problems associated with it. The late Dr. Hirschfeld was the world's leading authority on this phase of sexual deviation. He was founder of the Institute for Sexualwissenschaft (Sexual Studies) at Berlin (later destroyed by Hitler). Hirschfeld wrote especially for ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS, a summary of his studies in this field and his autobiography. (US-Media Document 12, 1943)*

In addition, many other medical researchers claimed that homosexuality was indeed a mental disease, thereby justifying medical trials involving various dehumanizing experiments on homosexuals. Psychologically, some homosexuals had to be part of conversion therapies (Stone, 2017). Medically, some individuals were given medicine to treat psychiatric illnesses while others were castrated as a way to cure their homosexuality (Altman, 1982). In general, homosexuals were seen as *sexual psychopaths* who were *mentally ill* and *unstable*. Dr. Socarides is a good example of how a symbolic elite showed interest in finding out answers regarding homosexuality. However, his findings concluded that homosexuality was a *tragic human condition* and the ones who suffered needed to be *rehabilitated*. Dr. Socarides's language showed a level of professional empathy towards homosexuals. However, discrimination was implicit in the way his conclusions were presented:

*Dr. Socarides said that the National Institute of Mental Health was "ideally constituted" to set up a center for sexual rehabilitation. "Such a national center will be started by one of the Western governments," he added, "and I hope it is here . . . A comprehensive program is needed to diminish, reverse, and prevent this tragic human condition that involves such large numbers of population." (US-Media Document 1, 1967)*

*The “sexual psychopaths” defined as persons seemingly unable to control impulses, are unpopular patients, both with attendants and with other inmates of a mental hospital, the doctors said. (US-Media Document 2, 1950)*

*The Miller Act, designed to protect society from sex outrages by mental treatment instead of prison terms, was passed by Congress on June 8, 1948. Its first “patient” was committed to the Federal institution for the mentally ill in October of that year. (US-Media Document 2, 1950)*

On the contrary, some Americans believed that homosexuals were not mentally ill, but they deliberately chose to be homosexuals, thus engendering a major polemical discussion on the topic:

*While the psychological mechanism of homosexuality is primarily a psychiatric problem, on the other hand, the commission of unacceptable social acts falls definitely into the category of the legal and disciplinary spheres. Barring psychosis, individuals should be held socially responsible and acts. Those who have committed homosexual offenses should held accountable for their failure of control. (US Policy Document 3, 1949)*

For these authors, being a homosexual by choice meant that these individuals were pedophiles or sex offenders by choice and therefore represented a major threat to American society (Stone, 2017). These assumptions prompted the government and media to use these remarks as rhetorical strategies to prejudice Americans while emphasizing the dangers that homosexuals represented for children and adolescents. This was evident in several written and spoken texts in the US, although Mr. Knight, Medical Director at the Austen Riggs Foundation, suggested that some heterosexuals also targeted minors:

*They can be a menace to young people, especially school children. They live fearing of entrapment, exposure, blackmail or loss of their jobs. (US-Media Document 7, 1965)*

*Here again homosexuals as a class do not necessarily solicit or seduce younger men or women with whom they come in contact. Some do and some don't, Just as some heterosexual people solicit younger people of the opposite sex with whom they come in contact in their jobs or socially. It is not necessarily in the nature of homosexuality to practice seductions indiscriminately. (US Policy Document 8, 1950)*

In addition to the criminal understanding of homosexuals, the major concern was that homosexuality represented a *security risk* for the government. As explained before in the context of the Lavender Scare, claiming that homosexuals were a *risk* was based on the idea that homosexuals would be the target of *blackmail*. The blackmail represented a scandalous threat for the government, humiliation and discrimination for homosexuals (working for the government), and an opportunity for the communists to create turmoil in the country (Stone, 2017):

*The investigation is being held because some members of Congress believe that employment of “homosexuals and other moral perverts” is a security risk in that such persons might be subject to blackmail by Communists. . . .*  
*If one homosexual contact is enough for a Communist blackmailer’s purposes, then, assuming again that Dr. Kinsey’s figures can be applied to Civil Service employees and members of Congress, 37 percent of them are poor security risks for that reason. This would work out to 525,279 male Civil Service employees and 192 white male members of Congress. (US-Media Document 5, 1950)*

Following are two government documents in which homosexuality was discussed and the authors explained why it was a *security risk* for their institutions. In the first document, Seymour D. Vestermark, Acting Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, responded in a letter to Mr. Francis Flanagan, Chief Counsel of the Senate Investigations Subcommittee. In this letter, Dr. Vestermark explained the reasons as to why homosexuals were a *security risk* in federal positions, claiming that homosexuals carried the same *risks* as other employees with other negative personality characteristics such as liars, alcoholics, or philanderers. He concluded that *covert* homosexuals represented a greater risk than *overt* homosexuals because if they were to be caught, they were likely to be blackmailed by communists:

*For example, the liar or the person who gossips maliciously, the person who desires to portray his importance, the show-off, the alcoholic, the person who suffers from great financial need and is subject to bribery, persons with questionable background, persons with bad associates, and the philanderer. . . .*  
*Obviously there would be no question about the overt homosexual person who seeks his sexual gratification from persons of the same sex and is caught in the act. This raises the*

question as to other homosexual individuals whose homosexuality is latent and does not express itself by overt behavior. (US Policy Document 7, 1950)

*In the latter case any homosexual is liable to blackmail, and the homosexual with promiscuous tendencies.* (US Policy Document 8, 1950)

These concerns were also widely disseminated in the media. In one *Esquire Magazine* article, the author concluded that shame, humiliation, and fear were common feelings among the victims of homosexual blackmail. These feelings were coopted by criminals to set up innocent heterosexual men to pay blackmail money in exchange for silence. Briefly said, the *Esquire* article described in detail a popular racketeering scam in which male victims were targeted by different groups of criminals that would approach them with an *effeminate*-looking man. Then, the criminal (as a fake homosexual) would ask the victim to have a drink with them in order to suggest that the victim enjoys spending time with homosexuals. Later on, a fake police officer would attempt to arrest the victim and the effeminate individual, suggesting that he, the fake police officer, would disclose the victim's homosexuality to his family and employers. At this point, the fake police officer would be open to bribery in exchange for his silence. This example illustrates what it meant to be a homosexual between the 1940s and 1960s in the US. It is important to note that the language used to refer to homosexual acts in this *Esquire Magazine* article is *depraved*. In addition, the author in many cases throughout the article suggested that homosexuality was indeed *humiliating* and embarrassing. The article was created to prevent heterosexual men from falling prey to such an extortion scheme, which became common in the 1950s. The fear of being called a homosexual during this historical time in the US showed the level of discrimination and dehumanization that homosexuals experienced:

*Here is the inside story of the rotten perversion racket. It's not a pretty one, but the public; —and you—can no longer afford to deny it. . . .*

*The victim invariably assumes that the pretended officers are genuine. He shares and fears public contempt for homosexuals and believes he will be suspected of depraved behavior regardless of any defense he may attempt. The loathsome and humiliating situation in which he finds himself leaves him helpless and vulnerable to any suggestions that seem to offer escape from embarrassment. (US Media Document 4, 1950)*

## **Stranger Within Us**

In the previous sections, I have described the way in which American society along with the elites and symbolic elites used stereotypes to categorize and understand homosexuality in America. Bauman (1993) suggests that even when American society was aware of the differences between them and the *Other*, they often believed that some homosexuals were able to hide and blend in with them. This troubling idea was mostly disseminated in media outlets that suggested that people they knew could be *deviates*, as was the case in a press article published in the early 1950s that claimed that various famous Americans were actually homosexuals. This publication implied that Americans rejected homosexuality and acknowledged that *deviates* could be any of the people they knew. Even more troubling was the idea that homosexuals could be found among the elites and symbolic elites in their communities:

### *MANY FAMOUS DEVIATES*

*However, Dr. Kinsey states (p. 201), "Many of the socially and intellectually most significant persons in our histories, successful scientists, educators, physicians, clergymen, business men and persons of high positions in governmental affairs, have socially taboo items in their sexual histories and among them they have accepted nearly the whole range of so-called sexual abnormalities." (US-Media Document 5, 1950)*

Not knowing how to identify homosexuals was used as a strategy to heighten Americans' sense that homosexuals represented a danger to vulnerable Americans such as children and adolescents. The narrator in the TV commercial in Inglewood, CA, suggested that Americans would never know when a homosexual would be around their area searching for their next victim. The narrator warned the audience that sometimes homosexuals looked *normal*, and therefore, it was challenging to identify these perverts:

*One never knows when the homosexual is about, he may appear normal.* (US TV Commercial Document 1, 1961)

Similarly, it was troubling for Americans to learn that some homosexuals were not easily identifiable because they could have a double life and mask their homosexuality to blend in with different sections of American society. This meant that some individuals did not fit the stereotypical characterizations of a homosexual, making it difficult to prove their homosexuality. Some even were married and had children. This fear was widely referenced in press and policy documents. For the symbolic elites, some homosexuals were able to hide their homosexuality and could only be identified if they were *motivated* enough to *disclose* their *illness*. The text suggests that some homosexuals were able to present themselves as heterosexual men; therefore, their motivation to be truthful would be the only way to diagnose their homosexuality:

*Many homosexual men carry out a successful lifetime masquerade—with wives, children and entirely masculine appearance, he says.* (US-Media Document 9, 1963)

*I would say that the homosexual can be diagnosed or detected by a competent psychiatric examination only if he is motivated to reveal himself. A well-poised homosexual, with good conversational techniques a desire not to disclose himself, could keep a psychiatrist from getting adequate information on which to base a diagnosis. If the person suspected of being a homosexual is sent unwillingly to a psychiatrist for “clearance” I would not see why he would have any motivation to reveal something would jeopardize his job and possibly his reputation.* (US Policy Document 8, 1950)

It was also feared that homosexuals had started to create their own social identity and their own spaces inside American society. According to the following excerpts from press articles, Americans were aware that homosexuals congregated in different neighborhoods in American cities for different social and sexual purposes. These spaces represented public establishments (e.g., bars, bathhouses) and other public areas (e.g., public toilets, parks) where homosexuals would look for sex and for their victims:

*In some areas of the East Side the “middle-class” homosexuals lead outward lives that are prosperous and even gay in the original sense, built around tasteful apartments and*

*weekend cocktail parties. The West 70's are home to a less prosperous class of homosexuals who drift through the rooming-house neighborhoods between the park and Broadway. (US-Media Document 7, 1965)*

*In Greenwich Village, a center for the bohemians of the homosexual world, one real estate management concern estimated that about one-fourth of the 245 apartments in its 18 West Village buildings were rented to homosexuals . . . First Deputy Police Commissioner John F. Walsh says the Police Department has limited itself to an effort to suppress solicitation in bars, public lavatories and Turkish baths and any approaches to minors by homosexuals. No attempt is made, he says, to enforce the theoretical ban on private homosexual conduct between consenting adults. (US-Media Document 9, 1963)*

Dr. Irving Bieber (1963) claimed that homosexuals were not immune to sexual attraction by women. According to him, *inverts* looked to get in closer contact with women, although, sexual intercourse with women caused them fear. It is important to note that the term *immune* in Dr. Bieber's remarks suggested that homosexuality was a contagious disease that could affect both men and women:

*There is popular belief that homosexuals are immune to sexual attraction by women. Dr. Irving Bieber, director of the most recent extensive study of homosexuality, disputes this view and cites the presence of large numbers of inverts in occupations that bring them into close personal contact with women to prove the reverse . . . He asserts that homosexual men receive sexual stimulation from women. But, because their capacity for normal erotic expression has been crippled psychologically, Dr. Bieber believes female attraction produces a reaction of fear and search for homosexual outlet. (US-Media Document 9, 1963)*

## **Rhetorical Axis: Homophobic Discourse in the Pre-Stonewall US**

### **Legitimization of Hate**

An emergent strategy in American public discourse to justify homosexual dehumanization and criminalization was the use of rhetorical strategies of coercion and legitimization (Chilton, 2004). These strategies were used to justify three different aspects of homosexuality: homosexuality as an *illness*, the criminalization of homosexuals, and the reasons why homosexuals were considered a *security risk* for the US.

From the legal standpoint, media articles relied on symbolic elites (e.g., doctors, psychiatrists, and scientists) to legitimize discrimination against homosexuals and their sickness. As has been mentioned before, many of the medical doctors carrying out research to find out more about homosexuality were already biased with respect to this topic. There seems to have been a major interest in disproving Dr. Kinsey's gradations of sexuality. In many of the following press articles, the authors presented statistical data as a way to support their claims and with the purpose of giving a more authoritative tone to their articles (Chilton, 2004). In the first article referenced below, the author cited Dr. Socarides as topic authority, with the purpose of criticizing the Kinsey Report. Dr. Socarides suggested that Dr. Kinsey and his team used these conclusions (e.g., obligatory and utilitarian homosexual) to claim that there were fewer homosexuals than he had anticipated. This was supported by Dr. Socarides's citation of *other psychiatrists* as a legitimizing source:

*Dr. Socarides drew a careful line of distinction between "obligatory" homosexuality and "utilitarian" homosexual behavior. The "obligatory" homosexual, scarred by disturbances in early life, has to perform such acts to escape unbearable anxiety, but "utilitarian" homosexual activity is a far different thing. It may be an experiment or occur in barracks during war. The Kinsey report, Dr. Socarides emphasized, con-used the two and came up with the misleading figure of 28% for adults who engaged in homosexual contact. Dr. Socarides' figure of 2 ½ million homosexuals is on the low side for estimates made in recent years by other psychiatrists.* (US-Media Document 1, 1967)

In the second referenced article, the author cited a group of medical doctors to define homosexuals as sexual psychopaths and to claim that, according to psychiatrists, a group of individuals under treatment would not be cured. These claims implied that homosexuals were ill and were not going to be cured by professionals in the field of medicine and psychiatry, an assertion that would elicit fear and provoke discrimination in the readers of these newspapers (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 1999). This is a good example of how coercion and legitimizing served as rhetorical tools of predisposing Americans against homosexuals:

*The cases are reported by Dr. Bernard A. Cruvant, Milton Meltz, and Francis J. Tartaglino, all of the hospital staff, for publication in a coming edition of the American Journal of Psychiatry. It deals with the first 24 persons committed to St. Elizabeths under the Miller Act. The “sexual psychopaths” defined as persons seemingly unable to control impulses, are un popular patients, both with attendants and with other inmates of a mental hospital, the doctors said. Admitting that the group under care isn’t statistically representative of sex offenders in the community, the psychiatrists concluded that at least those under treatment are not likely to be cured by present techniques.* (US-Media Document 2)

In a *New York Times* article published in 1963, the author relied on a citation of an unknown report as means of establishing authoritative voice in the article that suggested that homosexuals would be healed if they were treated by professionals. The purpose of this claim was to contradict the homophile groups that claimed that homosexuality was not a sexual deviance. In addition, Dr. Bieber was cited to emphasize the medicalization of homosexuality:

*“Our findings are optimistic guideposts not only for homosexuals but for psychoanalysts who treat them,” the report concluded. We’re firmly convinced that psychoanalysis may well orient themselves to a heterosexual objective in treating homosexual patients rather than “adjust” even the more recalcitrant patient to a homosexual destiny. The organized homosexuals dispute the validity of psychiatric findings on deviance. They argued that the medical students of the problems see only those homosexuals who are disturbed enough to seek treatment. Therefore, they say, findings based on the sample cannot be applied to the majority of adjusted homosexuals.*

*To this, Dr. Bieber, replies that, during his wartime service, he interviewed intensively about 75 homosexuals discovered by military authorities. Among these involuntary subjects for study he found no basic differences in their psychopathology from that of the voluntary group under treatment, except that the former were more defensive and resistant to recognizing their deviance.* (US-Media Document 9, 1963)

These rhetorical legitimizing strategies were also used to instantiate the criminality of homosexuals. In the following excerpt, the author in a press article used the term *law* in a general sense with the purpose of arguing that the majority of homosexuals were *exhibitionists*. The document did not provide a direct reference to the specific law that the author referred to; nor did it mention that the report was filed in regard to the *exhibitionist* cases that the author cited. In the second example, the author cited *some experts* to provide a more authoritative tone to the article.

The document did not mention who the experts were. The term *expert* suggests that the topic being discussed needed to be taken seriously because it was supported by authoritative sources even though they were not presented to the readers. This legitimizing strategy serves as a way to give journalists credibility and create in readers a sense of reliability (Chilton, 2004). In addition, the author used certain terms that served as coercive devices because they appealed to emotions of fear and terror. For example, the author claimed that the *number of homosexuals were rapidly increasing*. The terms *number* along with *increasing rapidly* aimed to suggest that homosexuals were an alarming threat and that their rapid growth needed to be brought under control through legal channels (Chilton, 2004, van Dijk, 1999):

*Most Are Exhibitionists*

*Under the present law, they stated in their report, the majority of cases received have been exhibitionists. (US-Media Document 2, 1950)*

*Some experts believe the numbers of homosexuals in the city are increasing rapidly.*

*There have been an average of 120 arrests here annually under this section, most often for acts in public. (US-Media Document 9, 1963)*

Finally, rhetorical strategies of legitimization served as means to justify discriminatory employment practices in federal and government positions. In the first excerpt below, the author cited a federal judge to explain that homosexuals were *unfit* for any federal jobs. A federal judge in the US represents a symbolic elite with access to power and great knowledge of the US law. For this reason, referencing a federal judge to claim that individuals who *actively engaged in homosexual practices* were unfit for federal jobs legitimizes the notion of the general unsuitability of homosexuals in government positions. In addition, the verb *reaffirmed* in the sentence below was evidently used to reaffirm (not to affirm) the judge's decision, suggesting that he was in a capacity to instantiate someone else's opinion on the matter:

*A Federal judge here yesterday reaffirmed the Civil Service Commission's right to consider a person who "actively engages in homosexuality" as unfit for Government employment. (US-Media Document 3, 1967)*

One article, nonetheless, suggested that if the law recognized and decriminalized homosexual relations, blackmail would not necessarily affect the security of the country. The author recognized that homosexuality was a sex perversion that repulsed most Americans and claimed that anyone who would want to decriminalize homosexuality needed to reconsider this outrageous idea by getting their heads examined. In this article, the author presented two different positions: on the one hand, they condemn homosexuality, and on the other, they suggest decriminalizing associated procedures for the purpose of keeping the country away from a security risk:

*Any writer who sets out to suggest the desirability of revising the country's criminal laws on homosexuality probably should begin by having his head examined. His topic is distasteful and his view unpopular, and any thanks he may get from those who agree will be more than offset by howls of outrage from those who miss his point. Nevertheless, the subject has been recently in the news, and it provides an opportunity for reflection upon themes that go far beyond the sexual relationships in question. (US-Media Document 8, 1964)*

However, the decriminalization proposed by the author was not as important as maintaining the freedom that the US, as a country and as a society was thought to historically embrace and defend. The author therefore expressed two not entirely compatible positions: (a) homosexuality was condemned and it was suggested that it needed to continue to be criminalized; and (b) even though homosexuality was deemed a perversion, it was not worth the security risk it caused the government and the menace to US freedom:

*If homosexual relations, under the American Law Institute definition, no longer were criminal, the whole point of blackmail operations in areas of the national security would be blunted. More importantly, if less tangibly, adoption of the New York commission's proposal would tend to reaffirm one of the most ancient principles of the law, which is that men should be free to pursue their widely varying concepts of happiness so long as they do not encroach upon the rights of their neighbors. This is the key point. The thought*

*of sex perversion gives most of us the creeps; but the thought of freedom from needless coercions of the state embraces an ideal we ought to defend.* (US-Media Document 8, 1964)

In the following excerpt, the author relied on numerical data to support their claims about gradations of homosexuality in federal workers. In general, statistics and other numerical sources provided to readers afford a sense of reliability and accuracy to the information asserted in the article (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 2011). In the same way, the sums presented here in five- and six-digit numbers suggest the approximate number of homosexuals working for the US government. Given the political and historical circumstances in the 1950s, and the stereotypes associated with homosexuals during this era, 525,279 represented an alarming number of homosexual federal workers for the readers and government agents. Such statistics served as a strategy to elicit emotions of disgust, fear, and terror. Furthermore, in the same article, the author used Dr. Kinsey's findings to demonstrate how these statistics could be applied to find out the number of *exclusive homosexuals* working in federal jobs. This comparison is important for two reasons. First, the Kinsey Report was heavily criticized by right-wing media in the US because its conclusions did not necessarily support the ideas that homosexuality was an illness or a criminal offense. Therefore, symbolic elites (e.g., media) often used and cited Dr. Kinsey's studies as a way to disprove these findings. The second reason was about demonstrating the wrongness of homosexuality:

*Statistically, 21 Congressmen are wholly homosexual; 192 congressmen are bad risks because of behavior; 56,787 Federal workers are exclusively homosexual; 525,279 in Civil service are blackmail perversion risks.*

*The Senate sub-committee investigating employment of "homosexuals and other moral perverts" by the Federal government had better read the Kinsey report before it goes very far.*  
*Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey and his associates found, for instance, that 4 per cent of the white males of the country are "exclusively homosexual thruout their lives after the onset of*

*adolescence*” (p. 651, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, W. B Saunders Co.).

*If this figure can be applied to the 1,419,674 male Civil Service employees, it means that 56,787 Federal employees are “exclusively homosexual.”* (US-Media Document 5, 1950)

### **Presuppositions and the Use of Questions in Homophobic Discourse in the US**

Presuppositions are propositions in which the hearer takes for granted the truth of what has been uttered by the speaker (Fairclough, 2001). Presuppositions were salient rhetorical strategies used in the US to discriminate against homosexuals. Let us remember that presuppositions can occur in different syntactical forms such as claims, questions, negations, rhetorical questions, or requests (van Dijk, 2014). In the corpus, there are various examples of how presuppositions were used in different rhetorical questions and other syntactic forms.

In the following media excerpt, the author asked: *Just who are these sex offenders, and how are they responding to treatment?* The overall idea of the article discussed the changes that the government in Washington planned to introduce in terms of recognizing homosexuals as mentally ill. The term *just* suggests that the author wanted a precise understanding of homosexuals. For the readers, it was already suggested in the question that *sex offenders* referred to homosexuals and that was how the author chose to define homosexuality. The author’s lexical choices in this question presupposed that the reader already understood homosexuals as *sex offenders* who were undergoing medical *treatment*. Interestingly, the way that homosexuals were defined by the medical doctors in the same article did not involve use of negative *Other* presentation strategies (van Dijk, 1993). The doctors said: *A 25-year-old, married colored musician with numerous arrests since adolescence for larceny and 18 for exhibitionism and peeping*. Nowhere in the doctors’ definition was it suggested that the individual was a *sex offender* or a homosexual. The underlying assumption is that the author formulated a question at the beginning of the paragraph that presupposed the idea that homosexuals were *sex offenders* in

need of *treatment* instead of presenting the doctors' definition of this specific patient at the beginning of the paragraph. Since the question already suggested homosexuals as *sex offenders* and ill individuals, the reader could most likely infer that homosexuals behaved in the way the doctors described the 25-year-old individual:

*Just who are these sex offenders, and how are they responding to treatment? Representative cases, cited in a preliminary report by three St. Elizabeth doctors, give some of the answers. They include: "Case A. A 25-year-old, married colored musician with numerous arrests since adolescence for larceny and 18 for exhibitionism and peeping. He has used alcohol, cocaine and marijuana since age 12. He came from a broken home and was institutionalized many times before the age of 12. 'He is immature and egocentric but has been a superficially "good" patient, but his self-punishing operations have been very conspicuous. His jobs, therapy and friendships have all evolved into failures.'" (US-Media Document 2, 1950)*

*Esquire Magazine* published an article in 1950 that aimed to prevent heterosexual men from falling prey to a scam where fake police officers blackmailed men with money in exchange for silence. The use of questions in this article is relevant because of the many assumptions that were made available to the reader. The article starts with two questions: *WHY all this talk about homosexuality?* and *Why is so much being written on the subject these days?* The author used these two questions to clarify that a large number of press articles had been addressing the topic of homosexuality, which served as a way to distance this particular text from the polemical medicalization or criminalization of homosexuality. These two *Wh* questions (in this case, *Why*) were asked to establish that in this article, the author and their readers were not going to encounter what was being discussed about homosexuality in the other media outlets. The author clarified that this article was written to prevent innocent men from a dangerous scam happening throughout the country that no one dared to discuss in the media. The purpose of this article was not to discuss homosexuality as a political issue but rather as a social one that could potentially affect the lives of innocent heterosexual men. The author asked *What's it all got to do with you?*

to imply that homosexuality could victimize the reader. The use of the object pronoun *you* suggests that the author was directly addressing the readers (who were mostly heterosexual men) to interest them in learning how homosexuality could ruin their lives if they were not aware of this racketeering scandal. In describing the *victims*, the author chose to emphasize the term *normal* which was collocated in between the terms *sexually* and *men*. Consequently, the author presupposes homosexuals as *abnormal* and shifts the focus to *normal* men, allowing the readers to better empathize with this latter group and to discriminate against homosexuals:

*WHY all this talk about homosexuality? you may ask. Why is so much being written on the subject these days? Well, apart from the fact that any peculiar behavior pattern that affects an appreciable element of society is bound to have an impact upon all of us, our studied refusal in the past to discuss homosexuality has led to the shocking success of a shake-down racket so heinous it is rarely mentioned in print . . . What's it all got to do with you? This, among other things: There are hundreds of innocent victims of this racket. They are innocent because they are sexually "normal" men; they are victims because they're afraid to complain to the police. And don't think it couldn't happen to you!* (US-Media Document 4, 1950)

In a *New York Times* article published in 1955, Dr. George W. Crane described an experience he had with the mother of a soldier who was dismissed from military service on the basis of his homosexuality. The purpose of the article was to address some of the questions that the mother of the soldier had regarding her son's sexual orientation. In general, it can be said that Dr. Crane presented an objective understanding of homosexuality as a form of sexual orientation although he still considered homosexuality an illness. Dr. Crane's view of homosexuality is evident in that he believed that homosexuality could be cured (with the willingness of the person involved) and used the term *victim* to refer to homosexual:

*But the victim's relatives can't cure him by their desire any more than they can change a confirmed alcoholic. The victim himself must want to change, and then shun his own sex while deliberately cultivating the opposite sex.* (US-Media Document 10, 1955)

Dr. Crane claimed that if a man dates a woman and the family does not approve of the woman, the man is not very likely to stop dating her. This example was used to explain how homosexuality functions at a psychological level. This explanation is supported by three different questions in which Dr. Crane asked the mother about something that she could understand and with which she could sympathize. Dr. Crane explained:

*For example, suppose a boy had proposed to his girlfriend and was so devoted to her he felt he couldn't live without her. But his parents then told him she wasn't good for him, so he should jilt her. How would he feel? Would he accept the advice with delight? And would it be easy to break up his romance?* (US-Media Document 10, 1955)

However, I want to focus on the questions and presuppositions that emerged from the communication of the mother of the soldier. First of all, the mother asked if her son was *losing his mind*. This implies that her understanding of homosexuality was related to psychiatric illness. Generally, psychiatric disorders such as schizophrenia, anxiety, and depression, among other disorders, can be treated with drugs. The mother's question presupposed that her son's mental disorder could be cured. Furthermore, the mother wondered if her son inherited this sickness from his uncle who, in her own words, *went insane*. These remarks also suggest that the mother understood homosexuality as a psychiatric illness. The concerning part of these questions is that the readers will infer similar conclusions from the mother's questions:

*Do you suppose he is losing his mind? One of my uncles went insane, so could he have inherited this abnormality?* (US-Media Document 10, 1955)

Dr. Crane's answers regarding homosexuality could be viewed as objective because he claimed that homosexuality did not have any relation to insanity. Dr. Crane explained that most Americans react negatively and associate homosexuality with leprosy, when this should not be the case. This is probably how he positively presented himself although the conclusion of the article evidenced Dr. Crane's opinion towards homosexuality when he claimed that *bitter as this*

situation may be, the only way to cure the victims is if they are willing to change and learn to be with the opposite sex. Van Dijk (1993) would refer to this rhetorical strategy as a common way to negatively present the *Other* while positively presenting oneself:

No, he didn't inherit his homosexuality. And it has no connection with insanity. . . . Furthermore, the public must quit affecting such horror at the sound of this word. Many Americans still act as if the term is synonymous with the cry of 'leprosy' in Biblical days. . . .

Bitter though it may seem at the start, if they will go through the proper motions, including dates with the opposite sex, compliments and kisses, they can evolve the more mature emotional type of love which is represented by heterosexual romance between male and female. But the victim's relatives can't cure him by their desire any more than they can change a confirmed alcoholic. The victim himself must want to change, and then shun his own sex while deliberately cultivating the opposite sex. (US-Media Document 10, 1955)

One final question that the mother asked was in regard to choosing a *man* versus a *lovely girl*. The mother wondered why her son did not prefer to be with a woman. The lexical choices made by the mother when asking the question shed light on the types of assumptions towards homosexuality and a heteronormative relationship commonly held at the time. First, the mother compared a *man* versus a *girl* and not a woman. A girl denotes innocence, youth, and beauty whereas *man* could suggest the opposite. Furthermore, the mother chose to collocate the term *girl* with the adjective *lovely* and chose not to similarly characterize the term *man*. The mother did not understand why her son would not choose the beauty of an attractive and beautiful girl over a man. Interestingly, Dr. Crane responded to this assertion that love is love and those feelings can be felt by a woman or a man:

But how could he be fonder of a man than of a lovely girl? his mother asked in surprise . . . Well, love is love. Whether of your own sex or the opposite sex. (US-Media Document 10, 1955)

A TV commercial addressed to Inglewood residents was created in 1961 to warn parents about the dangers of homosexuals attempting to rape their high school children. The video is

narrated by Lieutenant Williams, a police officer attached to the juvenile division at the Inglewood Police Department in California. The video shows Ralph, a middle-aged man driving a car, who approaches a young high school male student with the intention of taking him home, gaining his trust, and eventually sexually abusing him. During this scene when Ralph in his car approached the young student, Lieutenant Williams posed the question: *Oh it looks innocent enough, doesn't it?* This question presupposes different ideas about Ralph as a homosexual man. First, it suggests that homosexuals are not easily identifiable and, therefore, parents need to know how to recognize these predators. The tag question “isn't it?” implies that the narrator and the hearer are in sync with each other, as if the narrator assumed that the hearer had already agreed with him about Ralph's *innocent* appearance (Fairclough, 2001). The lieutenant focused on physical appearance, implying that Ralph looked too *innocent* for someone to be able to identify him as a homosexual and as an individual who is sick. The term *innocent* presupposes the criminality of homosexuals, which explains why the narrator used this question to alert parents that the criminality of homosexuals was not dependent on physical appearance. The lieutenant continued the commercial, asking the question *You see?* to empathize the difficulty of recognizing homosexuals by their appearance. *You see?* is a question that suggests that the narrator is in keeping with ideas shared with his audience. The narrator presented Ralph as someone who appeared to be *a nice guy*, although this claim was followed by the conjunction *but* which van Dijk (1993) claims is a popular rhetorical strategy used to positively present oneself and negatively define the *Other*. The narrator suggested that homosexuals can present as nice people but they carry an illness that is not visible to the average person's eyes and, consequently, parents and students need to be aware and mistrustful of homosexuals. The video presented only negative ideas that were not supported by pseudoscientific evidence of homosexuality.

Homosexuality was presented from a stereotypical perspective of homosexual men being predators:

*Oh it looks innocent enough, doesn't it? . . .  
When the driver struck up a friendly conversation, in fact, he seemed like a real nice guy but what Jimmy didn't know was that Ralph was sick—a sickness that was not visible like smallpox but no less dangerous and contagious. A sickness of the mind. You see? Ralf was a homosexual—a person who demands an intimate relationship with members of their own sex. (US TV Commercial Document 1, 1961)*

### Summary

To summarize, this chapter reveals how the American government during the 1950s and 1960s used different discursive strategies to justify dehumanization and criminalization of homosexuals. To present my evidence, I have constructed my argument around two axes: *substantive* and *rhetorical*.

From the substantive axis it can be concluded that Americans relied on the use of stereotypes for the purposes of defining homosexuals based on their physical appearance, their social and sexual behavior, and assumptions about their medical state or criminal behavior. These stereotypes represented homosexuals as effeminate, queer, soft, and lacking masculinity in their personalities.

In medical terms, homosexuals were seen as sick individuals who needed treatment, whereas in legal terms, they were considered sex offenders, sexual psychopaths, and criminals. From a moral perspective, homosexuals were moral perverts, guilty, sinful, and unnatural. They were also characterized by unorthodox sexual behavior, promiscuous sex, and abnormality. Along the substantive axis, I also explored the prevailing definitions and understandings of homosexuals. Using pseudoscientific language, homosexuals were categorized based on medical studies following Kinsey's Scale Gradations (Kinsey et al., 1963), which classified homosexuals as *wholly* or *exclusive* homosexuals, referring to the highest level of homosexuality. The goal of

understanding homosexuals' behavior appeared to be to criminalize and prosecute them. Being a homosexual was considered a deliberate decision, which implied that homosexuals were sex offenders by choice (Stone, 2017). In addition, homosexuality represented a *security risk* for the government, based on the idea that homosexuals would be the target of *blackmail*.

For some Americans, some homosexuals did not fit the stereotypical characterization. Some homosexuals were able to hide their sexual practices and could only be identified if they were *motivated* enough to *disclose* their *illness*.

Along the rhetorical axis, two salient discursive strategies emerged: legitimizing/coercive strategies and presuppositions. Coercive and legitimizing strategies were used to justify three different aspects of homosexuality: homosexuality as an *illness*, the criminalization of homosexuals, and the reasons why homosexuals were considered a *security risk* for the US. Various medical doctors carried out research to find out how to cure homosexuality. Many of these researchers were interested in disproving Dr. Kinsey's gradations on sexuality. The strategies used to accomplish this included pseudoscientific rhetoric, numerical data, statistics, and language that elicited emotions of fear (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 1999). These strategies created an impression that homosexuals would bring turmoil to the government and represented a threat for vulnerable Americans.

Presuppositions were also salient rhetorical devices used in the discursive process of criminalizing and dehumanizing homosexuals. Most of the examples of presuppositions were contained in questions and rhetorical questions. The use of these questions suggests that speakers and writers were in sync with listeners and readers in assuming similar stereotypical conceptions of homosexuals and that discussion could proceed to resolving issues of medicalization and criminalization.

## CHAPTER 7

### DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the findings in this dissertation and provides a comparative analysis of emerging themes from the collected data of the two historical contexts. In addition, I contextualize my study findings within the theoretical and methodological frameworks as well as the materials contained in my literature review. The chapter is divided into three sections. The first section presents a summary of the findings of this dissertation and underscores a comparative and contrastive analysis of the main points of comparison and contrast between the two historical contexts studied in this dissertation by crystallizing the findings of my contextual and discursive analysis. The second section discusses the theoretical implications of my study findings, focusing on the fields of sexuality, language, and social justice. The third section presents recommendations for future research with regard to hate speech and its relationship to society and education. Please note that I refer to the pre-Stonewall US and the US interchangeably.

#### Summary of Research Findings

##### **Normalization of Hatred Through the Discursive Construction of the *Other***

In both American and Nazi German societies, stereotypes were generally used for two purposes: (a) to define and categorize homosexual men; and (b) to justify the dehumanization, medicalization, and criminalization of homosexuals. Based on the data of my study, the way in which these stereotypes were used and the purposes they served are relevant examples of hate speech and, most specifically, homophobic discourse because these words, within their respective historical contexts, were generally offensive and discriminatory in nature (Fairclough, 2001; Leap, 2010; van Dijk, 1993, 2011). These characterizations were based on five similar

physical, sociopolitical, criminal, medical, and moral categories, with the exception that in the US I added a sexual category. Hence, I can conclude that in both contexts stereotypes served as a prevalent substantive strategy that created a reductionist characterization and understanding of homosexuals (Cook & Cusack, 2010).

The most salient stereotypical category that was used to describe homosexuals in both the US and Nazi Germany was based on physical features. The importance of a defined masculine body and corresponding behavior were essential factors used to differentiate heterosexual men from homosexuals. In both societies, homosexuals were considered to lack masculinity, to behave and dress like women, to speak softly, and to have noticeable feminine mannerisms (Altman, 1982). While Nazis differentiated between a *fake* homosexual (e.g., a heterosexual man who might have been in financial need or who was confused about his sexuality) and a *real* homosexual to indicate their motivation and level of homosexuality, Americans created new terms to describe the level of femininity in homosexuals. Although these new terms (e.g., *queen*, *queer*) have been reclaimed in our current era and now have joyful and positive connotations, in the period under study they were pejorative and offensive homophobic slurs. In the US, the Kinsey Report served as a way to measure the level of homosexuality of an individual ranging from *exclusively* heterosexual to *exclusively* homosexual (Kinsey et al., 1963). Furthermore, the sociopolitical category of stereotypes in both contexts demonstrates that homosexuals were seen as *enemies* and *security risks* to their governments. This view of homosexuals provided a justification for political leaders and symbolic elites from both countries to oppose any type of homosexual participation in their governments because they believed that homosexuals could permeate and infect with homosexuality their citizens, institutions, and indeed entire nations. In the US, these discriminatory practices at the federal level were intensified due to the Lavender

Scare, an alleged list of names of federal employees who were supposed to be homosexuals and were at risk of being publicly shamed, humiliated, and discriminated against (Stone, 2017). From a medical standpoint in both societies, a majority of elites and symbolic elites believed that homosexuality was an *infectious* disease, prompting researchers and scientists from all fields to find a solution to *cure* homosexuality (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995). This belief served as a way to degrade homosexuals' existence by conducting inhumane experiments on them (Bauman, 1993). Another significant group of US and Nazi elites supported the criminalization of homosexuality. The rationale for this position is that they believed that homosexuals were criminals and, therefore, deserved to be punished, incarcerated, and even killed. The criminalization of homosexuality allowed the creation of several laws (e.g., sodomy laws in the US and Paragraph 175 in Germany) that justified discrimination against and dehumanization, pathologization, and extermination of homosexuals with the assumption that they were sinners, rapists, and child molesters. In addition, in both historical contexts, homosexuals were thought to be opposed to mainstream religious, moral, and ethical principles. From a moral perspective, homosexuals were considered sinners, fornicators, unnatural, and sodomites (e.g., zoophiles). Finally, in the US, more than in Nazi Germany, homosexuals were seen as sexually promiscuous, exhibitionists, fetishists, and cross-dressers. I would suggest that this stereotypical view of homosexuals was more evident in the US because of the creation of bathhouses and other public areas, which in several US cities became safer spaces for homosexuals to gather and have sex during the 1950s and 1960s (Altman, 1982).

The process of defining the *Other* (homosexual) served in both societies as a way to understand and predict homosexual behavior. These substantive stereotypical views of homosexuals as feminine, criminals, sick, perverts, and promiscuous permitted Americans and

Nazis to disseminate hateful rhetoric and *perversify* (e.g., prejudice) citizens through various discursive strategies and societal outlets such as media and television. The concerning side of the process of defining and understanding the *Other* based on pseudoscientific evidence and discriminatory ideas is that it normalized hatred by dehumanizing, criminalizing, and medicalizing homosexuals (Bauman, 2002). In other words, the reproduction of hate was authorized by elites who, through different substantive (e.g., stereotypes, definitions, and understandings of the *Other*) and rhetorical (e.g., metaphors and presuppositions) strategies, routinized hateful behavior and manipulated the minds of ordinary citizens (e.g., *perversification*) to make them hate homosexuals (Bauman, 1993; Blass, 2009; Kelman, 1973; van Dijk, 1993). It is not possible to conclude to what extent American or German citizens despised homosexuals before the manipulation of public discourse; nevertheless, it is possible to claim that without the normalization of hatred and the dissemination of hateful discourse, ordinary Americans and Germans could have had an indifferent view towards homosexuality. As manipulated minds, citizens were, to some extent, obligated to react negatively (not indifferently) against those dangerous *aliens* (Bauman, 1993, p. 150), making this an important consequence of hate speech. As Bauman (1993) explains, for homosexuals to enter the social and physical space of Americans and Germans, they needed to be perceived as *enemies* who either had to be fought and expelled or as temporary guests who needed to be confined and isolated.

Furthermore, it is important to note that in both the US and Nazi Germany, some homosexuals did not fall under any of the stereotypical characterizations discussed before. This lack of characterization allowed homosexuals to not be subject of any medical or criminal persecution. However, the uncertainty of homosexuals being able to hide and go unnoticed in these two societies resulted in the tightening of laws and more rigorous sexual scrutiny.

Therefore, the discourse of fear played a pivotal role in the dissemination and reproduction of hate as well as in the manipulation of citizens against homosexuals (Chilton, 2004; Wodak, 2015). These fears seem to have been effective discursive tools of hate in their emphasis on the vulnerability of children and the fear of a health epidemic (Bauman, 1993; van Dijk, 1993).

Other salient examples of hate speech in my study were the discursive strategies of legitimization and coerciveness (Chilton, 2004). These were common rhetorical strategies prominently used by Nazi and US politicians to further their hateful agendas and ideologies. These strategies permitted the manipulation of public discourse through the grounding of homophobic remarks in language of fear and terror (Chilton & Schäffner, 2011). In both historical contexts, these strategies involved using pseudoscientific arguments against homosexuality and presenting numerical data to emphasize and legitimize the dangers of homosexuality. In the US, pseudoscientific claims were also presented as scientific information that claimed to represent a more objective understanding of the dangers of homosexuality for their government and society. Elites used pseudoscientific arguments to contradict the conclusions of the Kinsey study because the views of this research on homosexuality were not only scientifically proven but also not in keeping with the sociopolitical and heteronormative ideologies of US society at this historical time (Butler, 1990; Stone, 2017). Furthermore, the data were not only presented using a cognitive argument but also supported from a moral perspective. These pseudoscientific remarks legitimized moral or religious argumentation indicating how hate speech, in this particular case, served as an approach to prejudice Americans against homosexuality (Chilton, 2004). In addition, numerical data and statistics were popular legitimizing strategies of homophobic discourse in both societies. Political leaders and other symbolic elites reinforced the notion of homosexuality as a threat to the German nation because

it was claimed that, besides raping, homosexuals would also impact the annual birthrate of healthy Germans, through their corrosive influence.

In term of rhetorical strategies used as hateful devices, my study concluded that the use of metaphors in Nazi Germany and the use of presuppositions in the US were salient in the process of dehumanization of homosexuals in these two historical contexts. In Nazi Germany, metaphors were used to dehumanize homosexuals through representation of homosexuality as: a disease, as an impure practice, and as the enemy against which one is called to struggle. In the US, the rhetorical strategy was different, but the intention and effect had similar dehumanizing and alienating effects on homosexuals as well as prejudicing effects on ordinary citizens (Austin, 1975). Presuppositions were popular rhetorical devices among US elites, widely used in public, media, and political discourse because of their manipulative nature. In addition, the perlocutionary effects of presuppositions implied sociological and linguistic consequences in ordinary citizens in terms of persuading and terrorizing them against homosexuals (Austin, 1975; Fairclough, 2001; Searle, 1970; van Dijk, 2011).

### **Comparative and Contrastive Analysis of Research Findings**

After considering the summary and analysis of the data from chapters 5 and 6 of this dissertation, it is possible to delineate clear contextual and rhetorical similarities and differences in the way that Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US used language to justify homosexual discrimination.

#### **Similarities**

The most evident similarity between the two societies is the hatred towards male homosexuals, which was corroborated in the various institutional practices and measures taken against them. This research demonstrates how hate speech and homophobic discourse served as a

way to bridge the political and heteronormative ideologies with the normalization of hatred (Bauman, 2002). These ideologies were initiated from simple words and later evolved into discriminatory government and institutional actions against homosexuals. From there they became stereotypes, then laws, and finally, these ideologies were powerful enough to normalize and justify hatred in both historical contexts (Bauman, 2002; Gilreath, 2011; Weber, 2009).

From the substantive categorization, both societies used several stereotypes to understand and define homosexuals. As mentioned earlier, the most salient stereotype by far was the effeminacy of homosexuals, followed by the idea that homosexuals were ill and criminals (Altman, 1982). The data in this study prove that stereotypes served as powerful strategies of homophobic discourse because all of the stereotypical references used to refer to homosexuals in this study were in nature biased and discriminatory, which are fundamental elements of hate speech (van Dijk, 1993). Also, these stereotypes were in keeping with historical views of homosexuals and can explain why they were relevant in the process of dehumanization, criminalization, and medicalization of homosexuals (van Dijk, 1997; Wodak, 2001). Another similarity is the fact that both elites and symbolic elites in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US relied on social, medical, criminal, political, and religious pseudoscientific information as a strategy to claim discriminatory remarks as facts (van Dijk, 1997, 2011). These pseudoscientifically based facts were key rhetorical elements in the process of *perversifying* (e.g., manipulating) their respective societies (Chilton, 2004) because citizens (who might have otherwise had an indifferent view of homosexuality) were pushed to believe that homosexuality was something that citizens needed to be careful of to avoid the contamination of their children and their countries. The data in this study allow me to claim that in both historical contexts, the effective reproduction and rapid dissemination of homophobic ideologies were only possible through access to and manipulation

of public discourse (van Dijk, 1993). Elites and symbolic elites in both societies, with access to public discourse, made ample use of media, policy, and academic discourses to manipulate information and, consequently, demonize homosexuality. These strategies of discourse served not only as catalysts of hatred but also as successful rhetorical tools to justify, tolerate, and normalize the dehumanization of homosexuals. Furthermore, the level of dehumanization of homosexuals, to some extent, was similar in Nazi Germany and the US because both societies created laws that allowed the medicalization and criminalization of homosexuals. While the US did not have concentration camps and did not blatantly exterminate individuals for being homosexual, Atascadero Hospital in California used homosexuals in scientific research with the same level of dehumanizing experiments against homosexuals as they did in Nazi Germany, including castration and other inhumane emotional treatment (Ingle, 2015). This similarity is significant because it shows the relationships between hate speech and its consequences on this vulnerable minority (Weber, 2009).

### **Differences**

In the previous section, I mentioned that one similarity between Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US was the hatred towards male homosexuals. However, the data in this dissertation suggest that the level of hatred and homophobia was somewhat different in each society. It would be challenging to measure societal and institutional hatred, but it is possible to differentiate and describe the level of inhumanity in regard to the actions that each of these societies took against homosexuals. To that end, it is necessary to consider the sociocultural and political contexts of each of these societies (van Dijk, 2011; Wodak, 2015). Nazi Germany was a dictatorship, which allowed the government to make decisions without the need to consult and seek approval from the German parliament. Furthermore, the Declaration of Human Rights did

not exist until 1948, prompting Nazis to inhumanely treat minorities and prisoners without any type of social consideration or legal accountability. On the other hand, the US was a democracy and its government depended on Congress, which took into account the Declaration of Human Rights in making decisions regarding homosexuals. This means that Nazi Germany was able to make arbitrary decisions and implement them at will whereas the US had to rely more on pseudoscientific information to persuade the courts and Congress to approve anti-homosexual laws and initiatives. This acknowledgement is relevant because it demonstrates the different types and levels of hatred and homophobia between Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US. Homophobia is understood as the disgust and disdain for homosexuals or anyone who is believed to be a homosexual (Leap, 2010). Therefore, this study allows me to claim not only that Nazi Germany's homophobia was systematic and institutional, but also that it was violent homophobia that justified dehumanization of homosexuals and normalized collective hatred (Bauman, 2002). In the US, homophobia was primarily institutional and psychological. It was limited to shame and the marginalization of this minority from the rest of the society; extermination of homosexuals was not likely to have been a solution for the US (Weber, 2009). Another difference between these two societies is the reason each one of them had for hatred. On the one hand, Nazi Germany was interested in keeping the Aryan race clean and healthy because Nazis believed that homosexuals were capable of bringing about the degeneration of healthy heterosexual men, which would consequently lead to the decrease of their population (Grau & Shoppmann, 1995). On the other hand, the US was mostly interested in keeping homosexuals and communists away from their government because they feared that homosexuals were security risks for their nation (Stone, 2017). As a result, the process of dehumanization and criminalization varied between these two historical contexts. In the US, the process of

medicalization of homosexuals demonstrates that there were many individuals interested in finding a solution to homosexuality, which could suggest an interest in rehabilitating them. While this solution was still inhumane, it differs from Nazi Germany, where the approach did not suggest any interest in finding a less cruel alternative that would have made it possible to keep homosexuals alive. It cannot be denied that some Nazis were interested in finding a cure to stop homosexuality, but this was not what Nazi elites wanted or believed to be the solution to the problem of homosexuality. Finally, the salient rhetorical devices in Nazi Germany and the US were different and can explicate the significant role of hate speech in the process of normalization of hatred in each historical context. As mentioned earlier, metaphors were widely used in various types of written and spoken texts in Nazi Germany. This is also related to the context in which metaphors occurred and explains why homophobia was generally blatant in Nazi Germany (van Dijk, 1993). Metaphors allowed Nazis to address and to speak about homosexuality, which was a topic they did not fully understand, in ways that were easier to associate and describe to themselves and to others. These metaphorical references played a significant role in shaping Nazi ideology and the thought processes of many citizens regarding the perception of homosexuals (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). In the US, the type of homophobic discourse was mostly exhibited through the use of presuppositions. This implies that much of what was said of homosexuals was already assumed and taken for granted by ordinary citizens. This can also explain why the US relied heavily on pseudoscientific evidence as a way to persuade and legitimize hateful information and present it as fact (Fairclough, 2001; van Dijk, 2011; Wodak, 2015).

### **Implications of Research Findings**

To recap, *hate speech* is an umbrella term that refers to any type of verbal, psychological, or physical abusive behavior that justifies all sorts of discrimination (Whillock, 1995). Similarly, *homophobic discourse* is a form of hate speech which aims to harm only homosexuals (Leap, 2010). Both of these terms encompass any overt or covert type of behavior (Leap, 2010; Whillock, 1995). Based on these definitions, it is possible to claim that elites and symbolic elites in the US and Nazi Germany with access to power and public discourse used language with two purposes: (a) dehumanizing, pathologizing, and criminalizing homosexuals; and (b) manipulating (e.g., *perversifying*) the views of ordinary citizens against homosexuality. As evidenced in chapters 5 and 6 of this dissertation, the data collection demonstrates that, while different rhetorical strategies were used in each historical context, manipulation of public discourse was a pivotal aspect in the process of prejudicing the perceptions and opinions of ordinary citizens against homosexuality. While not intended to be generalized, the findings in this research study make a contribution to the existing literature in the fields of language, sexuality, and social justice.

### **Implications for Gender and Sexuality**

The data suggest that homosexuals were dehumanized, criminalized, and pathologized based on their sexual orientation and their expression of sexuality because, in these two historical contexts, homosexuality violated the societies' heteronormative principles at a time when mass conformity was necessary to the agenda of the state (Bauman, 2002; Butler, 1997). In addition, sexuality in these two societies was dictated by elites who shaped all expressions of sexuality based on heteronormative and strict binary gender categorizations and societal roles that did not allow sexual diversity and lacked tolerance (Butler, 1997; Fone, 2000). I have shown how

physical and societal masculine delineations and expectations that were enforced in Nazi Germany and the US represent examples of homophobic discourse. Gender roles, both masculine and feminine, were predefined and strictly scrutinized as a process of differentiating the healthy from the sick and the vulnerable from the criminal (Large, 2007). Consequently, the *Other* was constructed on the idea that homosexuals were not *real* men and, therefore, *they* [homosexuals] were different from *us* (Bauman, 1993). These findings represent a significant contribution to the existing literature because they reinforce the idea that gender stereotyping and strict categorization of sexuality can invoke disdain, disgust, and hatred towards homosexuals, causing stigma, heterosexism, and sexual prejudice (Leap, 2010).

### **Implications for Language and Discourse Analysis**

In the field of language, the data suggest that homophobic discursive practices proved consistent with other types of discriminatory discourse, such as racist, anti-Semitic, transphobic, and Islamophobic discourses (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 1993, 2005, 2014; Wodak, 2015). The findings of this dissertation suggest that elites and symbolic elites in the US and Nazi Germany relied on pseudoscientific arguments to substantiate their political and discriminatory agenda so that ordinary citizens could accept these claims as authoritative (Chilton, 2004). Many of these claims were supported by US and Nazi scholars, medical doctors, and scientists who played a role in the legitimization of false and unjust conclusions. Therefore, the conclusions regarding homosexuality demonstrated how language might have prejudiced individuals with opinions that were presented and, most specifically, legitimized as hateful facts (van Dijk, 1993, 2005). Even though many of these claims did not necessarily cite or quote specific or reliable research findings, such pseudoscientific arguments could not easily be challenged by ordinary citizens without technical training, and therefore they were accepted as established facts (Kallis, 2008).

This rhetorical strategy shows that there was a respect for science in both of these societies and perpetrators were proficient in working with the *Zeitgeist*. Pseudoscientific arguments used to characterize homosexuals allowed Americans and Nazis to evoke negative emotions by creating a sense of resentment and by eliciting anger and disgust towards homosexuals because they were presented as a disease, enemies of the nation, and criminals (Van Dijk, 2005). In addition, other homophobic remarks, supported by numerical calculations, were strategically manipulated with the purpose of demonstrating to Germans and Americans the significant potential damage and threat of homosexuals to their respective societies. These data were considered authoritative because they were presented as evidence. In the US, percentages and other statistics supported different discriminatory practices that justified the persecution of homosexual employees in federal institutions. The significant aspect of the use of these legitimizing and coercive strategies in the US and Nazi Germany is that individuals with access to power are in a position to disseminate false information and manipulate the minds of ordinary citizens with arguments that are not scientifically proven or that are curated with numerical data that only serve to distract audiences from the truth (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 1993, 2005). These findings explain how hate speech was masked as relevant data and, consequently, the pernicious messages carried in these rhetorical texts appeared more palatable to ordinary citizens (Chilton, 2004; van Dijk, 1993, 2005). The findings may inform the work of future linguists and applied linguists about the consequences that access to and manipulation of public discourse can cause to their societies (Bauman, 1993).

For the field of discourse analysis, Nazis demonstrated that metaphors are relevant in hate speech because the impact and influence of these devices as hateful discursive tools were pervasive in everyday life, influencing the language, thought, and action of ordinary Germans

(Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Moreover, these stylistic devices allowed Nazis to express their opinions about a topic that represented an experience or concept that was somewhat unfamiliar to them or that was simply difficult for them to define (Cameron & Maslen, 2010). Additionally, these rhetorical strategies reduced homosexuality to a disease, effecting a level of segregation that allowed for dehumanization of this cohort. Since metaphors can shape cultures and ideologies, the use of this specific rhetorical device sheds light on how discriminatory and dehumanizing practices against homosexuals in Nazi Germany were quickly normalized (Bauman, 1993; Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). Moreover, the Nazis' use of metaphors was explicit and did not hedge the meaning of their utterances about homosexuals (van Dijk, 1993; 2011). These types of dehumanizing metaphors (e.g., bacilli, infection, disease, epidemic) are likely to be considered politically incorrect in modern society, because contemporary hate speech is often masked with positive-self presentation in order to express disdain without being explicit (van Dijk, 1993, 2005). In the US, elites presented several propositions with the dishonest and manipulative intent of prejudicing ordinary citizens (Fairclough, 1992). Some presuppositions were embedded in questions and rhetorical questions because these syntactical forms contained discriminatory and dehumanizing information that the authors wished to convey and that ordinary American already knew (or were assumed to know) with regard to homosexual behavior (Fairclough, 2001).

On the whole, my study's findings demonstrate the importance of studying, analyzing, and predicting how the use of discursive devices designed to create hate and loathing can implicitly influence the minds of ordinary citizens against vulnerable minority groups (Bauman, 1993; van Dijk, 2005). The findings of my study indicate that these devices provided a vehicle for elites and symbolic elites with discriminatory agendas to deceive, misinform, mislead, and,

most problematically, *perversify* (e.g., prejudice) their audiences against minorities (Chilton, 2004). Finally, this study corroborates Gilreath's (2011) premise that speech causes harm because words do not operate on their own. They are integrally and fundamentally part of the social context where events they are intended to influence take place. By identifying these rhetorical strategies as well as excavating the historical contexts in which they were used, it has been possible to make visible how hate speech and its negative societal effects can determine the unhappy destinies of minorities and vulnerable groups in societies (Bauman, 1993; van Dijk, 1993).

### **Implications for Social Justice Education**

In terms of social justice, my study findings demonstrate that the politics of fear was a salient and popular persuasive strategy in the process of discrimination against homosexuals. The perpetrators of prejudice in both societies found in the discursive construction of hatred an effective strategy for normalizing discrimination and cultivating hatred towards homosexuals instead of looking for opportunities that would permit the creation of safer, welcoming, and inclusive societies that could embrace and reconcile our various innate human differences. (Bauman, 1993; Fone, 2000; Wodak, 2015). All of these fears were presented with the purpose of exacerbating the existing divide between *Us* and *Them* and capitalizing on the notion that separates homosexuals from ordinary citizens and sets up an antagonism between the two groups (Wodak, 2015). The process of deconstructing these various devices and strategies in which I have engaged represents a worthwhile agenda for social justice education, given the many other cases where rhetorical strategies are used for hateful effects.

### **Suggestion for Future Research**

In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, Bauman (1993, 2002) reminds us about a society that allowed the Holocaust to happen, and he also warns us about the possibility that, if nothing is done to prevent this phenomenon from happening, present and future generations are doomed to experience such widespread normalization of hatred and genocide once again. Gilreath (2011) makes the point that hate speech and many other forms of targeted hateful rhetoric are now taking place on the internet and social media, which did not exist in the eras that were the focus of my research. Given these stark realities, it is important to continue to research which rhetorical strategies are most commonly used in these digital interactions so that we can understand how they influence the manipulation of public discourse and the normalization of hatred against any minority and vulnerable group or individual (Wodak, 2015). The rhetorical strategies used today are not necessarily new. There are many cases around the world where some rhetorical strategies used in Nazi Germany and the pre-Stonewall US are still visible. In the US, in both past and present times, politicians and other symbolic elites are restricted by democratic and legal structures. In other words, the US has had to follow laws that may prevent US symbolic elites in the present from being explicit in the use of language against minorities (van Dijk, 2011). However, in many nations where dictatorial regimes have taken power and the discourse of the so-called state of social emergency has become prevalent, as was the case in Nazi Germany, rhetorical strategies of hate are more evident and violent. Researchers need to identify and analyze these rhetorical strategies.

### **Conclusions**

The findings suggest that hate speech, along with reactionary political movements, continue to proliferate (Wodak, 2015, preface). Nowadays, hate speech has evolved into a

linguistic phenomenon immersed in a rhetorical populism where hateful characterizations and imputing cannot easily be identified. In addition, the politics of fear continue to have right-wing aspects similar to those in the two historical contexts studied in this dissertation, in which some politicians and symbolic elites endorsed traditional, conservative values and morals while appealing to anti-intellectualism and ignorance (van Dijk, 2005; Wodak, 2015) to disseminate and reproduce homophobia. Bauman (2002) and van Dijk (1993) reminded us of the significance of understanding how discourse and language have been used against vulnerable minorities in order to prevent similar debacles from occurring in the future. The findings in this dissertation contribute to the understanding that the discursive construction of hate has historically served as an effective approach to the normalization of anti-Semitic, xenophobic, homophobic, transphobic, and nationalistic acts of violence, dehumanization, and criminalization of vulnerable minorities through explicit or implicit forms of rhetoric.

### **Researcher's Postscript**

While historically and culturally the pre-Stonewall US and Nazi Germany were significantly different, both of these contexts had similar views towards homosexuality and implemented various strategies to marginalize and criminalize homosexuals and to normalize and justify homophobia. This said, the experience of researching this dissertation has allowed me to claim that today's German society seemed to be more welcoming and transparent in terms of revealing and acknowledging the atrocities that were committed during the Holocaust. This stance was evident in the relatively easy access I had to all the historical documents that I have used in this dissertation, illustrating the realities of Germany's history as a nation, society, and culture. In contrast, my experience in the US suggests a reluctance to document historical events and facts that could potentially bring disgrace and dishonor to American society. My data

collection process in the US, which involved three major cities with rich archival collections, revealed mostly historical records that showed positive and humane accounts of the society's stances towards the history and evolution of homosexuality. In addition, US institutions (e.g., the police and hospital in California) that were involved in discriminatory and dehumanizing practices against homosexuals disregarded my request to access their archival records and did not provide any negative records (at least, that I could access) that could damage their public image.

It is not my intent here to provide an exhaustive discussion of social, cultural, and political implications of a society refusing public access to historical records of the events that shaped their culture and society in the past, but clearly one of them is to impede the process of learning from one's mistakes (Bauman, 1993). The difference between the two societies is evident in how the German society has publicly pardoned homosexuals and has offered a formal apology, whereas the US has not done so to this date. How can a society create an ethos of compassion if there are no historical records to reveal the consequences of not seeking to cultivate this ethos? What is the legacy of any society's past, if contemporary generations cannot gain access to it and seek to understand it in its own historical context? It is my sincere hope that my research study will contribute to the healing of the past and will serve present generations in understanding the relevance and commitment of the creation, protection and conservation of any nation's institutional memory.

## REFERENCES

- Adamczyk, A., & Pitt, C. (2009). Shaping attitudes about homosexuality: The role of religion and cultural context. *Social Science Research, 38*(2), 338–351.
- Ali, F., & Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2010). The dark side of love and life satisfaction: Associations with intimate relationships, psychopathy and Machiavellianism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*(2), 228–233.
- Altman, D. (1982). *The homosexualization of America*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2018). *Sexual orientation and homosexuality*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/topics/lgbt/orientation.aspx>
- Arkin, R. M., Appelman, A. J., & Burger, J. M. (1980). Social anxiety, self-presentation, and the self-serving bias in causal attribution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(1), 23–35.
- Auschwitz-Birkenau. (2019) *History*. Retrieved from <http://auschwitz.org/en/history/>
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Bartov, O. (2015). *The Holocaust: Origins, implementation, aftermath*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bass, A. (2018). *Fetishism, psychoanalysis, and philosophy: The iridescent thing*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (1993) *Postmodern ethics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bauman, Z. (2002). *Modernity and the holocaust*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. R. (Eds.). (2003). *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Bayley, R., & Schecter, S. R. (2004). Language socialization in theory and practice. *Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 17(3), 605–625.
- Berube, A. (1990). *Coming under fire*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bible Hub. (2017). *Genesis 19:4*. Retrieved from <http://biblehub.com/genesis/19-4.htm>
- Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). *Kinesics and context: Essays on body motion communication*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Black, J. (2016). *The Holocaust: history and memory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Blass, T. (2009). *The man who shocked the world: The life and legacy of Stanley Milgram*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Boswell, J. (1980). *Christianity, social tolerance and homosexuality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bottomore, T. B. (1993). *Political sociology*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Brown, D. G. (1957). The development of sex-role inversion and homosexuality. In *The Journal of Pediatrics* (pp. 613-619).
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cameron, L., & Maslen, R. (2010). *Metaphor analysis: Research practice in applied linguistics, social sciences and the humanities*. London, UK: Equinox.
- Carter, D. (2004). *Stonewall: The riots that sparked the gay revolution*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (2011). Discourse and politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 303–330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cook, R. J., & Cusack, S. (2010). *Gender stereotyping: Transnational legal perspectives*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Crompton, L. (2003). *Homosexuality and civilization*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- De Fina, A. (2011) Discourse and identity. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 263–282). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- del-Teso-Craviotto, M. (2006). Words that matter: Lexicon and gender ideologies in women's magazines. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(1), 2003–2021.
- del-Teso-Craviotto, M. (2006). Language and sexuality in Spanish and English dating ads. In J. Coates & P. Pichler (Eds.), *Language and gender: A reader*. (pp. 430–446). Cambridge, UK: Blackwell.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (1997). *Must we defend Nazis?: Hate speech, pornography, and the new First Amendment*. Fredericksburg: New York University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Dwork, D., & Van Pelt, R. J. (2002). *Holocaust: A history*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Eskridge, W. N., Jr. (2008). *Dishonorable passions: Sodomy laws in America, 1861–2003*. New York, NY: Viking.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London, UK: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Essex, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak., R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 357–378). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fetish. (2019). In *Lexico*. Retrieved from <https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/fetish>
- Fone, B. (2000). *Homophobia*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality. Vol. 1: An introduction*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Frank, W. (2014). *Law and the gay rights story: The long search for equal justice in a divided democracy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Gee, P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Gellately, R., & Stoltzfus, N. (Eds.). (2001). *Social outsiders in Nazi Germany*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Giles, G. (2001). The institutionalization of homosexual panic in the Third Reich. in R. Gellately and N. Stoltzfus (Eds.), *Social outsiders in Nazi Germany* (pp. 223–255). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Giles, G. (2002). The denial of homosexuality: Same-sex incidents in Himmler's SS and police. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 11(1 & 2), 256–290.
- Gilreath, S. (2011). *End of straight supremacy: Realizing gay liberation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Grau, G., & Shoppmann, C. (1995). *Hidden Holocaust?: Gay and lesbian persecution in Germany 1933–45*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Greig, C. J., & Martino, W. J. (Eds.). (2012). *Canadian men and masculinities: Historical and contemporary perspectives*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3 edited by P. Cole and J. Morgan, Academic Press. Reprinted as ch.2 of Grice 1989, 22–40.
- Hale, C. (2003). *Himmler's crusade: The Nazi expedition to find the origins of the Aryan race*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Halliday, M. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Baltimore, MD: Edward Arnold Press.
- Hitler, A. (1925). *Mein Kampf* [My struggle] (R. Manheim, Trans.). Verlag Frz. Eher Nachf, G.M.B.H.
- Ingle, M. R. (2015). *ASYLUM: A gay dachau*. N. p.: LULU Publishing Services.
- Inversion (2019). In *Cambridge Dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/inversion>
- Johnson, P. & Vanderbeck, R. M. (2014). *Law, religion and homosexuality*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kallis, A. A. (2008). *Nazi Propaganda and the Second World War*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kantor, M. (2009). *Homophobia: The state of sexual bigotry today*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Karimi, F. & Thompson, N. (2014, February 25) *Uganda's President Museveni signs controversial anti-gay bill into law*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2014/02/24/world/africa/uganda-anti-gay-bill/index.html>
- Kelman, H. C. (1973). Violence without moral restraint: Reflections on the dehumanization of victims and victimizers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 29(4), 25–61.

- Khayatt, D. (2003). Terms of desire: Are there lesbians in Egypt? In R. Bayley & S. R. Schecter (Eds.), (2003) *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual societies* (pp. 218–234). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Kinsey Institute Online. (2019). *The Kinsey scale*. Retrieved from <https://kinseyinstitute.org/research/publications/kinsey-scale.php>
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., & Martin, C. E. (1963). *Sexual behaviour in the human male*. Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Långström, N., Rahman, Q., Carlström, E., & Lichtenstein, P. (2008, April 19). Genetic and environmental effects on same-sex sexual behavior: A population study of twins in Sweden. *Springer Science+Business Media, LCC*.
- Large, D. C. (2007). *Nazi games: The Olympics of 1936*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Leap, W. (2010). Introducing the special issue. *Gender and Language*, 4(2), 179–185.
- Longerich, P. (2012). *Heinrich Himmler*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lumsden, R. (1997). *Himmler's black order: A history of the SS, 1923–45*. Stroud, UK: Sutton.
- Mac An Ghail, M. (Ed.). (2000). *Understanding masculinities*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Mondimore, F. M. (1996). *A natural history of homosexuality*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Musolff, A. (2016). *Political metaphor analysis: Discourse and scenarios*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academics.

- Nussbaum, M. C. (2006). *Hiding from humanity: Disgust, shame, and the law*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Padfield, P. (1990). *Himmler: Reichsführer-SS*. London, UK: Macmillan.
- Perverse. (2018). In *Oxford Learner's Dictionaries*. Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/perverse?q=perverse>
- Provencher, D. (2010). I dislike politicians and homosexuals: Language and homophobia in contemporary France. *Gender and Language*, 4(2), 257–321.
- Rainsford, S. (2017). Chechen “gay purge” victim: “No one knows who will be next.” Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-41645281>
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1946). *Réflexions sur la question juive* [Anti-Semite and Jew] (G. Becker, Trans). Paris, France: Morihien.
- Schaffner, A. K. (2012). *Modernism and perversion: Sexual deviance in sexology and literature, 1850–1930*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Searle, J. (1970). *Speech acts*. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sedgwick, E. (1990). *Epistemology of the closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Stanworth, P., & Giddens, A. (2001). *Elites and power in British Society*. Ann Arbor, MI: Books on Demand.
- Stone, G. R. (2017). *Sex and the constitution: Sex, religion, and law from America's origins to the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Liveright.
- Todd, M. (2018). *Straight jacket*. London: Black Swan.

- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. (2017). *Background and timeline: Nazi persecution of homosexuals 1933–1945*. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.ushmm.org/information/press/press-kits/traveling-exhibitions/nazi-persecution-of-homosexuals/background>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. London, UK: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1987). *Communicating racism: Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. London, UK: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as social interaction*. London, UK: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1999). Discourse and the denial of racism. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 541–558). London, UK: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95–120). London, UK: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2003). The discourse-knowledge interface. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 85–109). Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Contextual knowledge management in discourse production. In R. Wodak & P. A. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology, and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 71–100). Amsterdam, Netherlands: J. Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse and ideology. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 379–407). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Discourse, ethnicity and racism. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction.*, (pp. 241–262). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and knowledge*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (2nd ed, pp. 466–485). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Waldron, J. (2012). *The harm in hate speech*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weber, A. (2009). *Manual on hate speech*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.
- Weeks, J. (1981). *Sex, politics and society: The regulation of sexuality since 1800*. Burnt Mill, UK: Longmans.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Analyzing European Union discourses: Theories and applications. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 121–135). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 1–34). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weiss, M. L., & Bosia, M. J. (Eds.). (2017). *Global homophobia: States, movements, and the politics of oppression*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press,

- Westwood, S. (2000). "Feckless fathers": Masculinities and the British state. In M. Mac An Ghail (Ed.), *Understanding masculinities* (pp. 21–34). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Whillock, R. K. (1995). The use of hate as a stratagem for achieving political and social goals. In R. K. Whillock & D. Slayden (Eds.), *Hate speech* (pp. 28–54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Whillock, R. K., & Slayden, D. (Eds.). (1995). *Hate speech*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wickberg, D. (2000) Homophobia: On the cultural history of an idea. *Critical Inquiry*, 27(1), 42–57.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 61–94). London, UK: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. A. (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology, and interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: J. Benjamins.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London, UK: Sage.
- Wolfson, N. (1997). *Hate speech, sex speech, free speech*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A

#### GERMAN DOCUMENTS

##### Policy Document 1

To  
 the Secret State Police Office Berlin,  
 the Prussian Criminal Police Office Berlin,  
 all control centers and all stations of the state police in the empire,  
 all control centers and all stations of the criminal police in the empire.

Subject: Fight against homosexuality and abortion. Second order for the execution of the decree of the RFSS. U. ChdDt. Pol. RMdj. Of 10 October 1936—S.V.1 24/36 g –

The content of the Notifications received so far and of various requests give cause to clarify the rules of the Decree as in the following:

##### Regarding clause 5 and 6:

The rules of the decree apply analogously for state police offices as well.

In all cases it is to be noted down on the forms A and B if and when the Perpetrator has been arrested (type of detention) and in which prison he is staying currently. Furthermore, the situation must be described briefly, whereby former proceedings against the perpetrator (files of the prosecutor's office if necessary) must be mentioned. But a delay of the report shall not occur because of that.

##### Policy Document 2

State criminal police office Kassel

May 11, 1937

##### Confidential

Guidelines for the fight against homosexuality and abortion.

##### I. General aspects

*[introduction skipped]*

1. In 1933, 2 million men have been recorded as members in homosexual associations and clubs. The first years after the seizure of power had shown no drop, but an increase of homosexuality. No estate and no profession was spared that plague, especially the youth was highly at risk. The findings of Kraft-Ebing and of the Jew Magnus Hirschfeld which are based on the assumption, that homosexuality is a hereditary or an inborn anomaly, were proven wrong. Impeccable conclusions by the police have shown, that only two out of hundred men, who act in a homosexual way or feel homosexual, can be considered to have actual abnormal tendencies. The far most of the other men must be considered "seduced". If monitored strictly and separated from their former associates those "seduced" have, while in systematic labor, changed remarkably fast and can today be addressed as normal men.

*[paragraph 2 skipped]*

3. In the future the police must reduce those cases of homosexuality and abortion, so that the loss of birth rates, that is a result of those torts, can be pressed down to a minimum. In that fight one shall not stop before any profession or estate.

In the future he would evaluate the competence of the criminal police after the successes in these matters, because he considers the fight against homosexuality and abortion one of the most important duties of the police.

Because homosexuals are not just active in the big cities and because abortion is, to our experiential knowledge, especially common in the countryside, it is important that the fight against homosexuality and abortion is executed strictly in the countryside as well.

From now on the head of the German Police will inform himself quarterly about the cases of homosexuality and abortion which have been reported. Civil Servants who, in processing of those matters, do not follow his guidelines will be held accountable.

## II. Special aspects regarding homosexuals

### 1. Homosexual men

Homosexual men are enemies of the state and must be treated as such. The healing of the German national body and the preservation as well as the strengthening of the German nation is at stake.

The "Black Corps" defines in its issue of 4.3.1937, episode 9 homosexuals correctly, when it says: "The experience showed, that those who were infected showed corruption of character: mostly they became, wimpish, unreliable natures. On the one hand groveling, on the other domineering. Without any doubt the disease took away numerous, even hundreds of thousands of men in their prime, from the natural way of reproduction. We know that in his individual growth every person must go through a phase, which is experienced unconsciously. In that phase one is, to a certain extent, receptive for poison. When sexual instincts first appear, the opposite sex is not yet the conscious object of desire. And unfortunately, the experience shows that those who carry the disease tend to approach especially young people who are that age. And unfortunately, they do not do it openly, but masked as well-meaning friends. They take all sorts of detours just to cover up what they're true intentions are. Only in consideration of the abuse of young minds, the growing numbers of those who tumble can be explained. A homosexual teacher is able to ruin a whole class, a youth leader to which Children are entrusted can ruin a whole generation and a friendly "uncle" is able to ruin the youth of a whole village. They are state criminals because they do surround themselves with people like themselves, not just because of their tendencies but, as soon as they are in a position of power and as soon as people do rely on them, also out of expediency. They create a state within a state, a secret organization whose interests run counter to the interests of the nation, therefore they are subversive. There are no "ill people" to be "treated", but enemies of the state to be eradicated".

Homosexual men tend to choose professions, which allow them to get close to other males. Lots of servants or masseurs for example act homosexual.

Those homosexual men who are, because of their appearance and their acting, not able to hide their homosexuality do often offend public decency and are therefore easily recognized as homosexual. They often look pale and have an unsteady and piercing gaze. Their manner is sweetish and effeminate, their moves are prancing, and their body shapes often resemble those of women. They like to put on makeup and perfume and to powder their faces. Also, they like to wear clothing for women. In their interaction with each other they often use girl's- and nicknames.

They are to be found at the main traffic roads, at the train stations, in the gardens, at public baths, at sports grounds, at light- and air baths and especially around those comfort stations where they look for their suitors. They also reside near the employment offices where they make those submissive, who are in search for work by offering easy jobs (at offices for example) or money. They socialize at those coffee houses and bars which they know are? as venues of homosexuals. The owners of those premises often have homosexual tendencies themselves. They often linger at health resorts and baths where they take the chance to associate themselves to “strangers”. There are homosexuals in every city, every profession and at every age. Among the arrested homosexuals there are workers, craftsmen, civil servants, lawyers, actors, educators, friars. Some homosexuals feel a preference towards men in uniform.

Those homosexuals who feel a desire towards the youth are especially dangerous. Again and again they are able to tempt and infect adolescents by their art of seduction. The homosexual sadist does not even shay away from murder. The experience shows, that the sacrifices of those criminals are always extremely high. A man who is identified as corrupter of youth must, without any exemptions, be removed from human society. He shall not be believed if he claims that his action was a singular one. Also, the probability of relapse is extremely high, so that it, in the interest of the state, seems necessary to keep him in a closed penal facility.

## 2. Young male prostitutes

The young male prostitutes who, just as the female prostitutes, make their living by fornicating are especially dangerous. Just some of them have actual homosexual tendencies. Among them there certainly are those who have normal sexual tendencies. They behave themselves towards homosexual men as pederasts and offer fornication out of self-interest. Just like female prostitutes the male prostitutes with homosexual tendencies or homosexual feelings are often in a relationship with a pimp and often they are somehow in love with them. And just like the female prostitutes they are exploited and even abused by their pimps. Those pimps are especially dangerous because they instigate the prostitutes to theft and blackmail or blackmail the clients themselves. Even though there is no special law considering those male pimps, the police takes a high interest in eradicating those degenerated subjects. They must be identified as participants, assistants, offenders. With the help of the state police department a placing of them in concentration camps should be possible.

Just as the homosexual men young male prostitutes, who manly work in the bigger cities, look for their clients at the main traffic roads, at the train stations, in the gardens, bars and around to the comfort stations. They do behave similar to female prostitutes as the try to get the attention of their victims by winking etc. as well as addressing them directly. They do offend public decency at the male comfort stations as they expose their genitals and position themselves in an explicit way to attract men with homosexual tendencies and to get their attention. Those actions are usually committed in a way that the huge majority of people have? to notice it. Every person who enters such a public restroom unintentionally becomes an eye witness. Police officers who witness such a thing can arrest both, the young male prostitute as well as the client for offending public decency. Young male prostitutes and female prostitutes know each other as colleagues. Often, they can be found at the same locations, support each other and make common cause.

## III. Fight against homosexuality

### 1. Actions should be taken against:

a) Homosexual men who are offending public decency or stand out in an offensive manner, especially the young male prostitutes and their company. They are to be convicted by permanent monitoring of the main traffic roads, the gardens, bars employment offices, public restrooms etc.

if necessary, confidants can be consulted. The young male prostitutes are to be eradicated completely by taking away their income opportunity.

b) Those homosexual men who are extremely careful and act secretly, those who take their victims up to their hotel rooms or approach them on walks or hiking tours. They stand out because they avoid female company and are seen mostly accompanied by men with whom they walk arm in arm. Helpful informants for the registration of homosexual men can be: Doormen at Hotels, luggage racks at train stations, coachmen, hairdressers, especially on train stations and at hotels and pool attendants.

c) Homosexual men who comply their dirty trades as educators in Schools, youth associations, military institutions and monasteries. From time to time there are statements of Youngsters and Participants of those mentioned Institutions concerning strange behavior of their educators and their associates. Those statements can be used as proof. Autonomous acting is not approved unless it is indispensable. Clarification and intervention must be entrusted to the criminal police department Kassel which might get in touch with the responsible police station.

## 2. What has to be done:

a) A permanent control of those strangers in hotels and guesthouses especially during summer- and winter vacation. Homosexuals prefer double rooms.

b) Monitoring of the ads in the daily newspapers concerning inappropriate offers etc. Probably the authors of those ads are homosexuals.

c) All male persons on the suspicion of having homosexual tendencies must be registered. Especially in smaller communities it is impossible for the homosexual to cover up his tendency permanently. His different nature peculiar behavior will be recognized, it will be talked about.

d) The policeman who wants to fight homosexuality successfully must be in touch with every social class. He must be very attentive and check on every statement concerning abnormal behavior of men. In some cases, it is recommended to consult trustworthy informants. He must be able to get in touch with every person of his district which is considered abnormal.

e) The files that contain the name of the homosexual, the place of residence, the crime and the time of the crime must be ordered properly. Young male prostitutes, blackmailers, corrupter of the youth must be marked as such.

f) the closest cooperation with criminal police stations and health institutions is necessary. In every important, difficult or extensive case or if appropriate revisers are not present, specialists of the criminal police department Kassel must be consulted immediately. Those specialists might contact the responsible police station.

## 3. Intervention against homosexuals.

a) Breaches of homosexuals must be sanctioned following the paragraphs 175 a, 176, 183, 253, 361, a-c.

b) For police processing all men identified as homosexual must be registered, photographed and they must provide fingerprints. If they are suspected of having committed a crime they must be presented to a judge. It must always be assumed that they try to obscure their actions. If it is not possible to prove their crimes, they must not be released directly. After their identification treatment they must be searched for letters of friends and like-minded people. Their apartments must be examined as well. If no material can be found that justifies further actions, the suspected persons must be cautioned strictly, the monitoring must continue and the persons must be examined on a regular basis. If they stand out again the police department Kassel must be informed so that the necessary actions can be arranged.

c) It must be ensured that the interrogations take place undisturbed. No uninvolved persons are allowed to attend the interrogations.

d) A sense of tact is absolutely necessary. The responsible officer must do his duty sensitively. Especially if he deals with stumbled youngsters under the age of 21 who might not be punished if their cases are not serious. It would be condemned strictly If the responsible officer is enticed to ask captious questions that are not necessary—if he digs into the “erotic”. The work of the officer is considered as decent only if the seduced man or the blackmailed person comes to the impression that the police is not just putting him to his justified punishment, but also is willing to help him with becoming a decent person again. It is important that the blackmailed person loses his shame to make a statement in front of the police. He must be convinced that, he won't lose his tormentor without the help of the police and that his information will be treated with understanding and as discreet as possible. The paragraph 154b of the STPO must be respected.

#### 4. Reporting obligation in preprinted form.

a) Homosexuals who had been conspicuous since 15.10.1936 or will be conspicuous in the future:

aa) Crimes concerning § 174, 176 and 253 of the RSTGB as long as they base on homosexuality and

bb) Immediately after a complaint is registered cases concerning § 175 and 175a of the RSTGB Preprint B and a filled file card in light green. -IS-

A) If the Perpetrator is a member of the NSDAP or fills a high rank.

B) If the Perpetrator is a member of the Wehrmacht

C) If the perpetrator is part of an Order

D) If the perpetrator is a civil servant.

E) If the Perpetrator is a Jew.

F) If it is a person who had a high rank before the assumption of power.

b) Young male prostitutes who had been known before the 15.10. 1936, are conspicuous since the 15.10. 1936 or will be conspicuous in the future:

For every young male prostitute, a light green file card—IS—must be filled out. In the section “accomplice” on that card the words “young male prostitute” must be noted down in crossed letters. The file card must be sent to the police department Kassel along with a special letter. The Police department Kassel will send up the file card to the central Reich Office concerning the fight against homosexuality and abortion in Berlin. The letter will be kept in Kassel for further notifications concerning change of residence etc.

#### 5. Report obligation of residency:

Every change of residence of the known homosexuals and male prostitutes must be reported to the criminal police department Kassel and to the central Office of the Reich concerning the fight against homosexuality and abortion. A special Letter must be attached. Therefore, it is necessary that every police station is exactly informed about the changes of residency in their district.

#### 6. Particular aspects on filling out and sending the preprints:

a) All preprints must be filled out completely, rightly and legibly. If possible, by typewriting.

b) In every case it must be noted down on preprint B if and when the Perpetrator was arrested as well as the kind of arrest and the name of the institution where he is arrested currently.

c) The facts must be described briefly, and all former processes must be mentioned. A delay of report must not occur because of that.

d) The reason why stately by the state? actions are necessary must be mentioned as well in the report.

e) The reports on preprint B must be addressed at:  
 criminal police department of the state—Pr. Criminal investigation office, Central office of the Reich for the fight against homosexuality and abortion Prinz-Albrecht-Straße 8 Berlin  
 They must be sent to the criminal police department at Kassel.

#### 7. Photos added to the Reports

Photographs (2) of the affected Persons must be added to the reports on homosexuals and male prostitutes.

#### 8. Report obligation on preprint LKP. 13 and 14.

If the necessary Conditions are compiled reports on preprint LKP, 13 must be submitted within 24 hours.

#### 9. Actions of the state Police

The state police must take action if the behavior of the perpetrator shows an endangerment of population policy, the people's health, the youth or if it is considered to be a violation of ideological principles of national socialism. Protective custody is considered a state police action as well. Protective Custody is legitimate if public safety and public order in endangered by the behavior of the Perpetrator. In very serious cases protective custody can be applied directly at the state police department.

[ . . . ]

### **Policy Document 3**

Confidential

*[Illegible]*

Headquarters of the leader

Head of the armed forces high command

Guidelines for the dealing with crimes concerning unnatural fornication

(§§ 175, 175a and 330a RStGE)

A.

It must be separated:

- I. Perpetrators who acted out of tendency or out of a grown incorrigible instinct.
- II. Perpetrators who got lost just once, especially if they can be considered "seduced".
- III. Perpetrators who cannot be assigned exactly to one of the two above.

#### Concerning I:

The tendency must be proven in the sentence. Thorough surveys are necessary and not just in court, but during the investigation process as well. Comrades and reservists must be questioned. If necessary, the investigation must include the life of the perpetrator before he joined the Wehrmacht. If there are doubts the perpetrator can be transferred to the reserve army. A cooperation between the home court and the central office of the Reich concerning the fight against homosexuality is recommended because it increases the chances to get to the needed information. In serious cases strict terms of imprisonment are appropriate. In extremely serious cases §5a KSSVO can be exacerbated and it can be sentenced to death. The convicts must be dismissed from the military service. If the execution of sentence is not already in hands of the public authorities, the judge shall ask them to take over the execution of sentence.

#### Concerning II:

Maximum care and attention are necessary. That the action has been committed while under the influence of alcohol must not be an excuse. Special attention must be taken attention on crimes

committed by superiors against their inferiors. The consequences of a deed committed without inborn tendencies is just as serious as with a positive finding of those tendencies. Convicts must be treated by following general rules. That means that after partly or full serving of the sentence Feindbewährung is permitted.

Concerning III:

In those cases, custody in field penal camps. At those camps and after that while among the troupes strict monitoring is necessary. If the suspect is useless for military service, he must be transferred to the hands of justice for further serving of his sentence. In case of a relapse treatment after I.

B.

Cases that have been dealt with before those guidelines entered into force must be dealt with by those guidelines as well. Especially for the question if the can stay in military service or not. If, against I, a man stayed among the troupes he must be dismissed even if he proved himself. Exceptions can only be made if such a soldier proved himself in a really long term, so that a relapse is highly unlikely.

C.

The confirmation of a high ranked commander is advisable.

Keitel

**Policy Document 4**

Leader of the SS and Head of the German police

Berlin 10. Oct. 1936

At the ministry of the interior

S V 1 24/36 g

Confidential!

Not published in the RMBliv

Subject: Fight against homosexuality and abortion

The population policy and the people's health are endangered by the still high numbers of abortion. Abortions runs counter to the ideological principles of the national socialism. The not insignificant numbers of homosexual activities as well are considered a grave endangerment as well, especially for the youth. An effective fight against that plague for the masses is necessary more than it has been hitherto.

1. The work on those torts mentioned above lies generally in the hands of the responsible police department.

2. For the ordered recording of and an effective fight against those crimes according to uniform guidelines, I establish a central Reich office for the fight on homosexuality and abortion at the Prussian state criminal police department.

To:

The secret state police department, Berlin

the Prussian state criminal police department, Berlin

all state police headquarters and all state police stations

all criminal police headquarters and all criminal police stations.

3. If state police actions must be taken, the secret state police department must be informed, and the necessary actions must be encouraged. A special unit II S will be established at the secret state police department to work on those cases.

4. The special unit II S at the secret state police department and the central Reich office for the fight against homosexuality and abortion at the Prussian state criminal department will be managed by the same person, so that a fast cooperation is ensured.

5. From the 15<sup>th</sup> of October 1936 it must be reported to the central Reich office for the fight on homosexuality and abortion:

A. In Cases related to § 218 RSTGB,

*[three subitems a), b), c) all concerning abortion.]*

B. Crimes related to §§ 174, 176 and 253 if they base on homosexuality and cases related to §§ 175, 175a immediately after charges are pressed. The attached preprint B must be used.

a) If the Perpetrator is a member of the NSDAP or fills a high rank.

b) If the Perpetrator is a member of the Wehrmacht

c) If the perpetrator is part of an Order

d) If the perpetrator is a civil servant.

e) If the Perpetrator is a Jew.

f) If it is a person who had a high rank before the assumption of power.

The reports related to A a and B must include a statement about if and for what reason actions of the secret state police seem necessary. The order for actions of the secret state police must be given by the special unit II S of the central Reich office for the fight on homosexuality and abortion.

6. The central Reich Office for the fight on homosexuality and abortion does register abortionists and young male prostitutes. The persons that are known already must be reported to the central Reich office for the fight on homosexuality and abortion (preprint I P), including exact personal data and if possible, photographs. Every change of residence must be reported as well.

7. Reports relating to clause 5 do not relieve the responsible criminal police station of their duties to take actions for the fight against the crime immediately. The central Reich office for the fight on homosexuality and abortion is, in agreement with the special unit II S allowed to give orders on the continuation of the investigations or investigate directly.

## Policy Document 5

Preprint B.

Name of authority

Date

Report on crimes related to §§ 174, 174, 175a and 176 RStGB

Date

Author

Crime against morality related to §§ 174, 175, 175a, 176 and 253 RStGB has been complained.

I. Information on personal data of the suspect:

- |                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Name and first name: | 5. religion (including former religions) |
| 2. Profession:          | 6. Race:                                 |
| 3. Place of residence:  | 7. Family status:                        |
| 4. Birthday:            | 8. Citizenship:                          |
|                         | 9. Accomplice:                           |

II. relevant previous penalties:

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Known as corrupter of youth            | 2. Known as young male prostitute   |
| 3. Known as blackmailer on a sexual basis | 4. Perpetrator is a member of . . . |

## Policy Document 6

4. Nov. 1941

Leader of the SS

Berlin, 31. Oct.

Prinz Albrecht Str. 8

Headquarter of the Leader

Dear Minister!

I refer back to the lecture given by my consultant SS-Obersturmbannführer Bender on the 20<sup>th</sup> of October 1941. I come to you with the following request:

As you already know the leader recently mentioned to me, that he wants crimes within the SS or the police concerning §§ 175, 175a RStGB sentenced by death penalty. I examined if that Order of the leader is already defined in the current criminal law or if it must be established. I came to the following conclusion: §§ 175, 175a RStGB. Do not allow the death penalty yet. § 1 of the law concerning the change of the current criminal code of September 4. 1941 does, under certain circumstances, threaten those criminals to death who act repeatedly or are guilty of crimes against moral principles. But sadly, it does not involve homosexuals who are guilty on crimes against moral principles because it just refers to the §§ 176–178 RStGB. For those members of the SS and the police that are governed by the special jurisdiction of the police and therefore by the trial of war, § 5 of the war penal law could constitute the base on which the death penalty in cases related to homosexual crimes could be established. But further case facts are necessary, so that a universal use for all cases concerning §§ 175, 17a RStGB can be precluded. In that regard, internal guidelines defined by the Führer, could determine, that for maintenance of chaste male behavior within the SS and the police, homosexual misconducts must be punished with death penalty in general, thus the necessary case facts can be considered met. But, because with every judgment must come a justification, in doing so, the impression could occur easily to the outside, that the moral within the SS and the Police call for such a sanction. A further case fact of the § 5a KSSVO. is, that a criminal act against chaste male behavior must exist. This requirement lapses, if a member of the SS or the Police acts? homosexual outside the troupes towards a civilian.

Finally—and that is the main reason why I need to reject the possibility to use § 5a KSSVO—the law is not effective on all members of the SS and the Police who are not governed by the special jurisdiction of the police and therefore by the trial of war. This means that, the use of § 5a KSSVO. would result in a different treatment of homosexual crimes within the SS and the police. That is impossible and has never been intended by the Führer.

Therefore, I come to the conclusion, that a penalty code still needs to be established, to fulfill the Führers order. According to the report of Obersturmbannführer Bender, you dear minister share that opinion.

A fitting change of the code of law seems far too lengthy and as well not a fortunate solution. Especially because that new special law does not affect the majority of people, but just a certain group of persons. I do agree with you, that the best solution would be the publishing of an order of the Führer that also contains the justification of the special provision created by the Führer. So that all misunderstandings will be excluded. My request to you is therefore to enact such a decree. I kindly thank you for your already promised help.

Regarding the content of that new law I do share your position, that in consideration of the various and different crimes the death penalty cannot be the only option, but only a possibility. Besides that, there must be the possibility of prison sentence for the minor cases. That, in

accordance with the will of the Führer, a strict use of the death penalty must be carried out by the courts, is obvious. Furthermore, I consider it to be right that, even within the SS and the police, according to Abs. II § 175 RstGB, the possibility must exist, to pardon those young men who did not act out of homosexual tendencies but have been seduced, so that they can be recovered for the national community. Especially I think about those cases in which young, respectable men have been seduced by their superiors or any other person they depended on.

Concerning the temporal validity of that new law, I think that it must determine all crimes that have been committed during the membership of the SS or Police. That means that it must be valid retroactive. I myself would appreciate if furthermore all crimes committed before entering the SS or the police would be covered by that new law as well. Such an action would be helpful for keeping away homosexual vermin from those Institutions.

For Cooperation Obersturmbannführer Bender will be at the service of your employee Dr. Ficker at any time if needed.

With kind regards

Heil Hitler

Yours, Heinrich Himmler

### Policy Document 7

Der Reichsführer-SS and the head of the German police at the ministry of the interior

[Copy]

H.A. SS Court Ia 121 Tgb. 287/41

Berlin, SW 11, 7.3.1942

Confidential!

Subject: Decree of the Führer for keeping clean the SS and the Police

1. for keeping clean the SS and the police from homosexual vermin, the Führer defined in his decree from November 15. 1941, that every man who fornicates with another man or lets himself be seduced, must, without any consideration of his age, be sentenced to death. In minor cases prison sentence is acceptable, not under 6 months.

2. There will not be a publication of the Führers decree, because it could lead to misunderstandings. There have been just very few cases of homosexual misconducts within the lines of the SS and the Police. But nevertheless, they must be prosecuted with immense strictness, because the Führer wants, that his SS remains clean and must therefore be? kept clean from this dangerous and infectious plague.

Every Member of the SS and the Police must report any indecent approach immediately, even if it is committed by his superior.

3. The SS and Police courts are responsible for the handling of all such facts if members of the SS or the Police are involved. Therefore, offices of the Police and the SS must report exclusively to the departments of the Police and SS courts.

4. This order must be verbally communicated to all members of the SS and the police, including the information that a passing on to any person outside of the SS and the Police is forbidden. For that purpose, the order is to be read in front of . . .

*[sentence illegible]*

. . . Members of the SS and the Police must pioneer in the fight for the eradication of homosexuality within the German nation.

The superiors are responsible for the communication of the decree to all new members of the SS and the Police. The order must be subject of teaching on a regular base.

Der Reichsführer-SS und Chef der Deutschen Polizei  
Gez. H. Himmler

### Policy Document 8

Reichsminister und Chef der Reichskanzlei

Berlin, December 6. 1941

Confidential

To

Herrn Reichsführer-SS Himmler

Headquarter of the Führer

Subject: Decree of the Führer for keeping clean the SS and the Police. Regarding the letter of October 31. 1941 and with reference to the consultation of the 17. Nov. 1941.

Dear Reichsführer,

Hereby I send you a certified copy of the decree for keeping clean the SS and the police, enacted by the Führer on Nov. 15. 1941. The Führer wishes that this decree shall not be published, because a publication could lead to misunderstandings. Neither in the Reichsgesetzblatt, nor in any other paper. But the Führer does authorize you, to communicate the content of this decree to all current and all new members of the SS and the Police in an appropriate way. I transmitted further copies to the minister of justice with the request to confidentially communicate the content to all offices that need to know.

Heil Hitler

### Policy Document 9

16\* StGB § 175a. § 175 a is not subject of the mitigation Ziff. 8b.

*[first paragraph skipped]*

**Concerning No. 16 Remark:** it must be agreed with the opinion of the present judgment. The autonomy of clause 1 -3 of the § 175a StGB shows itself especially in consideration of the effect, that a repeal of the § 175 would involve. In that case namely, homosexual male fornication would be unpunished, just like heterosexual fornication. Heterosexual fornication has always been unpunished. If it would be considered a crime in cases that involve violation or threat, direct endangerment of life and body (§§ 176 clause 1, 177 StGB) or abuse of a dependent relationship (§ 174 StGB) or the misguidance of children under the age of 14 (§ 176 clause 3 StGB) cases concerning § 175a Clause 1 -3 must be considered crimes, even if male homosexual fornication is unpunished, because those cases involve violence and threat . . .

*[paragraph missing]*

Clause 1 of the § 175a does protect the freedom of will related to sexual matters against violation as a self-evident right. For the female sex that right is fixed in § 177 StGB. Clause 2 two does protect the same freedom of will concerning sexual matters against the abuse of dependent relationships, that is fixed in §174 StGH. Acts that are generally unpunished become crimes if they violate one of those paragraphs. Clause 3 does protect the sexual development of the youth against seduction and again as a self-evident right. Clause 4 is unlimitedly usable because here it justifies a tightening of law because of the frequency of crime.

**Policy Document 10**

Head of the German Police

Berlin 29.10.1937

To:

- a) Secret state Police office
- b) State Police Offices and State Police headquarters
- c) Criminal investigation Office
- d) Criminal Police Stations and criminal Police headquarters

Subject: arrest of actors and artists for unnatural fornication.

The Reichsführer of the SS and Head of the German Police at the ministry of the interior ordered, that every arrest of an actor or an artist because of unnatural fornication must base on an authorization given out by himself alone. Exceptions can be made if one of the named was caught in the act.

Therefore, I request a report to the secret state police department in every such a case. The secret state police department will take care of everything else regarding the special authorization of the Reichsführer SS.

**Policy Document 11**Crime prevention by the police

I request that, in future every homosexual who did seduce more than one person shall, after his release from prison, be given in preventive custody.

To the criminal police.

as a message to the secret state police.

Paper of Order P. 68

**Policy Document 12**

Criminal investigation Office

Berlin, 23.9.1940

Tgb. Nr. Allg. 2057 B

To the criminal police department

Subject: Crime Prevention

Reference: Letter from the 7.9. 1940—K. Tgb. Nr. 60 –

The order for crime prevention that, in accordance to the decree from 12.7. 1940, determines, that those homosexuals who did seduce more than one person must be given in preventive custody, is not valid for those homosexuals who have been emasculated, if, after medical evaluation, the sexual drive is stopped and a relapse to homosexual behavior is unlikely.

**Academic/ Scientific Document 1**

Präsident Prof. Dr. med. Karl Astel

Weimar, 14.6.1937

Marienstr. 13

To the  
Reichsführer SS  
H. Himmler,  
Berlin SW 11  
Prinz-Albrecht-Str. 11

[. . .] The fortune of our children and all further descendants, even the fulfilling of our whole being, does depend on the incorruptibility of our will and the conscientiousness of our actions. Our message is: to always serve the finer, healthier and more capable, species appropriate life. If you provide the necessary funds, I will publish three greater papers, out of my everyday research, that might have a meaning for you in various respects.

1.) You already described the first of these pieces as utterly welcome. It relates to the research on homosexuality, that means the hereditary condition of homosexuality, the possible accumulation within the tribe of homosexuals, the frequent occurrence related to certain physical or mental characteristics and attributes etc.

For the work on that paper, I need the addresses of at least 100 specific homosexuals from Thüringen and kindly ask for their prompt submission. [. . .]

**Academic/ Scientific Document 2**

To Präsident Prof. Dr. Karl Astel  
Weimar, Marienstr. 13

22. June 1937

Dear fellow Party member Astel,

I kindly thank you for your letter from the 14<sup>th</sup> of June and for the irritant, well done photographs. I especially liked the Pictures of your Children and your wife.

Concerning the objective part, I will, regarding 1.) arrange that the secret state police will send you the names of at least 100 specific homosexuals from Thüringen . . .

Hail Hitler!  
H. Himmler

**Academic/ Scientific Document 3**

*[Second paragraph]*

On my initiative the Gestapo Weimar did arrest a SS Führer who as well worked as medical officer of health in Thüringen. Unfortunately, I did not have evidence, not even sufficient suspicious facts, but I never trusted that low fellow since I took over the stately healthcare Thüringen. I always had a bad feeling about him.

[. . .] Afterwards I found out, that is an old complaint that is currently lying in the prosecutor's office at Jena. Here he is accused of having forced a 16-year-old boy, who he examined, to unnatural fornication. Klipp made that guy a civil servant although he had been warned. The warning letter is at my hands or rather at hands of the Gestapo.

**Academic/ Scientific Document 4**

Standortarzt der Waffen SS  
 Weimar  
 Subject:

Weimar-Buchenwald, 29. July 1944

Note

On the evening of 26.7.1944 SS-Sturmbannführer Dr. Värne came to the concentration camp Buchenwald to inform himself on the Possibilities concerning his experiments that have been authorized by the Führer. In a first meeting it was arranged to screen five real homosexuals, who seemed appropriate for a testing of his theory. To measure the hormone level, a urine sample must be taken before the surgical procedure. It has been tried to take that sample here at the camp, but we learned that that will not be possible, especially in regard of the procurement of test animals like rats, rabbits and chicken. Therefore, this should take place in Prague, the current residence of the Sturmbannführer, in an institute especially equipped for this purpose.

**Academic/ Scientific Document 5**Visit of Stbf. Vaernet on the 27.10.1944

Out of the six castrates	9576/4	Ledetzky
	21526/4	Reinhold
	31462/4	Schmindt
	20998/56	Henze
	29941/56	Boeck
	21957/56	Köster

Two times blood samples for cholesterol check. Two times with one week in between. The same from 4 -6 Homosexuals.

Earmarked homosexuals: 779/4 Voß, Wilhelm, 6169/4 Parth, Franz, 6186/47 Kreuz, Friedrich

**Academic/ Scientific Document 6**

Carl Vaernet SS

Prague IX 23/11/44  
 Deutsche Heilmittel GmbH

Weimar-Buchenwald

It would be convenient if I could get to the surgeries of the next patients on Friday 1/12. I would like to the surgeries on the castrated patients of whom you sent me the urine. As well I would like to do surgeries on 4 or 5 pure homosexuals. Especially of those men I need collected urine before I can get to surgery. If possible, I would like to measure the amount of lime and creatine in the blood of those new patients before I get to surgery. I hope that I will get the opportunity to talk about those matters with Sturmbannführer Dr. med. Schüler during my stay.

If I don't receive any message, I will arrive at the camp on Friday morning.

Heil Hitler

## Academic/ Scientific Document 7

Head of the air force medical service  
 Instructions for Army doctors  
 For the assessment of homosexual actions

Saalow, 7<sup>th</sup> of July 1944

### A. preliminary legal remarks

*[first paragraph skipped]*

By “Fornication” every kind of fornication between males is meant, even if it is not related to actual sexual intercourse. That means it includes mutual onanism or unilateral onanism on the other person, possibly frisking or kissing of another body or letting the own body being frisked or kissed. Lustful staring at coincidentally naked bodies is not enough. The common sense of shame must objectively be violated. On a subjective foundation a lustful intention to attract each other or a third male must be obvious (Reichsger.-Entsch. 28, 77). The mere attempt is unpunished, but in most cases, completion is reached.

*[§ 175a is repeated]*

By “man” (apart from clause 3) every male person is meant, regardless the age. Concerning clause 2: here a relationship of dependence must exist that, if abused, forces the dependent part of that relationship into fornication. Related to military matters we are speaking of Relationships between a higher-ranking member of the military and his inferiors. Therefore, it is a relationship of dependency.

Regarding § 175a: we can juridically speak of “seduction” only if the perpetrator is older than 21, while the other involved person is younger than 21. Without a reference to that paragraph we can speak of seduction regardless of age [ . . . ]

We speak of professionalism if the intention of gaining profit is related to an ongoing sexual relationship, even if it is not a regular source of income. [ . . . ] If the intention of gaining profit is not met, we talk about habitual actions and not about a crime according to § 175a 4. Male prostitutes are legally not equated to female prostitutes. For female prostitute’s, professionalism (§361 (6) is the legal base for considering sexual intercourse a crime, while sexual intercourse between two males is always considered a crime regarding § 175. It might be possible that the crime is a combination of § 175a and §361.

Homosexual actions between two females are not punishable unless they met §§ 174 (fornication with dependent people), 176 (coercion to fornication), 180, 181 (procuring) or 183 (nuisance), 361 (Violation). There are no special provisions that would put homosexuality between two females under § 175 and 175a, but such actions can possibly be regarded as fornication.

[ . . . ]

### B. Medical assessment

Guiding principles:

1. Not every man who acts homosexual is homosexual (fake homosexuality).
2. Homosexuality is not a necessary condition for fornication between males. fake homosexuals can commit offenses concerning §§ 175 and 175a as well. Not the tendency but the action is punished.
3. Not every homosexual man turns towards other males because of an inherited sexual urge. One can as well become homosexual. In those cases, we shall not speak of a homosexual urge but of a tendency. That tendency can be seen as the reversal of heterosexual urges.
4. Some fake homosexuals turn towards other males as well. In those cases, we shall speak of a propensity towards homosexual actions. The majority of fake homosexual’s lack that propensity.

5. The term “homosexual” must only be used for real homosexuals.

With those guiding principles a practical and useful classification of males who committed homosexual actions can be achieved. The allocation of every individual case often brings difficulties, but in most cases those difficulties can be overcome.

The guiding principles are generally valid for females as well. The only difference lays in the criminal prosecution.

#### I. Fake homosexuals

Fake homosexuals above all are those men who, without having a homosexual urge or tendency, let themselves be abused by homosexuals or perform homosexual actions at the request of homosexuals (purpose homosexuals).

The most primitive representative of those fake homosexuals is the male prostitute. Even though there are real homosexuals among those male prostitutes (who got off rails out of need or acquisitiveness) far most male prostitutes are in fact heterosexuals who act homosexual out of financial interests. Some of them have a certain tendency that facilitates their work. That tendency can either be traced back to their soul structure or to their education. Those men are on the edge to real homosexuality.

[. . .]

There is absolutely no doubt that young, strong and sexual easily attracted young men in need act homosexual even though they are not homosexuals (Need “homosexuals”). But that is almost exclusively the case if they are at the front or in an assignment that makes sexual contact to females impossible. A certain tendency towards the same sex or a missing natural aversion is of course necessary. A unilateral education in youth organizations or excessively close sport comradeship might have a promoting effect. It might have the effect that young men drift from comradeship towards erotic feelings. There is a certain idealization of the male body combined with a devaluation of the female that promotes a temporarily slip towards the brink of homosexuality. That has nothing to do with actual homosexual tendencies even though there might be a strong fixation on other males.

The risk that sexual need leads to homosexual actions is especially high if there is an aversion against masturbation (either explainable with personality or with education). In those cases that, in comparison harmless, valve brings no help.

[. . .]

Sexual need and seduction are often linked to each other. The sexual need makes young, weak soldiers receptive for seduction. Homesickness, the wish for somebody to rely or lean on to and the longing for tenderness are important factors as well. The line between comradeship and erotism is usually crossed intentionally by the seducer while the seduced does not even sees it. Like that, harmless and sexually normal young men are suspected to have homosexual tendencies.

[. . .]

We must also regard as fake homosexuals those young men who, while in the turbulent days of adolescence and while in their sexual instability, become receptive for seduction and homosexual actions. Other reasons for that receptivity might be: disappointing experiences with women, rejection by prostitutes, ideological effusiveness, imitation of Greek pederasty, revolutionary ambitions etc. Even if such a disgusting behavior continues over a certain amount of time, it does not mean that it is a permanent reversal of the normal sexual urge. It still must be considered a temporarily tendency, a derailment of the normal sexual urge, that can be corrected.

[. . .]

The field doctor must recognize those confusions of puberty especially if dealing with members of the air force who mainly are in that certain critical age. He must always keep in mind that even alarming signs in that age do not necessarily mean that he is dealing with homosexual urges or tendencies. The decision in these matters must be reserved for the experienced specialist. Initially those young men must be considered fake homosexuals and treated as such. Homosexual actions within the air force committed by people under the age of 18 must be treated according to the relevant law code (Law code of the Reich, law code of the military, juvenile criminal law).

## Media Document 1

Head of the air force medical service  
Instructions for army doctors  
For the assessment of homosexual actions

Saalow, 7<sup>th</sup> of July 1944

### A. preliminary legal remarks

[§175]

By “Fornication” every kind of fornication between males is meant, even if it is not related to actual sexual intercourse. That means it includes mutual onanism or unilateral onanism on the other person, possibly frisking or kissing of another body or letting the own body being frisked or kissed. Lustful staring at coincidentally naked bodies is not enough. The common sense of shame must objectively be violated. On a subjective foundation a lustful intention to attract each other or a third male must be obvious (Reichsger.-Entsch. 28, 77). The mere attempt is unpunished, but in most cases, completion is reached.

[ § 175a]

By “man” (apart from clause 3) every male person is meant, regardless the age. Concerning clause 2: here a relationship of dependence must exist that, if abused, forces the dependent part of that relationship into fornication. Related to military matters we are speaking of Relationships between a higher-ranking member of the military and his inferiors. Therefore, it is a relationship of dependency.

Regarding § 175a: we can juridically speak of “seduction” only if the perpetrator is older than 21, while the other involved person is younger than 21. Without a reference to that paragraph we can speak of seduction regardless of age [ . . . ]

We speak of professionalism if the intention of gaining profit is related to an ongoing sexual relationship, even if it is not a regular source of income. [ . . . ] If the intention of gaining profit is not met, we talk about habitual actions and not about a crime according to § 175a 4. Male prostitutes are legally not equated to female prostitutes. For female prostitute’s, professionalism (§361 (6) is the legal base for considering sexual intercourse a crime, while sexual intercourse between two males is always considered a crime regarding § 175. It might be possible that the crime is a combination of § 175a and §361.

Homosexual actions between two females are not punishable unless they met §§ 174 (fornication with dependent people), 176 (coercion to fornication), 180, 181 (procuring) or 183 (nuisance), 361 (Violation). There are no special provisions that would put homosexuality between two females under § 175 and 175a, but such actions can possibly be regarded as fornication.

[ . . . ]

### B. Medical assessment

Guiding principles:

1. Not every man who acts homosexual is homosexual (fake homosexuality).
2. Homosexuality is not a necessary condition for fornication between males. fake homosexuals can commit offenses concerning §§ 175 and 175a as well. Not the tendency but the action is punished.
3. Not every homosexual man turns towards other males because of an inherited sexual urge. One can as well become homosexual. In those cases, we shall not speak of a homosexual urge but of a tendency. That tendency can be seen as the reversal of heterosexual urges.
4. Some fake homosexuals turn towards other males as well. In those cases, we shall speak of a propensity towards homosexual actions. The majority of fake homosexual's lack that propensity.
5. The term "homosexual" must only be used for real homosexuals.

With those guiding principles a practical and useful classification of males who committed homosexual actions can be achieved. The allocation of every individual case often brings difficulties, but in most cases those difficulties can be overcome.

The guiding principles are generally valid for females as well. The only difference lays in the criminal prosecution.

#### I. Fake homosexuals

Fake homosexuals above all are those men who, without having a homosexual urge or tendency, let themselves be abused by homosexuals or perform homosexual actions at the request of homosexuals (purpose homosexuals).

The most primitive representative of those fake homosexuals is the male prostitute. Even though there are real homosexuals among those male prostitutes (who got off rails out of need or acquisitiveness) far most male prostitutes are in fact heterosexuals who act homosexual out of financial interests. Some of them have a certain tendency that facilitates their work. That tendency can either be traced back to their soul structure or to their education. Those men are on the edge to real homosexuality.

[. . .]

There is absolutely no doubt that young, strong and sexual easily attracted young men in need act homosexual even though they are no homosexuals (Need "homosexuals"). But that is almost exclusively the case if they are at the front or in an assignment that makes sexual contact to females impossible. A certain tendency towards the same sex or a missing natural aversion is of course necessary. A unilateral education in youth organizations or excessively close sport comradeship might have a promoting effect. It might have the effect that young men drift from comradeship towards erotic feelings. There is a certain idealization of the male body combined with a devaluation of the female that promotes a temporarily slip towards the brink of homosexuality. That has nothing to do with actual homosexual tendencies even though there might be a strong fixation on other males.

The risk that sexual need leads to homosexual actions is especially high if there is an aversion against masturbation (either explainable with personality or with education). In those cases that, in comparison harmless, valve brings no help.

[. . .]

Sexual need and seduction are often linked to each other. The sexual need makes young, weak soldiers receptive for seduction. Homesickness, the wish for somebody to rely or lean on to and the longing for tenderness are important factors as well. The line between comradeship and erotism is usually crossed intentionally by the seducer while the seduced does not even sees it. Like that, harmless and sexually normal young men are suspected to have homosexual

tendencies. [. . .] We must also regard as fake homosexuals those young men who, while in the turbulent days of adolescence and while in their sexual instability, become receptive for seduction and homosexual actions. Other reasons for that receptivity might be: disappointing experiences with women, rejection by prostitutes, ideological effusiveness, imitation of Greek pederasty, revolutionary ambitions etc. Even if such a disgusting behavior continues over a certain amount of time, it does not mean that it is a permanent reversal of the normal sexual urge. It still must be considered a temporarily tendency, a derailment of the normal sexual urge, that can be corrected.

[. . .]

The field doctor must recognize those confusions of puberty especially if he is dealing with members of the air force who mainly are in that certain critical age. He must always keep in mind that even alarming signs in that age do not necessarily mean that he is dealing with homosexual urges or tendencies. The decision in these matters must be reserved for the experienced specialist. Initially those young men must be considered fake homosexuals and treated as such.

Homosexual actions within the air force committed by people under the age of 18 must be treated according to the relevant law code (Law code of the Reich, law code of the military, juvenile criminal law).

## Media Document 2

Child abuser sentenced

Ten years of prison and emasculation

A horrible picture was shown at the criminal division of the district court Bochum. A degenerated educator is guilty of numerous atrocities towards schoolchildren who were entrusted to him. Those tremendous moral misdeeds took place from the time before 1929 until summer 1934, when they were finally discovered. It is about the 39-year-old, unmarried Ludwig Stader from Bommern, close to Witten. He was accused of sex crimes in 17 cases according to § 174, 175 and 176 of the StGB. Over that long period of time, the atrocities took place in the apartment of the accused as well as in the classroom. It is not possible to portray the degeneration and the extent of those child abuses. The court sentenced Stader guilty as charged to the maximum penalty of ten years prison—ten years lost honor. No mitigating circumstances were permitted. Furthermore, the step of emasculation was decided. The Sentence brands the accused as a child abuser of the worst kind, who deserves the worst penalty. (National-Zeitung, Essen 8.9. 1934)

## Media Document 3

SS-Untersturmführer Professor Eckhardt

Unnatural fornication is a death worthy

What foreign countries think

The current attitude of different states concerning the criminal liability of homosexuality is extraordinary revealing. The northern-Germanic people distinguish themselves sharply from the

western-Romanics. The Romanics rather ridicule homosexuality than actually condemn it. In all territories under Romanic law homosexuality is therefore completely unpunished, unless it is combined with aggravating circumstances (violation, crimes against minors, public nuisance). That is the case in France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxemburg, in Italy, Spain and Portugal including their Colonies overseas in central and south America, as well as in Russia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Turkey and Japan.

It is especially characteristic that the boarder of criminal liability runs right in the middle of Switzerland. The Romanic Cantons of Switzerland (Freiburg, Neuenburg, Genf, Waadt, Wallis, Tessin and Grauenbünden) do not punish homosexuality: The other cantons punish, just like the Germanic States, homosexuality with Prison.

The Germanic States, including those under the influence of Germanic, culture consider homosexual activity a serious crime against morality. Just as in Germany homosexuality is punished with imprisonment in Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Greece, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Latvia, England (life imprisonment), English dominions and the United States of Northern America.

### Corruption of naturalness

We come to the conclusion:

Two times in history the northern Germanic view on perversity has been corrupted. At first by the church, when it regarded the killing of homosexuals not as eradication of the perverted for the purpose of keeping clean the race, but as eradication of heretics in honor of god.

Second under influence of western believes that considered homosexuality more as a variant of normal men and not as a degeneration.

This second infiltration of northern feeling started with Voltaire, had its first highlight in the French Revolution and threatened to overrun Germany completely after the collapse of 1918.

The death penalty was abolished, and homosexuality was equated to other crimes against morality. That led to a complete shift in the valuation standard. Nevertheless, the aversion of the northern people against homosexuality could not be broken. Still the northern states stand united against the western cultural area.

It is no wonder that the idea of race maintained most purely in the northern states. A bastardization with a negro for example is considered a betrayal of race by the Germans, the Scandinavians, the English and the Americans alike. Conversely the western people do not feel the same way. Therefore, it is no wonder that the French Revolution, that brought us milder treatment of homosexuals brought us idea of Jew emancipation as well and therefore the danger of a complete degeneration of race.

When it comes to intermarriages between strange races we found our way back to old Germanic opinions. And just like that we need to find our way back to the guiding northern principles of eradicating the degenerated when it comes to the judgment of the race damning degeneration called homosexuality. Germany stands or falls by keeping clean its race.

### Media Document 4

#### Cowardice and homosexuality

Here as well homosexuality (active and passive) is equated to cowardice. That the action deserves death is testified by different sources. A Norwegian Law from the 12th century names it

under the inexpiable crimes. Another Norwegian source mentions as punishments either to be burned to death or to be buried alive. We can as well compare it with the fornication with animals that is often equated to homosexuality. According to northern and Frisian sources fornication with animals must be punished by being buried alive. It must be regarded a weakening when in the 12th century in Norway just the abused animal was killed and the perpetrator was just emasculated.

Document 5 (M5)

National-Zeitung, Essen, 21.7.1935

Lay brothers abused wards

Arrested on basis of § 175

As we hear, ten lay brothers of the local nursing home “Lindenhof” in which mostly mentally ill people are housed, were arrested in the last days. They have been arrested because of misconducts towards their wards. These unbelievable actions infringe § 175 of the law code. The actions must be considered worse because they have affected those people of unsound mind. The depravity of the perpetrators must be considered even worse because they did not act as single persons, but as a whole “club”. That “club” indulged its perverted tendencies and took advantage of the mentally and physically defenselessness of its victims in the most shameless way possible. Even though we merely talk about lay brothers, it is a fact that we are talking about members of the catholic church, who are guilty of a despicable crime in violating all moral and secular principles. Instead of taking care of these poor people, they took advantage of their function by bringing the mentally ill to heel.

## **Media Document 6**

Monatsschrift f. Kriminalbiologie u. Strafrechtsreform 1941, H I

[. . .]

Without considering that in this case, just like in other known cases, we are dealing with a completely and organically changed personality, L. states that homosexual actions, to which those sick people tend, are based on a hereditary disposition or an endocrine damage. That all remains empty theory if other disgusting sexual urges to which those people with organically changed personalities tend are included (for example exhibitionism, self-indulgence, hyper hedonism or the contrary, lust after children)

K. is not a schizophrenic. Even though Kretschmer sees a connection between homosexuality and psycho-physical damage of schizoid-schizothyme relationships, it is obvious that the presumed connection between inherited dispositions and homosexuality do not exist. Among the last 170 men who were accused because of their homosexual actions I just met three with schizophrenics in their families. I would not even talk about homosexuals in those cases. L. considers even the slightest homosexual tendency as an inherited disposition, for example if we are talking about people in pubescent boys.

[. . .]

## Media Document 7

### Fight Homosexuals

[. . .]

He [Hirschfeld] was able to get at least 3000 signatures from directors, teachers, professors, civil servants, poets, authors, high ranking members of the military and journalists. They all supported him with his request [about deleting § 175]. Hirschfeld managed to be invited by the secretary of state Nieberding who at that time was the head of the ministry of justice. Nieberding told Hirschfeld “The government cannot do anything about it as long as the people are not informed about the fact that we are dealing with ethical principles and not with sexual or scientific quirks. You have to explain to the public what we are dealing with so that the public knows about the consequences of deleting § 175.”

That encouraged Hirschfeld to further undermining actions. Together with the two Jews Dr. Kronfeld and Dr. Wertheim he founded the “institute for sexology” in Berlin. [. . .]

With Hirschfeld’s attempt to erase § 175 (with which he did not succeed) a strong countermovement within the lines of the homosexuals formed up. That countermovement finally ended up in the formation of the “Gemeinschaft der Eigenen” (Community of equals) which was the opposite pole of Hirschfeld’s institute. That “Community” did not follow Hirschfeld’s methods because the only purpose of his method was to explain homosexuality on a scientific base. The movement brought the problem to a completely new level. It declared homosexuals as superior to the sexes male and female, as higher humans. For the first time the idea of an independent “male” or “female” culture arose. Not so much in homosexual actions itself but in that culture as well as in the idea, that “friendship (homosexual friendship of course) can compete with marriage lies the danger of those currents.

[. . .] The head of the “Wandervögel” Jansen stood in close relation to those organizations. Therefore, it is no wonder that the former youth organization drifted completely towards homosexual behavior. The old German youth organizations provided a welcoming field of activity for the homosexuals. The terrible influence that those efforts had on the youth is proven by the fact that the regional leaders of one of the largest German youth organizations was completely in the hands of homosexuals. A huge impact on that had as well Hans Blüher. With his book “Die Wandervogelbewegung als erotisches Phänomen” (The Movement of the Wandervögel as an erotic phenomenon) implanted his thoughts into the brains of the youth. He explains that every tendency towards another human being, regardless of [illegible].

## Media Document 8

Das schwarze Kops—Paper of the Schutzstaffel of the NSDAP—Body of the Reich’s  
Leadership

Those are enemies of the state!

A nation that is facing the task to rise its annual birthrates by 1,5 million, cannot afford to lose a huge part of its fathers, just because they became victims of a tactic of attrition that is going on for decades and is directed against the German national body. With that the political task we need to master is outlined.

At first the task was approached without considering the scholars who scratch their heads while trying to figure out the “essence” of that plague. It is known that the “results” of those experts in

that field—no matter if they were called *Kraft-Ebing*, *Schrenck-Notzing* or *Magnus Hirschfeld*—always based on the conclusion that homosexuality is an inherited, or at least a congenital anomaly. The different Theories contradict each other just concerning the origin of that anomaly. Based on those conclusions the moral attitudes arose, which the Jew Hirschfeld formulated more or less as in the following: Homosexuality is congenital just like the cleft palate or the harelip. Just as little as one is allowed fight or punish a person because of their harelip one can prosecute or imprison a homosexual.

The men who approached to the task in the third Reich would have—and that needs to be stated despite all the humanitarian clamor—mercilessly performed their task even if Hirschfeld & Co. would have been right. But with their work they came to a, even for them surprising, knowledge. The number of those who act out of predisposition does not play a role in the total amount of cases they dealt with. Out of one hundred homosexuals not even two belong to that group with which science occupied itself exclusively so far! That changes the pitiful view on those poor, sick people “who can’t help themselves” completely.

The opponent might argue something like “conclusions made by the police are not scientifically underpinned”. The delinquent has an interest in presenting himself as capable of improvement; his statements are worthless.

That must be responded with: If we would just rely on statements made by delinquents a way higher number than two out of hundred would come up, because the whole Ideology of the homosexuals is based on the “not being able to help themselves” and the smarter ones among them like to exploit § 51.

But the assigned political task is not just about the punishment of those who committed a crime, it includes as well educational measures and finally a success monitoring, of which the concerned person knows nothing of. At this the abnormal must be distinguished clearly from the follower and the seduced.

By then urging them to systematic labor—for the far most of them it might be the first time in their whole existence—they will be controlled strictly and segregated from “normal” people, the complacent performance of their so-called sickness will be prevented. By forcing them to recognize their likeminded as a mirror that shows their own impossibility, the transformation will occur with surprising punctuality. The “sick” will heal. The “abnormal” shows himself as quite normal. He is just going through a phase of personal development that he missed out as a youngster. Only the two percent of the really abnormal remain. Those who were the origin of the disease outside in life, now become the concentration of disgust, which separates the wheat from the chaff.

Just the two percent are the sick ones. Just as little as the born criminal they appear poor and pitiable.

Their danger exceeds the imagination. 40.00 abnormal people, who we can afford to cast aside, are, if given the freedom, able to poison 2 million.

One will argue, that those two million probably lack character so that let themselves be poisoned. But of course, a nation cannot just consist of integer characters firm as iron. One more reason to protect the weak. Just as one would not use hygienic progress to protect those who have an indestructible nature and resist every bacillus, but those who are vulnerable. The bourgeoisie who wants to close his eyes and does not want to believe these terrifying facts, is not innocent. For decades the leading intellectuals tolerated the public propaganda of the homosexuals, maybe it was even seen as special achievement of democratic freedom. They just stood and watched as the youth movement more and more fell into the clutches of the inverts. They did not reach out for

the whip as the leader of the Wandervogel Hans Blüher openly declared in his book “Wandervogel”, the “The German wandervogel-Movement is an erotic phenomenon” and “that the Movement would not be possible without the inverted (page 35), because every affection towards a human being, regardless the sex, is eventually an erotic one. A Wandervogel must not feel ashamed for his affection towards a younger comrade, it is not indecent. Etc.” He states, that it is no coincident, that the leader of one of the largest youth leagues was an invert. That is the ideology with which the criminals tried to convince the youth. The fact that they especially focused on the youth shows their criminal tendency just as much as their criminal intention. This intention turns itself against the continued existence of the nation. A homosexual teacher is able to ruin a whole class, a youth leader, to whom children are entrusted can ruin a whole generation and a friendly “uncle” is able to ruin the youth of a whole village. They are state criminals because they do surround themselves with people like themselves, not just because of their tendencies but, as soon as they are in a position of power and as soon as people do rely on them, also because of expediency. They create a state within a state, a secret organization which interests run counter to the interests of the nation, therefore they are subversive. There are no “ill people” to be “treated”, but enemies of the state to be eradicated.”

## Media Document 9

Laws § 175 and 175a

1935: an aggravated version of the Paragraph was formulated by the fascist state

### § 175

(1) A man who does fornicate with another man or lets himself be abused to fornication, will be sentenced to sentenced to prison.

(2) If the participant has not reached the age of 21 at the time the act is committed, the court may refrain from punishment in particularly minor cases.

### § 175a

With prison up to 10 years, under attenuating circumstances not less than 3 months prison, will be sentenced:

1. A man who forces another man to fornication by violence or threat to danger his life and limb or lets himself be abused by him.
2. A man who forces another man to fornication by abusing a dependent, employment or inferior relationship or lets himself be abused by him.
3. A man over the age of 21 who seduces another man under the age of 21 to fornication or lets himself be abused by him.
4. A man who professionally practices fornication or professionally lets himself be abused by men or offers himself to prostitution.

1945: This version was taken in the Federal Republic of Germany. Homosexual people were punished harder than they were before 1933.

## Speech Document 1

### The Ideology of eradication

Heinrich Himmler: “the question of correctly led sex is a question of survival for every nation”

“When we took power in 1933 we also discovered the homosexual associations. Their registered membership was over two million; cautious estimates by offices dealing with the matter range from two to four million homosexuals in Germany. I myself do not put the figure so high, because I do not believe that everyone in these associations was personally a homosexual in the real sense. On the other hand, of course, I am convinced that not all the homosexuals were registered in the associations. My guess is between one and two million. But one million really is the minimum we can assume, the very lowest and weakest estimate permissible in this area. Please think what that means. According to the most recent population figures, we have 67 to 68 million people in Germany—that is, taking raw figures, roughly 34 million males. So there are approximately 20 million sexually capable men (males above the age of sixteen). Perhaps this is wrong by a million, but that is of no significance.

Assuming one to two million homosexuals, the result is that roughly 7-8% of men in Germany are homosexual. If that is how things remain, our nation will fall to pieces because of that plague. A nation will not for long bear such a destruction of its sexual economy and equilibrium”.

## Speech Document 2

If you further take into account the facts I have not yet mentioned, namely with a static number of women, we have two million men too few on account of those who fell in the war, the you can well imagine how this imbalance of two million homosexuals and two million war dead, or in other words a lack of about four million men capable of having sex, has upset the sexual balance of Germany, and will result in a catastrophe.

I would like to develop a couple of ideas for you on the question of homosexuality. There are those homosexuals who take the view; what I do is my business, a purely private matter. However, all things which take place in the sexual sphere are not the private affair of the individual, but signify the life and death of a nation, signify world power or ‘swissification’. The people which has many children has the candidature for world power and world domination. A people of good race which has too few children has a one-way ticket to the grave, for insignificance in fifty or a hundred years, for burial in two hundred and fifty years.

Therefore, we must be absolutely clear that if we continue to have this burden in Germany, without being able to fight it, then that is the end of Germany, and the end of the Germanic world. Unfortunately, we don't have it as easy as our forefathers. The homosexual, whom one called 'Urning', was drowned in a swamp. The professorial gentlemen who find these corpses in the peatbogs are certainly unaware that in ninety out of a hundred cases, they have a homosexual before them, who was drowned in a swamp, clothes and all. That wasn't a punishment, but simply the extinguishment of abnormal life. It had to be got rid of, just as we pull out weeds, throw them on a heap, and burn them. It was not a feeling of revenge, simply that those affected had to go ... In the SS today, we still have about one case of homosexuality a month. In a whole year, about eight to ten cases occur in the entire SS. I have now decided upon the following: in each case, these people will naturally be publicly degraded, expelled, and handed over to the courts. Following completion of the punishment imposed by the courts, they will be sent, by my

order, to a concentration camp, and they will be shot in the concentration camp, while attempting to escape. I will make that known by order to the unit to which the person so affected belonged. Thereby, I hope finally to have done with persons of this type in the SS, so that at least the good blood, which we have in the SS, and the increasingly healthy blood which we are cultivating for Germany, will be kept pure.

However, this does not represent a solution to the problem for the whole Germany. One must not have illusions about the following. When I bring a homosexual before the courts and have him locked up, the matter is not settled, because the homosexual comes out of prison just as homosexual as before he went in. Therefore, the whole question is not clarified in the sense that this burden has been identified, in contrast to the years before the seizure of power.

## APPENDIX B

### US DOCUMENTS

#### Media Document 1

Washington Post, Sept 25, 1967  
Center to Treat Homosexuals Urged.

By Jean M. White

A professor of psychiatry has called for establishment of a 'national center for sexual rehabilitation' to study and treat homosexuals.

Dr. Charles W. Socarides, who made the proposal in a lecture at the National Institute of Mental Health, estimates there are 2 ½ million 'obligatory' adult homosexuals in the United States. Homosexuality, he said, is a 'condition of certainly epidemiological proportions' and one that calls for a pooled program of research and treatment, similar to those for mental retardation, epilepsy, and alcoholism.

'There is no place—hardly any place, I would say, in the US—where a homosexual can go and say: I am a homosexual. I need help'. Dr. Socarides said.

Dr. Socarides is clinical assistant professor of psychiatry at Albert Einstein College of Medicine and specialist in the study of sexual perversion.

In his NIMH lecture, Dr. Socarides argued that the roots of homosexuality lie farther back into early childhood—in the 'pre-oedipal' stage before the age of 3—than generally accepted in classic theories on the causes of homosexuality.

He also thinks his findings may hold up for fetishism, travestitism, sexual masochism, and exhibitionism. This has led to what he calls 'A Unitary Theory of Sexual Perversion'. By the age of 3, Dr. Socarides argues, a child should have achieved separation and 'individuation' and established a stabilized identity of his own. The 'crucial' period for the genesis of homosexual traits is between, 1 ½ and 3 years, as he sees it. Younger than that, it is normal for a child to have fantasies of 'merging' with his mother.

The trouble with homosexual, he feels, is that they don't achieve separation at the proper age. During later periods of stress and strain, they regress back to the earliest mother-child 'merged' relationship. 'The homosexual's mother is domineering and tyrannical. The best way to describe her is as a crushing mother that will not allow the child to achieve his own autonomy', Dr. Socarides said.

At another point, he observed: 'I don't want to blame mother for everything, but it comes down to this'. Most homosexuals, he said, show evidence of a 'screaming phenomenon'—screaming for an inordinately long time and beyond the age of 3 whenever their mother disappears from behind the baby carriage or at night.

The New York psychiatrist took a swipe at the Mattachine Society and other homosexual groups for inflating the figures on the incidence of true homosexuality and trying to argue that it is not an illness but normal behavior of a minority group. He added that the press also added to the 'confusion' and misunderstanding about homosexuality.

Dr. Socarides drew a careful line of distinction between 'obligatory' homosexuality and 'utilitarian' homosexual behavior. The 'obligatory' homosexual, scarred by disturbances in early

life, has to perform such acts to escape unbearable anxiety, but 'utilitarian' homosexual activity is a far different thing. It may be an experiment or occur in barracks during war.

The Kindsay report, Dr. Socarides emphasized, con-used the two and came up with the misleading figure of 28% for adults who engaged in homosexual contact.

Dr. Socarides' figure of 2 ½ million homosexuals is on the low side for estimates made in recent years by other psychiatrists. He emphasized that it does not include 'latent' homosexuals who are not pushed over the borderline into overt acts. He had an answer for the 'glamorous' argument from homosexual societies that many important men and geniuses have been practicing homosexuals and it has existed into antiquity. Therefore, they argue, homosexuality is not an illness.

'It is precisely, that we were all once children and we all have to face the challenge of passing through the most difficult period of separation-individuation, into a separate and independent identity from our mothers', Dr. Socarides countered.

One patient told Dr. Socarides that he gets 'a shot of masculinity' from the homosexual act and relief from loneliness and anxiety. The psychiatrist warned that doctors must be cautious in treating homosexuals or 'they can make things worse'.

Dr. Socarides said that the National Institute of Mental Health was 'ideally constituted' to set up a center for sexual rehabilitation. 'Such a national center will be started by one of the Western governments', he added, 'and I hope it is here . . . A comprehensive program is needed to diminish, reverse, and prevent this tragic human condition that involves such large numbers of population'.

## Media Document 2

The Washington Post Monday, June 19, 1950.

Sex Offense Law Drawbacks Cited

By N. S. Haseltine Post Reporter

Washington's program to treat its public sex offenders as mental but instead of penal cases isn't paying off as a salvage operation, its operators agreed yesterday. At the same time, the psychiatrists of St. Elizabeths Hospital praised the program as a pioneering, progressive step which is attracting national interest.

They listed its chief drawbacks with as insufficient funds for the intensive psychiatric treatments necessary to straighten out sexual psychopaths, and present operation of the Miller Act which sends only the poor risks, the sex-twisted humans least likely to respond to treatment.

The Miller Act, designed to protect society from sex outrages by mental treatment instead of prison terms, was passed by Congress on June 8, 1948. Its first 'patient' was committed to the Federal institution for the mentally ill in October of that year.

One Out of 36

Since then, St. Elizabeths officials said yesterday, 36 offenders have been similarly committed and only one returned to the courts. Seventeen of the legally designated 'sexual psychopaths' have progressed to the relative freedom of 'general confinement' but 19 are still in the hospital's maximum-security wards.

Just who are these sex offenders, and how are they responding to treatment? Representative cases, cited in a preliminary report by three St. Elizabeth doctors, give some of the answers. They include: 'Case A. A 25-year-old married colored musician with numerous arrests since

adolescence for larceny and 18 for exhibitionism and peeping. He has used alcohol, cocaine and marijuana since age 12. He came from a broken home and was institutionalized many times before the age of 12. "He is immature and egocentric but has been a superficially 'good' patient, but his self-punishing operations have been very conspicuous. His jobs, therapy and friendships have all evolved into failures'.

The cases are reported by Dr. Bernard A. Cruvant, Milton Meltz, and Francis J. Tartaglino, all of the hospital staff, for publication in a coming edition of the American Journal of Psychiatry. It deals with the first 24 persons committed to St. Elizabeths under the Miller Act.

The 'sexual psychopaths' defined as persons seemingly unable to control impulses, are unpopular patients, both with attendants and with other inmates of a mental hospital, the doctors said.

Admitting that the group under care isn't statistically representative of sex offenders in the community, the psychiatrists concluded that at least those under treatment are not likely to be cured by present techniques.

### Most Are Exhibitionists

Under the present law, 'they stated in their report, the majority of cases received have been exhibitionists. It is questionable whether the exhibitionist is a sexual criminal of sufficient menace to justify indefinite commitment and whether the incidence of heinous sexual crimes will be reduced by his confinement'. Much more research is still needed, they said, particularly on how to predict behavior in the individuals both before and after treatment.

Praising the program, despite its financial limitations and other shortcomings, Dr. Samuel A. Silk, assistant superintendent at St. Elizabeths Hospital, said the Miller Act is striking at problems long neglected by society.

Though the sex offender problems are general throughout United States, he said, St. Elizabeths Hospital is the only public institution in the country to tackle them on mental treatment basis.

### Media Document 3

#### District Court Ruling

CSC's Right to Bar Homosexual Upheld JAN 1967

A Federal judge here yesterday reaffirmed the Civil Service Commission's right to consider a person who 'actively engages in homosexuality' as unfit for Government employment. District Court Judge George L. Hart's ruling came in case involving the narrower issue of whether the CSC had been sufficiently specific in its allegations of 'immoral conduct' before finding an alleged homosexual, Bruce Scott, 54, of Springfield, Va., ineligible for employment.

'Aren't we shadow-boxing?' asked Hart impatiently at one point during technical arguments between American Civil Liberties Union lawyer David Carliner and Government attorney Gil Zimmerman. 'The real question is whether an active homosexual can work for the Government'. The ACLU has been battling the Scott case in court for more than three years. Last year, the US Court of Appeals ruled that the CSC must be more specific in its allegations before barring Scott from employment. The CSC conducted further investigations, issued new allegations and continued to deny Scott's eligibility.

Carliner argued yesterday that the allegations were still vague and subjective. Th mentioned two non-sexual arrests, general descriptions of Scott as ‘effeminate’ and an account of homosexual activity at Scott’s home in which he wasn’t a participant.

Zimmerman countered that Scott was evasive during CSC interviews and flatly refused to say whether he was in fact a homosexual. His failure to answer CSC questions prevented the CSC from determining his ‘suitability’, Zimmerman said. ‘Therefore, there was no satisfactory showing of his eligibility’.

Hart ruled that the CSC had complied with the Court of Appeals’ requirement of greater specificity. Carliner indicated he will appeal. ‘Let’s hope this time we’ll get the matter settled once and for all upstairs (in the Court of Appeals),’ Hart said.

#### **Media Document 4**

THE VILEST OF THE RACKETS (Esquire Magazine, April 1950)

Here is the inside story of the rotten perversion racket. It’s not a pretty one, but the public; —and you—can no longer afford to deny it.

LLOYD WENDT

‘WHY all this talk about homosexuality?’ you may ask. ‘Why is so much being written on the subject these days?’ Well, apart from the fact that any peculiar behavior pattern that affects an appreciable element of society is bound to have an impact upon all of us, our studied refusal in the past to discuss homosexuality has led to the shocking success of a shake-down racket so heinous it is rarely mentioned in print. Annually, this vilest of rackets takes a fortune from the pockets of more American men than most of us realize. And, just because of our hush-hush attitude toward the whole subject of homosexuality, the police are unable to do anything about it, for public prejudice has, up to now, been unwittingly on the side of the criminals.

What’s it all got to do with you? This, among other things: There are hundreds of innocent victims of this racket. They are innocent because they are sexually ‘normal’ men; they are victims because they’re afraid to complain to the police. And don’t think it couldn’t happen to you!

The racket is an almost perfect crime from the viewpoint of the hustlers who practice it. They are seldom caught, and almost never prosecuted. The police know many of their leaders, some of whom “earn”—if we may use the word —splendid incomes as a reward for their criminality. Detective-bureau files in all big cities contain plenty of information on them. But few of the facts ever get before a judge and jury.

There is only one way to stop the racket, say experienced law-enforcement officials. That is by publicity. No man familiar with the technique of the sex-perversion shakedown need ever be a victim. Every man is a potential dupe if, through public ignorance and apathy, the foul business is allowed to continue.

Complete innocence is no protection against the hustlers. They generally travel in gangs of three, and they stage their repulsive dramas in public lavatories, in parks, on streets, sometimes, even, in a victim’s office or apartment.

The victim may be happily married, the father of seven children, and the champion weight lifter of his town, but virility is no safeguard.

Police officials estimate that the perversion shakedown is engineered at least once a day in many of the large cities of the country. The Chicago police report two hundred arrests of such

racketeers every year. New York, Cleveland, Boston, Detroit, and Los Angeles have been plagued by the thing for years. The arrest records are hardly an adequate indication of the prevalence of the crime. However, complaints are received in only a small proportion of the cases.

The extortion scheme works in several ways, for large or small stakes, but the basic pattern is pretty consistent. Let's take a look at one of the gangs in action.

Not long ago, a rugged foreman in a Gary, Indiana, steel plant, quit his job to see the country on the \$15,000 he had saved. He got no further than a Chicago saloon. There, over a couple of beers, he flashed a roll of bills and talked about his plans. His talk drew the attention of a spotter for a shakedown gang.

The two men struck up a quick friendship, and soon the spotter invited the now drunken foreman to his room for a drink.

The burly citizen from Gary hardly knew what happened next. A curly-haired boy appeared in the room out of nowhere, and, without his having the faintest idea how it had happened, the foreman suddenly found himself maneuvered into a compromising position with the boy. What's more, "a policeman" unexpectedly appeared at the door. The "policeman" flashed his badge and, in choice gutter language, loudly denounced the victim as a pervert. "You're under arrest," he said. He pointed to the spotter, the man who had originally invited the poor foreman into the room. "This man," he went on, "is our witness." The foreman stood helpless in his disgust and horror. The youth was obviously effeminate; a cop and a witness had caught two men in what looked like an incipient homosexual act. The Gary man felt sick as the big policeman hurled abuse at him.

Dazedly, he accompanied the cop out of the house and into a parked automobile, which looked exactly like a police squad car. The "witness" came along with them. The car started off, and then the witness began to plead with the policeman. "Please," he said, "be lenient, won't you? Sex perversion's a kind of disease. Give the bastard a break!"

The brawny foreman shuddered, but he began to have hope. Maybe he could get clear of the filthy affair. They were driving toward the Chicago police headquarters at Eleventh and State, and the foreman talked fast. He was innocent, he insisted. He had been framed. If they would let him go, he'd make it right with them.

(Continued on page 140)

Continued from page 53

The spotter took up the foreman's cause again. He pointed out that the Gary man's reputation would be forever ruined if they dragged him into police court. A block from the police building, the big cop relented. He repeated again what he thought of perverts, but consented to forget the whole thing. All he'd want, he said, would be \$5500 for bond—plus a little fix money.

The foreman agreed eagerly. The next morning, back in Gary, he drew \$6500 from his bank. Two weeks later he had paid out his entire \$15,000 to the blackmailers, but they kept on asking for more money. Finally, in desperation, the foreman visited a government agency, which interested itself in the matter because of the fact that extorted money, in an amount over \$5000, had been transported across state lines. Within a few days all three hustlers were identified, but the case collapsed when the victim refused to appear in court. He wanted no public connection with proceedings from which some might infer that he was a "queer." The racket gang was clear. The most the government agency could do was to provide an estimate of the hustlers' illicit earnings to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Incredible as it seems, this racket succeeds day after day, year after year, in most of the large cities of the country. A Boston hotel owner is estimated to have paid more than \$200,000 to extortionists prior to his death. A midwestern university professor mortgaged his \$17,000 home to meet payments before he finally complained to officials. A California bank officer embezzled money to pay off a gang and went to prison for his crime but refused to prosecute the shakedown artists responsible for it. And were all these men, and hundreds of others who have suffered, sexual perverts? Is that why they paid and paid and paid? Not at all!

The pervert hustlers flourish because people in general, if they know of the racket at all, assume that it is directed only against men addicted to homosexual practices. This is absolutely not true. Naturally, homosexuals are among the victims, but there is no reason why such obvious frame-ups should be confined to them. The few men who have possessed courage to help break up some of the gangs have, in the opinion of the police, been themselves completely innocent of abnormal sex behavior. But the police are not—and bear this in mind—concerned with the sex life of a man who is being blackmailed. They are primarily interested in smashing a rotten racket, one that particularly discredits police departments, since the hustlers pose as policemen.

The fact that a victim will go to the police should be the best evidence that he is guiltless of any abnormal practices. Why, then, do so many innocent victims take their losses in silence?

There are several reasons, all of them rooted in a general ignorance of the nature of the racket.

The victim invariably assumes that the pretended officers are genuine. He shares and fears public contempt for homosexuals and believes he will be suspected of depraved behavior regardless of any defense he may attempt. The loathsome and humiliating situation in which he finds himself leaves him helpless and vulnerable to any suggestions that seem to offer escape from embarrassment.

The hustlers are careful to exploit these psychological advantages. The tough “policeman” in civilian clothes making the arrest looks precisely like the kind of hardhearted traffic officer often portrayed in cartoons. He wears his hat low over his eyes in the approved fashion for plain-clothes detectives, and he speaks in a loud, gruff voice and is expert in beating down confused victims.

His confederate, the spotter, is similarly well-cast. He is always a soft-spoken, genial kind of fellow. And the “framer” or “baiter” is a homosexual young man who looks the part. Actually, many homosexuals are built like professional athletes, but the public thinks of “queers” as soft, curving, beardless, effeminate fellows. The hustlers select their baiter accordingly.

When possible, a sex-pervert gang will choose victims with great care, but usually circumstances determine the candidate for entrapment. The bulk of the crimes are against the ordinary guy who happens to be caught alone in a public washroom or at a secluded spot on the beach or in a park. If an advance selection is made, the gang looks first for a potential victim with money. If his physical appearance is of the kind often ascribed to homosexuals, he should prove to be an especially good prospect. A single man is preferred above one who is married, since he will be more suspect. A leader in boys’ activities is often selected, because the charge of perversion can be particularly terrible for such a man. But the racket can touch anybody at all—literally anybody. Listen, for instance, to the tragic story of Mr. A.

Mr. A. was a midwestern department-store executive, in charge of the women’s-wear division. A slight, trim, middle-aged bachelor, soft-spoken and mild, he had an excellent reputation. He went east on a buying trip and was spotted by a hustler who frequented the merchandise shows. A cursory investigation revealed that the man had money and that he was unmarried. He looked the type who readily could be bluffed. Patiently, and for days, the spotter kept his eye on Mr. A. The

gang held itself in readiness. Finally, the perfect opportunity presented itself: Mr. A. visited the men's room in a hotel. The shakedown gang found him there alone and staged its sordid act. Mr. A., sick from disgust and fear, found himself accused of a crime he had heard of only remotely. He paid over all his cash and wired his bank for more. On the following day the spotter, enacting his semi sympathetic role, reluctantly informed Mr. A. that an additional \$5000 was required. The gang got that too. For two whole years, the shakedown continued. Mr. A. lost his money, his health, and finally his sanity.

His nephew at last obtained from him an incoherent story of his experience with the shakedown gang and sent the details to a friend in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But it was too late. Mr. A. died in an asylum and no one has ever found out how much he paid to the racketeers.

They were careful to take their money in cash. Mr. A.'s fortune of about \$40,000 was gone, and it was evident that, before his collapse, he had shared every paycheck with the gang.

Not all plots are for big stakes, however. The gangs, traveling about the country, loiter in hotels, railroad stations, public rest rooms, and saloons in search of opportunities as they are presented.

The chance victim may be a bookkeeper, a clerk, a day laborer. He is nearly always frightened into giving his right name, and a telephone call is immediately made to his place of employment to verify the information he provides. After that the gang collects regular tribute. One workman paid out \$15 a week for many months before he obtained relief by visiting the police.

Such small-time cases occur by the thousands every year. They add to the enormous toll exacted by these most despicable of criminals. And not one of the shakedowns, big or small, need have succeeded!

Any man framed by the pervert hustlers may be certain of these facts:

1. He will get immediate and effective action from the police. They detest this type of hustler even more than they hate gun-crazy cop killers.

2. The racketeers are physical cowards and will run if their bluff is called. In most cases, they're much more afraid of public attention than their victim is; and if the victim insists on going to the nearest police station, the gang may carry the bluff as far as the entrance, but no further.

Such advice is easier to give than to take, of course. "The pervert hustlers are expert psychologists," says Captain Andrew W. Aitken, who is Chief of the Detective Division of the Chicago Police Department. "They know that fear will cause men to do strange things, and that nothing rattles a man more than to accuse him of a shameful crime. Because the public knows little about this rotten racket, the average victim fears he will be suspected of perversion, even though he's innocent. That fear should not stop anyone from going to the police. The fact that a man will complain is the best evidence of his innocence. Go to the police, and we'll end this rotten racket in a hurry."

One of the most respected residents of a large middle western city is a businessman whom, for the purposes of this story, we'll call Mr. Doe. Mr. Doe, whose wife divorced him some years ago, has never remarried. He lives alone in comparative luxury and he is small and frail-looking. A shakedown gang in his town decided that he was a perfect bet for their activities. They caught him alone in the men's room of a movie theatre one evening. We needn't go into the sordid details. It's enough to know that Mr. Doe found himself on the way to a police station at midnight. Surrounded by three strange men, two of whom appeared to be plainclothes men. Mr. Doe may have looked frail, but he was a man of tremendous vitality, integrity, and courage. He assumed—wrongly, of course, but justifiably—that he was actually in the hands of the cops, but he knew he was innocent. When, as they approached the police station, his companions began their routine of suggesting that a little money might help him out of his fix, he said,

furiously, “Not at all. There’s been a nasty misunderstanding and it’s more important to me to have it cleared up than to see it squelched.”

Continued on page 142

Continued from page 141

The hustlers pleaded, threatened, turned on every stop, but Mr. Doe was grimly determined to see the thing through. When they reached their destination, it was the hustlers who were trembling, not he. At the crucial moment, they turned tail and ran. Aware now of what had really happened, Doe told his story to the police and provided them with a detailed description of the criminals, who were soon rounded up and, as a result of Doe’s courageous testimony, convicted. Currently, though, the police have to do the best they can without much public co-operation of this sort. The occasional complaints in various cities have enabled them to book the most active of the racketeers, and the departments exchange photographs of the arrested hustlers. Thus, extensive rogues’ galleries have been built up, and the confidence squads are able to seize some shakedown experts at sight.

“We throw a known hustler into the bucket whenever we see him,” says Aitken. “It costs him lawyer’s fees to get out, and that runs up his overhead. A few vagrancy arrests a week convince him that the town is unhealthy for him.”

The enforcement officials do not blame a man too much if he is reluctant to appear in court. But, as has been pointed out, it is by no means necessary for a potential victim to go into court to break up the racket. He need only refuse to pay, and request police protection. When the pervert shakedown becomes unprofitable, it will end. And there are many ways of making the racket unprofitable. Let’s end this discussion with a happy story.

Not long ago, a retired Chicago broker, a man of sixty living in an expensive Lake Shore Drive apartment, had the habit of taking nightly walks alone along Oak Street Beach. Often, he rested on a park bench at the north end of the beach, a somewhat secluded spot. The baiter for a hustler gang, which had been studying the broker’s habits, stationed himself on that particular bench, posed as an ex-G.L, and won the confidence of the broker. The youth got himself invited to the older man’s apartment, took dinner with him one evening in a near-by restaurant, and then walked with him along the beach. When they reached the park bench, the stage was set. In the midst of a thoroughly innocent conversation, the baiter suddenly threw his arms around the older man—just as two “policemen” came up. The youth talked wildly of indecent acts, blaming his older friend.

The broker was effectively trapped. A widower, he lived alone. The elevator operator had seen him take the young man to his suite. He had been seen with the youth in the restaurant, where he was well-known. Two policemen and the youth accused him of perversion and he had no defense. He began to pay.

Months later, after he had been bilked of more than \$20,000, he entrusted his secret to a private detective agency. The agency soon provided the police with enough evidence to scare off this particular shakedown gang. The broker’s identity was never disclosed, and the blackmail quickly ended. Unfortunately, though, the gang remained free to prey on others.

There is no need to pay a detective-agency fee, however, nor does that method offer any final solution of the problem.

“The way to stop the racket is for the individual victim to show some guts,” says Captain Aitken. “Insist on going to the police! If every man does that, the shake artists will be through. Naturally, we’d like to have the complainant testify in court so that we can put the racketeers in prison,

where they belong. A few courageous men have done that. But, in any event, go to the police. They know this racket for what it is. Don't ever, under any circumstances, pay anyone a dime!" Other law-enforcement officers agree with Aitken. Public enlightenment is needed to end the racket, the officials say. They urge victims to take these steps: Those now paying blackmail should report at once to the police. They should consult with the police before stopping the extortion payments, since the police can be of use in trapping the criminals. They should have the courage to press their complaints through the court, but they will get police protection whether or not they agree to testify.

Potential victims, trapped by the racketeers, should insist on being booked at the nearest police station. They should not, under any circumstances, pay any money. Even though as a result of their sensible behavior the threat is ended, they should nevertheless promptly report the extortion attempt to the police. They should be ready and willing to co-operate with the police by identifying the criminals and testifying against them.

The police can smash the vilest of the rackets, and they can do it in a hurry. What they need is the help of a few men with guts. +H-

### **Media Document 5**

If Dr. Kinsey's Data Apply to US Jobs . . .

Statistically, 21 Congressmen are wholly homosexual; 192 congressmen are bad risks because of behavior; 56,787 Federal workers are exclusively homosexual; 525,279 in Civil service are blackmail perversion risks

Here is an authentic story on the current Senate homosexual probe, approved by Dr. Kinsey, who says: "You have correctly interpreted the data which you are using from our book. Certainly there is no question that the reality of the total situation need to be drawn to the attention of the country. Hysteria thrives best when only a small segment of the total picture is understood. Your story should do something to counteract that misunderstanding of the reality of the situation".

The Senate sub-committee investigating employment of 'homosexuals and other moral perverts' by the Federal government had better read the Kinsey report before it goes very far.

Dr. Alfred C. Kinsey and his associates found, for instance, that 4 per cent of the white males of the country are 'exclusively homosexual thruout their lives after the onset of adolescence' (p. 651, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, W. B Saunders Co).

A GAUGE?

If this figure can be applied to the 1,419,674 male Civil Service employees, it means that 56,787 Federal employees are 'exclusively homosexual'.

If it is legitimate to apply the figure to the white male members of Congress, it would mean that 21 senators and representatives are 'exclusively homosexual.'

The committee will have to wait until the publication of Dr. Kinsey's next book to discover what percentage of the better than 400,000 female Civil Service employes is, in his term, 'exclusively homosexual'.

## GRADATIONS

The Senate resolution authorizing the investigation does not define the terms 'homosexuals' and 'other moral pervers' used in the resolution, Dr. Kinsey declared (p. 650) that 'any question as to the number of persons in the world who are homosexual and the number who are heterosexual is unanswerable. It becomes necessary for him to devise a table of seven categories of gradations of sexual activities ranging from the exclusively homosexual to the exclusively heterosexual (p. 639).

## SECURITY RISKS

The investigation is being held because some members of Congress believe that employment of 'homosexuals and other moral pervers' is a security risk in that such persons might be subject to blackmail by Communists. If that is true, the subcommittee will be interested not only in that 4 percent which is 'exclusively homosexual', but also will have to take an interest in persons who fall into other categories in Dr. Kinsey's table of gradations.

If one homosexual contact is enough for a Communist blackmailer's purposes, then, assuming again that Dr. Kinsey's figures can be applied to Civil Service employees and members of Congress, 37 percent of them are poor security risks for that reason. This would work out to 525,279 male Civil Service employees and 192 white male members of Congress.

## MORE THAN A THIRD

Dr. Kinsey states (p. 650) that "37 percent of the total male population has at least some overt homosexual experience . . . between adolescence and old age. "According to Dr. Kinsey (p. 650), 13 per cent of the white male population falls into the three categories showing the greatest frequency of homosexual contacts. That 13 percent, he states, has more of the homosexual than the heterosexual for at least three years between the ages of 16 and 55."

Again assuming that these figures are applicable, that would mean that 68 members of congress and 184,558 Civil Service employees fall into the higher brackets.

A more thoro analysis of the educational, social and economic backgrounds of members of Congress and Civil Service employees might result in figures which are higher or lower than those above.

## MANY FAMOUS DEVIATES

However, Dr. Kinsey states (p. 201), 'Many of the socially and intellectually most significant persons in our histories, successful scientists, educators, physicians, clergymen, business men and persons of high positions in governmental affairs, have socially taboo items in their sexual histories and among them they have accepted nearly the whole range of so-called sexual abnormalities'.

The sub-committee will also investigate “the preparedness and diligence of authorities of the District of Columbia as well as the appropriate authorities of the Federal Government, for the protection of life and property against the threat to security inherent in the employment of such perverts by such departments and agencies”.

### THE REFORMERS TOO

At another point in his book, Dr. Kinsey states (p. 665), ‘The police force and court officials who attempt to enforce the sex laws, the clergymen and business men and every other group in the city which periodically calls for enforcement of the laws—particularly the laws against sexual ‘perversion’—have given a record of incidences and frequencies in the homosexual which are as high as those of the rest of the social level to which they belong’.

If the experience of either the Army or the Navy during war time is any criterion, it is highly unlikely that the subcommittee can either discover very many homosexuals in the government or devise methods of screening homosexuals by the Civil Service Commission.

### THE ARMY FIGURES

According to Dr. Kinsey (p. 621), Selective Service boards and Armed Forces sources give a total figure of about 1 percent of our wartime military strength officially identified as ‘homosexual’. The Kinsey figures show nearly 30 percent of men of the age group included in the Armed Forces are having some homosexual experience at that period in their lives.

‘The most obvious explanation of the very low figures of the Armed Forces sources’, Dr. Kinsey went on, ‘lies in the fact that both the Army and Navy had precluded the possibility of getting accurate data on these matters by announcing at the beginning of the war that they intended to exclude all persons with homosexual histories . . . Consequently, few men with any common sense would admit their homosexual experience to draft boards or to psychiatrists at induction centers or in the services’.

### **Media Document 6**

#### Soldiers and Sex

The Baltimore Afro-American (Aug 28, 1943)

The two great desires of overseas soldiers are hunger for food and hunger for sex. They come joined or mixed in curious ways. According to ‘Psychology of the Fighting Man’ published by the Infantry Journal and Penguin Books. The book states: Hunger or one is frequently expressed in hunger for the other. The satisfaction of hunger has been associated with the loving care and affection of another person—first his mother, then his wife. That is why an army marches on its stomach. Ill fed, the soldier feels lonely and dejected.

### Homosexuality

A sexually abnormal man who finds satisfaction only with other men, may get into the army. Some have no feeling of shame over their homosexuality. It is possible that they may even turn out to be excellent soldiers. The man whose homosexuality develops for the first time in a situation where he cannot have normal satisfaction, may be only mildly disturbed, but it is more likely that he will suffer strong feelings of guilt. As long as he is worried and dissatisfied, he may be all right when he returns to normal conditions.

### Letters from Home

The normal soldier who can indulge in promiscuous sexual activity without disgust may be an efficient soldier, but his loose talk and behavior may arouse the sexual needs of men who cannot resort to direct satisfaction without mental conflict. Separation from home, for soldiers of this kind, means loss of innumerable and intangible delights of feminine companionship. If the girl at home sends constant reassurances of faithfulness, gifts and letters in abundance, the soldier will find it much less difficult to keep his spirits high. If, however, he is denied these substitute satisfactions, the feeling of loneliness may drive him to seek sexual satisfaction with other women.

## Media Document 7

### The GAYS

The Baltimore Afro-American (Feb 27 1965)

That's the newest name for homosexuals. The practice is condemned as sin by Catholics, Protestants and Jews. It is also a felony to seek sexual partners from your own sex—termed sodomy among men, lesbianism among females.

Experts estimate the number in New York City alone as varying from 100,000 to 600,000 and growing. The campaign is on to win social acceptance.

Dr. Irving Bieber, New York Medical College psychiatrist, in his book 'Psychoanalytic Study of Male Homosexuals', finds the roots of homosexuality in disturbed early family relations.

A warmly related father precludes the possibility of a homosexual son. Homosexuality is an illness created by ill adjusted parents, usually a fond mother and hostile father. People are not born with it. Eighty-three per cent of those who have it would not like their children to follow in that path.

They can be a menace to young people, especially school children. Homosexuals are identified by slacks, long hair, fancy furnishing and what is described as that lingering look in their eyes, short coats and preference for publications specializing in nude and seminude men. They live fearing of entrapment, exposure, blackmail or loss of their jobs.

Even those who have wives and children and appear masculine do not feel themselves secure. Best news of all is the expert medical opinion that the illness can be prevented and can be cured.

### Media Document 8

A conservative View: The Law and Homosexuality  
Newsday Dec 15, 1964

#### The Law and Homosexuality

Any writer who sets out to suggest the desirability of revising the country's criminal laws on homosexuality probably should begin by having his head examined. His topic is distasteful and his view unpopular, and any thanks he may get from those who agree will be more than offset by howls of outrage from those who miss his point. Nevertheless, the subject has been recently in the news, and it provides an opportunity for reflection upon themes that go far beyond the sexual relationships in question. In New York the other day, a state commission on revision of the penal law made public a recommendation that aroused much controversy. The commission would exclude both adultery and homosexual practice between consenting adults from its proposed new penal law. A Catholic spokesman, Charles Tobin, condemned both proposals. An Episcopal spokesman, John V. P. Lassoe Jr., did not take a position on the retention of adultery as a crime, but he regarded the exemption of the defined homosexual acts as 'a significant and enlightened advance over existing laws.' (The actual language of the commission's recommendation deals with deviate sexual acts 'privately and discreetly engaged in between competent and consenting adults').

Tobin, in opposing the commission's bill, took the view that homosexuality 'is an increasing threat to sound family life in our community'. If he is right in this, there would be some justification in constitutional principle for maintaining criminal laws in the field, for presumably the state police power still may be exercised to make 'sound family life' secure. But is he right? The answer seems obscure, but it is worth keeping in mind that in any criminal prosecution the burden of proof lies upon the prosecutor. It seems to me at least doubtful that the voluntary actions carefully defined by the New York commission come within the proper ambit of the state's police power in a free society. Such sexual relationships, privately entered into between consenting adults, may be sin; I suggest that as a matter of law, they ought not to be crimes.

This has been the view of the highly respected American Law Institute, whose model penal code exempts these acts. It was the view of the late Judge Learned Hand, one of America's most beloved jurists, who once described deviate sexual behavior among consenting adults as a matter of morals, a matter largely of taste, and it is not a matter that people should be put in prison about.' This was the view taken by the State of Illinois in 1961, when it quietly dropped the applicable criminal statutes in a revision of its penal code. It was the recommendation in 1957 of Britain's Wolfender Commission. Neither France nor Germany punished the acts of consenting adults. The case against such criminal laws was stated vividly Oct. 10 in an opinion entered in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. A prisoner, convicted in state courts of sodomy, sought his freedom under habeas corpus on the contention that North Caro-

lina's law was unconstitutionally vague. While the federal court rejected this argument, the court made some observations that merit thought. North Carolina's statute, it was noted, was patterned directly after an English law of 1533. North Carolina in 1837 defined the offense euphemistically, as a 'crime against nature, not to be named among Christians.' The offense was made punishable by death. It was not until 1869 that the death penalty was eliminated in favor of a 60-year maximum term in prison. That is still the law of North Carolina today. The court called it 'a shocking example of the unfortunate gulf between criminal law and medicine and psychiatry.'

If homosexual relations, under the American Law Institute definition, no longer were criminal, the whole point of blackmail operations in areas of the national security would be blunted. More importantly, if less tangibly, adoption of the New York commission's proposal would tend to reaffirm one of the most ancient principles of the law, which is that men should be free to pursue their widely varying concepts of happiness so long as they do not encroach upon the rights of their neighbors. This is the key point. The thought of sex perversion gives most of us the creeps; but the thought of freedom from needless coercions of the state embraces an ideal we ought to defend.

### **Media Document 9**

Growth of Overt Homosexuality in City Provokes Wide Concern  
NYTimes Dec 17, 1963

The problem of homosexuality in New York became the focus yesterday of increased attention by the State Liquor Authority and the Police Department. The liquor authority announced the revocation of the liquor licenses of two more homosexual haunts that had been repeatedly raided by the police. The places were the Fawn, at 795 Washington Street near Jane Street, and the Heights Supper Club at 80t Montague Street, Brooklyn.

The city's most sensitive open secret—the presence of what is probably the greatest homosexual population in the world and its increasing openness—has become the subject of growing concern of psychiatrists, religious leaders and the police.

One division of the organized crime syndicate controls bars and restaurants that cater to the homosexual trade. Commenting yesterday on the situation, Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy said: 'Homosexuality is another one of the many problems confronting law enforcement in this city. However, the underlying factors in homosexuality are not criminal but rather medical and sociological in nature'.

The police jurisdiction in this area is limited. But when persons of this type become a source of public scandal, or violate the laws, or place themselves in a position where they become the victims of crime they do come within our jurisdiction.

This matter is of constant concern to us in our efforts to preserve the peace and protect the rights of all the people. It has been given and will continue to be given, special attention".

Experts' Views

Estimates range from an avowedly conservative 100,000 one leading psychiatrist to solicitation probably exaggerated 600,000 by the homosexual president of the Mattachine Society of New York, the organization dedicated to education of the general public on 'the problems of the sexual deviant.'

Some experts believe the numbers of homosexuals in the city are increasing rapidly. Others contend that, as public attitudes homosexuals have tended to be have become more tolerant, the homosexuals have tended to be more overt, less concerned with concealing their deviant conduct.

In any case, identifiable homosexuals—perhaps only half the total—seem to throng Manhattan's Greenwich Village, the East Side from the upper 40's, through the 70's and the West 70s. In a fairly restricted area around Eighth Avenue and 42d Street there congregate those who are universally regarded as the drags of the invert world—the male prostitutes—the painted grossly effeminate 'queens', and those who prey on them. In each of the first three areas the homosexuals have their own restaurants and bars—some operated for them under the contemptuous designation of 'fag . . . (illegible)' . . . against alleged entrapment of homosexuals by plainclothes policemen sent into homosexual haunts. The homophile groups have won some support from civil rights groups in their campaign to outlaw the uncorroborated testimony of an arresting officer as proof of cases of entrapment for soliciting.

#### Open to entrapment

The tendency of homosexuals to be promiscuous and seek pick-ups—a tendency even recognized even by the gay writer, Donald Webster Cory, in his book "the Homosexual America"—makes them particularly vulnerable to police entrapment.

Any sexual contact between persons of the same sex is punishable under the sodomy statute. If the action involves any use of force or threat of force or one of the participants is a minor, sodomy is a felony. There have been about 250 such arrests annually in recent years, with about two thirds of them coming to indictment or trial.

In all other cases, notably acts between consenting adults, sodomy is a misdemeanor. There have been an average of 120 arrests here annually under this section, most often for acts in public. First Deputy Police Commissioner John F. Walsh says the Police Department has limited itself to an effort to suppress solicitation in bars, public lavatories and Turkish baths and any approaches to minors by homosexuals. No attempt is made, he says, to enforce the theoretical ban on private homosexual conduct between consenting adults.

#### Blackmail Feared

Homosexuals and some legal authorities argue that this prohibition, even if unenforced should be removed from the statute books. Its mere existence, they contend, offers a foundation for possible blackmail of homosexuals. The British Government's Report of the Committee on Homosexual Practices and Prostitution—the so-called Wolfenden Report—strongly urged removal of legal penalties for private homosexual acts between consenting adults, but Parliament refused to act on the recommendation. In this country, only Illinois has acted in the sense urged by the Wolfenden Report. There have been 40 to 70 arrests a year in New York of homosexual offenses involving minors—their late teens rather than juveniles. Parental concern over this aspect of the problem probably is excessive, according to most psychiatrists and public officials

was probably an exaggeration, but the area named unquestionably has a relatively large homosexual population.

Some homosexuals claim infallibility in identifying others of their kind 'by the eyes—there's a look that lingers a fraction of a second to 1 ng.'

Most normal persons believe they have a similar facility in spotting deviates. This is true only of the obviously effeminate type—the minority who either openly proclaim their or orientation or who make only perfunctory efforts to disguise it

The homosexual community cuts entirely across society—from the Bowery bum to the corporation executive," says a spokesman for the Mattachine Society, himself an invert, He is the owner of his own trade publication business and serves the society under his own name, but was unwilling to be identified by name.

### Heterosexual Masquerade

Many homosexual men carry out a successful lifetime masquerade—with wives, children and entirely masculine appearance, he says.

In Greenwich Village, a center for the bohemians of the homosexual world, one real estate management concern estimated that about one-fourth of the 245 apartments in its 18 West Village buildings were rented to homosexuals.

In some areas of the East Side the 'middle-class' homosexuals lead outward lives that are prosperous and even gay in the original sense, built around tasteful apartments and weekend cocktail parties. The West 70's are home to a less prosperous class of homosexuals who drift through the rooming—house neighborhoods between the park and Broadway.

An all-night restaurant on Broadway in the 70's was described by officials of the Mattachine Society as 'the bottom of the barrel'—the haunt of exhibitionist queens and eccentrics. A visit there disclosed that even at noon there were half a dozen obvious homosexuals killing time over coffee and jukebox music.

### Impossible Dream

Many homosexuals dream of forming a permanent attachment that would give them the sense of social and emotional stability others derive from heterosexual marriage, but few achieve it.

The absence of any legal ties, plus the basic emotional instability that is inherent in many homosexuals, cause most such homosexual partnerships to founder on the jealousy and . . . [illegible]

There is a cliquishness about gay individuals that often leads one who achieves influential position in the theater—as many of them do—to choose for employment over a straight applicant, unless the latter had an indisputable edge of talent that would bear on the artistic success of the venture.

### Not immune to women

There is popular belief that homosexuals are immune to sexual attraction by women. Dr. Irving Bieber, director of the most recent extensive study of homosexuality, disputes this view and cites

the presence of large numbers of inverts in occupations that bring them into close personal contact with women to prove the reverse.

He asserts that homosexual men receive sexual stimulation from women. But, because their capacity for normal erotic expression has been crippled psychologically, Dr. Bieber believes female attraction produces a reaction of fear and search for homosexual outlet.

The tendency of high-fashion designers to produce styles that minimize or suppress womanly curves—styles that can be worn rally well only by hipless, bosomless mannequins—has often been interpreted as an expression of homosexual hostility toward women. In Dr. Bieber's opinion, it is, rather, another expression of fear.

The practice of homosexuality is regarded as sin by all three of the main branches of western religion—Roman Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism.

### Religions Condemn It

Leaders of all three reprove homosexual acts, just as they condemn illicit heterosexual conduct, but recognize that the homosexual needs both the support of the church and psychiatric treatment to help him overcome his deviant impulses.

‘The increase of homosexuality is only one aspect of the general atmosphere of moral breakdown that has been going on around us’ says Monsignor Robert Gallagher of the Youth Counseling Service of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York.

I believe there are some signs of recognition of the nature of this breakdown and of reaction against it. We refuse to let homosexuals say they are irresponsible. We try to help them to exercise human responsibility and give them the encouragement that religion has to offer. Parish priests are advised under pastoral counseling program to urge homosexuals to seek psychiatric help under treatment by the group achieved a heterosexual orientation.

‘Our findings are optimistic guideposts not only for homosexuals but for psychoanalysts who treat them’, the report concluded. We’re firmly convinced that psychoanalysis may well orient themselves to a heterosexual objective in treating homosexual patients rather than ‘adjust’ even the more recalcitrant patient to a homosexual destiny.

The organized homosexuals dispute the validity of psychiatric findings on deviance. They argued that the medical students of the problems see only those homosexuals who are disturbed enough to seek treatment. Therefore, they say, findings based on the sample cannot be applied to the majority of adjusted homosexuals.

To this, Dr. Bieber, replies that, during his wartime service, he interviewed intensively about 75 homosexuals discovered by military authorities. Among these involuntary subjects for study he found no basic differences in their psychopathology from that of the voluntary group under treatment, except that the former were more defensive and resistant to recognizing their deviance.

## Media Document 10

The worry Clinic  
 NYTimes August 3, 1955  
 By Dr. George W. Crane

Case P-303: Millicent G., aged 43 is the mother of a college son who has been dismissed from military service for homosexuality.

“Dr. Crane, I can’t understand why my son would ever become interested in such a thing,” she protested with hurt pride.

“Do you suppose he is losing his mind? One of my uncles went insane, so could he have inherited this abnormality?”

No. he didn’t inherit his homosexuality. And it has no connection with insanity. Furthermore, thousands of high-ranking officers in military, as well as enlisted men, have been washed out of service for homosexuality.

Furthermore, the public must quit affecting such horror at the sound of this word. Many Americans still act as if the term is synonymous with the cry of ‘leprosy’ in Biblical days.

Anything is abnormal which isn’t practiced by the majority or even 51 per cent of the general public. But this type of abnormality is statistical and not connected with loss of sanity.

Millicent was indirectly responsible for her son’s problem for she was a woman who left her boy alone a great deal, except for the company of household employees. And my interview with her son brought out the fact that he had learned his homosexuality originally at the age of thirteen from the butler in their home.

“But how could he be fonder of a man than of a lovely girl?” his mother asked in surprise.

Well, love is love. Whether of your own sex or the opposite sex.

God Almighty designed us human beings so we would be receptive to love as well as to carbohydrates. But accidental events in the childhood environment still predispose maybe 10 per cent of people to a form of emotional life that is not typical of the other 90 per cent.

When a person is ardently in love, he naturally doesn’t want to break up his own romance, even on the orders of his parents. For example, suppose a boy had proposed to his girlfriend and was so devoted to her he felt he couldn’t live without her. But his parents then told him she wasn’t good for him, so he should jilt her. How would he feel? Would he accept the advice with delight? And would it be easy to break up his romance?

Well. the same situation exists regarding homosexual romance. The homosexual ‘lovers’ have no interest in breaking up, even though their parents and other relatives may be horrified at the affair. The only way such a romance can be terminated is for one or both parties thereto to decide that such a romance is not proper. By sheer will power, such homosexuals have often broken their attachment for their own sex and developed happy marriage to members of the opposite sex. But they must resolutely date eligible members of the opposite sex, just as they would take medicine for an ultimate cure.

Bitter though it may seem at the start, if they will go through the proper motions, including dates with the opposite sex, compliments and kisses, they can evolve the more mature emotional type

of love which is represented by heterosexual romance between male and female. But the victim's relatives can't cure him by their desire any more than they can change a confirmed alcoholic. The victim himself must want to change, and then shun his own sex while deliberately cultivating the opposite sex.

### **Media Document 11**

#### **METRAZOL IS USED IN NEW TREATMENT**

The Atlanta Constitution, Feb 28, 1940

Trial With at Least Complete Initial Success Is Reported.

Use of metrazol, a synthetic camphor to stop homosexuality in six persons, was reported here yesterday.

Metrazol is a new medicine used for shock in treatment of schizophrenia, or split personality. Its trial with at least complete initial success on five male patients and one female was reported in the Commentator, a publication of the Owensby clinic here.

The physicians assumed that the cases are underdeveloped schizophrenias. They assumed also that the traits are a split-personality trouble in an arrested state.

They used the usual method of treating mental troubles with metrazol, in which this chemical induces deep coma. It has the same effect as insulin, the medicine first tried in the new shock treatment for insanity.

The six patients had been afflicted for periods ranging from, five to many years each. Their ages were 19 to 44. In all cases, the report said, the desires were stopped, but added that the time is too short and cases too few to be sure about this treatment.

### **Media Document 12**

Encyclopaedia-Sexualis: A comprehensive Encyclopaedia-Dictionary of the Sexual Sciences  
Edited by Victor Robinson, M.D.

Ad166—No title

Herald Tribune (1926-1962); Jan 17, 1943

Historical Newspapers: New York Tribune/ Herald Tribune

Professor of History Medicine at Temple University in Philadelphia, US.

THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS presents for the first time in an organized form the substance of man's knowledge of sex. It is a work of monumental proportions, covering the entire range of sexological subjects and including, in effect, a comprehensive library of concise information on every allied topic. This single volume contains everything in the sexual sciences from definitions of sex terms to exhaustive articles nearly 25,000 words in length on special subjects.

Every word in the ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS was especially written for this work under the editorial guidance of Dr. Victor Robinson, author of 'The Story of Medicine' and Professor of History of Medicine, Temple University School of Medicine. The contributors include the most distinguished authorities in the world. Years of painstaking editorial effort and the

combined scholarship of the greatest contributing staff ever assembled for preparation of a work on a single subject, went into the making of this book.

The ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS belongs in the library of every physician, sociologist, clergyman and social worker: it can be of invaluable assistance to every man and woman who in any way is confronted with social problems or entrusted with social responsibilities. In addition, every cultured person with a thirst for information and personal guidance in the profoundly important field of sex will find in the ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS a comprehensive source of knowledge.

*Some characteristic contributions*

Marriage [ . . . ]

Homosexuality by Magnus Hirschfeld. The author of this contribution has blazed new trails in the study of the most baffling subject. His patient research penetrated the cause of homosexuality and shed light on the problems associated with it. The late Dr. Hirschfeld was the world's leading authority on this phase of sexual deviation. He was founder of the Institute for *Sexualwissenschaft* (Sexual Studies) at Berlin (later destroyed by Hitler). Hirschfeld wrote especially for ENCYCLOPAEDIA SEXUALIS, a summary of his studies in this field and his autobiography.

Compulsive Acts [ . . . ]

Sexual Aspects of Religion [ . . . ]

## **Policy Document 1**

### AN ACT

To provide for the treatment of sexual psychopaths in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, TITLE I

### INDECENT EXPOSURE

Sec. 101. Section 9 of the Act of July 29, 1892, entitled "An Act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia", as amended D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 22-1112), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" before "That it shall not be lawful" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Any person or persons who shall make any obscene or indecent exposure of his or her person or their persons, as described in subsection (a), knowing he or she or they are in the presence of a child under the age of sixteen years, shall be punished by imprisonment of not more, than six months, or fined in amount not to exceed \$500.

### IMMORALITY-INVITING FOR PURPOSE OF, PROHIBITED

SEC. 102. The first section of the Act of August 15, 1935, entitled "An Act for the suppression of prostitution in the District of Columbia" (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, sec. 22 2701) is hereby amended to read as follows: "That it shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, persuade, or to address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading any person or persons sixteen years of age or over, in or upon any avenue, street, road, highway, open space, alley, public square, enclosure, public building public gathering or assembly in the District of Columbia, to

accompany, go with, or follow him or her to his or her residence, or to any other house or building, enclosure, or other place, for the purpose of prostitution, or any other immoral or lewd purpose, under a penalty of not more than \$100 or imprisonment for not more than ninety days or both. And it shall not be lawful for any person to invite, entice, or persuade, or address for the purpose of inviting, enticing, or persuading any such person or persons from any door, window, porch, or portico of any house or building to enter any house, or go with, accompany, or follow him or her to any place whatever, for the purpose of prostitution, or any other immoral or lewd purpose, under the like penalties herein provided for the same conduct in the streets, avenues, roads, or other public place, store, shop, or reservation or at any highways, or alleys, public squares, open spaces, enclosures, public buildings or other public places, stores, shops, or reservations or at any public gatherings or assemblies”.

#### INDECENT ACTS- CHILDREN

Sec. 108. (a) Any person who shall take, or attempt to take any immoral, improper, or indecent liberties with any child of either sex under the age of sixteen years, with the intent of arousing, appealing, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires, either of such person or of such child, or of both such person and such child, or who commit, or attempt to commit, any lewd or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of such child the intent of arousing, appealing to, or gratifying the lust or passions or sexual desires, either of such person or of such child, or of both such person and such child shall be imprisoned in a penitentiary, not more than ten years.

(b) Any such person who shall, in the District of Columbia, take any such child or shall entice, allure, or persuade any such child, to any place whatever for the purpose either of taking any such immoral, improper, or indecent liberties with such child, with said intent or of committing any such lewd, or lascivious act upon or with the body, or any part or member thereof, of such child with said intent, shall be imprisoned in the penitentiary not more than five years.

(c) Consent by a child to any act or conduct prescribed by subsection (a) or (b) shall not be a defense, nor shall lack of knowledge of the child's age be a defense

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to the offenses covered by section 104 of this Act or by section 808 of the Act of March 3, 1901, entitled “An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia”, as amended and supplemented (D. C. Code, 1940 edition, 22-2801)

#### SODOMY

SEC. 104. (a) Every person who shall be convicted of taking into his or her mouth or anus the sexual organ of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of placing his or her sexual organ in the mouth or anus of any other person or animal, or who shall be convicted of having carnal copulation in an opening of the body except parts with another person, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding ten years. Any person convicted under this section committing such act with a person under the age of sixteen years shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or be imprisoned for a period not exceeding twenty years. And indictment for the commission of any of the acts, hereby declared to be offenses, it shall not be necessary to set forth the particular unnatural or perverted sexual practice with the commission of which the defendant may be charged, nor to set forth the particular manner in which said unnatural or perverted sexual practice was committed but it shall be sufficient if the indictment set forth that

the defendant committed a certain unnatural and perverted sexual practice with a person or animal, as the case may be: Provided, That the accused the accused on motion, shall be entitled to be furnished with a bill of particulars setting forth the particular acts which constitute the offense charged.

(b) Any penetration, however slight, is sufficient to complete the crime specified in this section. Proof of emission shall not be

## TITLE II DEFINITIONS

SEc. 201. For the purposes of this title- (1) The term “sexual psychopath means a person, not insane, who by a course of repeated misconduct in sexual matters has evidenced such lack of power to control his sexual impulses as to be dangerous to other persons because he is likely to attack or otherwise inflict injury pain, or other evil on the objects of his desire”

(2) The term “court” means the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, the criminal branch of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, or the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, as the case may be.

(3) The term “patient” means a person with respect to whom there has been filed with the clerk of any court a statement in writing setting forth facts tending to show that such person is a sexual psychopath

(4) The term “criminal proceeding” means a proceeding in any court against a person for a criminal offense, and includes all stages of such a proceeding from (A) the time the person is indicted, charged by an information, or charged with an offense in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, to (B) the entry of judgment, or, if the person is granted probation, the completion of the period of probation

### **Policy Document 2**

September 11, 1950  
MEMORANDUM

TO: Francis D. Flanagan  
FROM: James F. Sheridan  
SUBJECT: Perverts in Government—Navy Department.

On August 30, 1950 the writer had an interview with Mr. Thomas Mulliken, Civilian Agent, office of Naval Intelligence. Mr. Mulliken had been referred as the person in the Navy who had the most knowledge on the handling of homosexuals. Captain DuBois who was interviewed in connection with this matter had that Mr. Mulliken be interviewed as had Captain in the Medical Corps at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda. Also at the interview was Mr. Barron, an assistant to Mr. Mulliken.

Mr. Mulliken is about 45 years of age, makes a good appearance and talks with authority on the subject. He gave the writer the impression that he was well conversant with the problem of homosexuals and had had considerable experience in the handling of such cases.

Mr. Mulliken feels very definitely that homosexuals are a poor security risk to have working in any organization and especially in the Navy. Mr. Mulliken also expressed the opinion that he felt that these sex perverts were a bad morale influence on any organization.

Mr. Mulliken pointed out that over a period of years he has built up a considerable file on the individuals and that his file contains only factual information. The writer was shown the files and could see that they were quite voluminous. Mr. Mulliken states that their investigation is on a continuing basis and that they get a great deal of information from informers.

Mr. Mulliken stated that as general rule those that talk and act like homos generally are. It is pointed out that the acting and talking are what is commonly ascribed to people who act in a "queer manner". Mr. Mulliken stated that he felt that there was too much stress on blackmail in connection with homosexuals and that blackmail was not as prevalent as people are led to believe.

Mr. Mulliken pointed out that homosexuals under pressure become neurotic and alcoholic and in this state indulge more in their practices. Mr. Mulliken pointed out that he did not believe that medical doctors can spot homosexuals and that on any boards that are set up to screen for homosexuals it is not necessary to include medical men. Mr. Mulliken feels that it takes experience with contact of these individuals to be able to spot them.

Mr. Mulliken stated that too much stress is placed upon the curing of homosexuals. He feels that there is a tendency to be soft with them and treat them as sick people. It is pointed out that as a result of this type of thinking homosexuals were able to spread and influence others. Mr. Mulliken feels that we should treat the problem in the same manner as syphilis was attacked, namely, by bringing the subject out in the open and educating the public to the problem and all its ramifications.

### **Policy Document 3**

49-882- Procedure for the Disposition of Cases of Homosexuals Involving Naval Personnel  
PIs-7,10 December 1949

**ACTION: ALL SHIPS AND STATIONS**

(b) Chairman of Personnel Policy Board memo to Secretaries of the Army, the Navy Force, and the Air services of 11 Oct. 1949, establishing policy re discharged of homosexuals from the armed services

1. Reference (a) is hereby canceled.
2. Reference lowed by the armed discharge of homosexuals b) established a uniform policy to be followed by the armed services with respect to the treatment and discharge of homosexuals
3. Consonant with reference (b), the Navy Department's policy and the administrative procedure for disposition of personnel in cases involving homosexual tendencies or acts.
4. Homosexuality within the naval service is primarily a military problem. However, insofar as the individual is concerned, homosexuality is a medical problem because it is a condition which must be considered at variance with the normal, mature, adult sexual development. While the psychological mechanism of homosexuality is primarily a psychiatric problem, on the other hand, the commission of unacceptable social acts falls definitely into the category of the legal and disciplinary spheres. Barring psychosis, individuals should be held socially responsible and acts. Those who have committed homosexual offenses should held accountable for their failure of control. Likewise, individual should be permitted to transgress the rights others.

All socially unacceptable sexual acts should be punished in direct proportion to the seriousness of the offense itself ever bearing in mind the need of the dual purpose of military justice, (1) as a deterrent, to maintain proper order and morale, and (2) the corrective influence on the individual himself. Each case needs careful, thorough, and individual study so that final treatment, action, or disposition logical, and legal ideas, according to the particular category into which it falls.

5. Known homosexual individuals are military liabilities and must be eliminated from the service. Commanding officers receiving information indicating that a person in the naval service possesses homosexual tendencies or has engaged in an act of homosexuality shall inquire thoroughly and comprehensively into the matter and ascertain all the facts and circumstances of the case, bearing in mind the peculiar susceptibility of such cases to possible malicious complete statement from the officer or enlisted person concerned, or his statement to the effect that he does not desire to make a statement; statements of witness; copy of the sample general-court-martial charge and specifications.

7. The Navy Department has occasionally encountered misconceptions on the following points: (1) The role of the medical expert in regard to cases involving homosexual acts while in the naval service, as classified in paragraph 6 above and (2) the degree of culpability of persons who, while in the naval service, have passively participated in homosexual acts. Explanations are therefore supplied as to these matters. (a) In the case of one who, while in the naval service, has been the active participant in a homosexual act opinion of medical experts that the participant is not a "true homosexual" is immaterial as concerns following the procedure set forth in the preceding paragraph. In the case of one who, while in the service, has allegedly made an indecent proposal or has attempted to commit a homosexual act, expert medical opinion that he is not a "true homosexual" is of bearing where the words or actions constituting the alleged proposal or attempt are admitted, but the actor contends that he spoke or acted facetiously with no real intent to engage in a homosexual act. Such an issue will normally be best left to resolution by a general court martial. In the case of one who while in the naval service, has engaged in a homosexual act as a passive participant, expert opinion that such passive participant is not a "true homosexual" is material only if a contention is made that the participation was not voluntary. In other than clear cases of forcible invasion, this issue is likewise one which can normally be best resolved by a general court martial. (b) It is emphasized that no distinction is made in administrative handling of cases of alleged participation in homosexual acts while in the naval service, based upon whether the role of a person in any particular act(s) was passive or active. It is the view of the Navy Department that one who voluntarily assumes passive role in such acts is no less a homosexual than the active participant. Commanding officers should impress this fact upon those under their command.

**Policy Document 4**

June 20, 1950  
 Captain A. S. McDill, USN  
 Director  
 Legislative Division Department of the Navy  
 Washington 25, D. G.,

Dear Captain McDill:

Mr. James P. Sheridan of our staff spoke to you last week concerning our present investigation of homosexuals in the Government. You referred him to Captain Samuel W. DuBois and Captain DuBois was interviewed. This letter is being written as an outgrowth of the conversation had with Captain DuBois and he can supply the information requested.

The Subcommittee in the course of its present investigation would like the following information from the Navy:

1. number of known and alleged homosexuals in the Navy (broken into Naval personnel and civilian personnel)
2. number of Naval personnel court martialed because of homosexuality
3. number of Naval personnel who resigned to avoid court martial
4. number of civilian personnel fired because of homosexuality
5. number of civilian personnel who resigned and were suspected of homosexuality.

In supplying the above figures would you please break them down into years and months. We would like the statistics to go back to 1 July 1945 or further if it is more convenient for the Navy.

Your cooperation in supplying the above information as soon as possible will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,  
 Francis D. Flanagan  
 Chief Counsel

**Policy Document 5**

June 19, 1950

TO: Francis D. Flanagan  
 FROM: James F. Sheridan  
 SUBJECT: Perverts in Government Department of the Navy

On June 15, 1950 the writer was in telephone conversation with Captain McDill, USN, Director, Legislative Division. The writer explained to Captain McDill the scope of our investigation on the subject matter and stated that we desired to talk to various people in the Navy who could give us the problem as it existed in the Navy concerning homosexuals. The writer explained to

Captain McDill that we also would like to have the name of someone in the Medical Department of the Navy to give their view on the sociological aspect of the problem. Captain McDill stated that there was no problem in the matter of perverts in the Navy as the Navy got rid of them as soon as they learned of them (it was quite obvious that Captain McDill was not speaking with authority). Captain McDill explained that if there was no physical harm the person involved was offered an opportunity to resign and escape court martial and his record was so marked. Captain McDill explained that in his opinion perverts were in the same category with thieves and liars as far as being poor security risks. The Captain further stated that he did not think that the Medical people of the Navy had anything to offer on the matter as they only came into the picture in cases of physical injury. The writer arranged with Captain McDill for an interview with Captain DuBois.

### **Policy Document 6**

Office of the Postmaster General  
Washington 25, DC

Honorable Clyde R. Hoey,  
United States Senate

Dear Senator Hoey:

I have your letter of July 19, 1950 wherein you request certain information in accordance with the provisions of Senate Resolution 280 (81st Congress, 2nd Session).

For your convenience your questions will be restated and answered in the order submitted.

Question No. 1: Does your Department consider a homosexual or sex pervert to be a bad security risk?

Answer: Yes

Question No. 2: Does your Department consider a homosexual or sex pervert to be an undesirable employee on grounds of general unsuitability or for reasons other than security?

Answer: Yes

Question No. 3: Do you have any present rules or regulations which prohibit or restrict the employment of homosexuals or other sex perverts in your Department? (If the answer is "Yes", please furnish a copy of such rules and regulations).

Answer: While the Department does not have published regulations on the subject, appointment to or retention in the postal service of homosexuals or other sex perverts would be incompatible with the Department's employment policy that all postal personnel are expected to be honest, trustworthy, of good character and reputation, loyal to the Government of the United States and to the Post Office Department, and that they conduct themselves in a manner which will reflect favorably upon service.

Question No. 4: Do you have any present rules or regulations which prohibit or restrict the employment of bad security risks other than persons suspected of disloyalty? (If the answer is "Yes", please furnish such rules and regulations).

Answer: It is believed that the employment policy stated in connection with Question No. 3 places restrictions on the employment of bad security risks.

Question No. 5: An outline of the procedures for the investigation of personnel suspected of homosexuality or other sex perversion prior to employment.

Answer: Any information in the possession of the Department indicating homosexuality or other sex perversion in connection with an applicant for employment would be turned over to the Post office Inspection Service for a complete investigation and report.

Question No. 6: An outline of the procedures for the investigation of personnel now in your employ who are suspected of homosexuality or other sex perversion.

Answer: Attached hereto is a copy of Order No. 38269 of August 11, which outlines the procedure followed in the adjudication of cases involving personnel on the rolls who may be suspected of homosexuality or other sex perversion.

Question No. 7: An outline of the procedure for dismissing personnel for reasons of homosexuality or other sex perversion.

Answer: The procedure for the removal of persons for reasons of homosexuality or other sex perversion is covered in Order No. 38269. (Copy attached)

Question No. 8: Recommendations regarding procedures to be established in the employment and possible dismissal of personnel for reasons of homosexuality or other sex perversion.

Answer: Insofar as the Post office Department is concerned; experience indicates that the present procedure being followed with respect to the employment and/or removal of personnel for reasons of homosexuality or other sex perversion adequately meets existing requirements.

Sincerely yours,  
Postmaster General

### **Policy Document 7**

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY Public Health Service  
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH  
Bethesda 14, Md August 24, 1950  
To: Francis Flanagan  
Chief Counsel Senate Investigations Subcommittee  
Mailing Room 160  
Senate office Building  
Washington, D. C.

I have read with considerable interest the statements and testimony given by the various persons who appeared before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee on July 26, 1950. These statements are exceedingly comprehensive and cover in adequate detail the questions raised regarding the problem of homosexuality. The various individuals who submitted this information have gone into a careful, detailed description presentation with regard to the personality make-up of the homosexual person and those who manifest overt homosexual behavior. I am of the feeling at this particular time, after having read this transcript, that very little additional information would be obtained from a panel discussion of the problem of homosexuality by consultants who might be gathered together for such a purpose.

In reading over the testimony that has been submitted, it is obvious that one is concerned with those factors which influence security and that one of those factors is homosexuality. There are other factors besides homosexuality which should be considered as possibly influencing security. In this connection I have raised additional questions concerning which I would like to have your opinion in consideration of this problem.

1. To what extent is homosexuality different from other personality characteristics which influence an individual as a security risk? For example, the liar or the person who gossips maliciously, the person who desires to portray his importance, the show-off, the alcoholic, the person who suffers from great financial need and is subject to bribery, persons with questionable background, persons with bad associates, and the philanderer.
2. Are all persons who may be called homosexuals security risk? obviously there would be no question about the overt homosexual person who seeks his sexual gratification from persons of the same sex and is caught in the act. This raises the question as to other homosexual individuals whose homosexuality is latent and does not express itself by overt behavior. It raises still another question as to the homo sexual participates in an overt act but is not apprehended. There are undoubtedly a greater number of the latter type of situations than the situation in which the individual is apprehended in an overt act.
3. What is the effect of homosexuality upon the emotional persons and the likelihood of their being impressed or influenced by association with other similar individuals? What is the degree or extent of approachability by others similarly constituted in which they might prove to be bad security risks? This raises an additional question as to whether it is any greater or different than those who suffer from emotional instability resulting from other causative factors.
4. How can the degree and extent of homosexuality that might result in that persons's being classified as determined? This is related to the question that if the problem is one of security, how much information do we need to know about that individual to decide the extent to which he can be trusted with classified material? In this connection the problem of homosexuality is obviously only a part the problem.

I raise the above questions hoping that they may be, helpful to you in further clarifying any thought regarding this problem. You will note that some of the questions I have raised were touched upon, to some extent, in the testimony submitted by others part resulting from the questions raised at the presentation of this testimony. I hope this will be helpful to you in framing additional questions that you may have in your mind.

I will be most pleased to give what other assistance I can.

Seymour D. Vestermark, M. D.  
Acting Director National Institute of Mental Health

## Policy Document 8

Austen Riggs Foundation

August 12, 1950

Dear Mr. Flanagan: Re: File 10-17

This is in reply to your letter of August 3 in reference to the above file number.

I will try to answer your questions as best I can, numbering them as you have numbered them in your letter.

1. I would say that the homosexual can be diagnosed or detected by a competent psychiatric examination only if he is motivated to reveal himself. A well-poised homosexual, with good conversational techniques a desire not to disclose himself, could keep a psychiatrist from getting adequate information on which to base a diagnosis. If the person suspected of being a homosexual is sent unwillingly to a psychiatrist for "clearance" I would not see why he would have any motivation to reveal something would jeopardize his job and possibly his reputation. On the other hand, with well-given psychological diagnostic tests overt homosexual proclivities would be fairly well revealed provided the subject gave any kind of spontaneous answers at all. If he refused to cooperate in the test or to give any responses then this avenue would be closed. Hence in either case great deal depends on the motivation of the subject. I do not believe that many psychiatrists would welcome the job of being "prosecuting detectives" trying to ferret out homosexuality in government office-holders.

2. As to the possibility of curing overt homosexuals successfully, this again depends on motivation. You cannot cure a homosexual or anyone else against his will and against his lack of motivation to change. Hence it would do no good whatever to send an unwilling homosexual into the other hand, if a homosexual is not at peace with his perversion and has a strong desire to change, he can be treated successfully by psychoanalysis—not all homosexuals but a good percentage of them.

3. The sexual deviate does not necessarily lack emotional stability. He may or may not, just as any other individual with more normal and conventional sexuality may lack it. A great deal depends on whether or not his homosexuality is practiced with discretion and loyalty and reserved for certain equally discreet and loyal homosexual partners, or whether he is one who practices promiscuous homosexuality with pick-ups. In the latter case any homosexual is liable to blackmail, and the homosexual with promiscuous tendencies would be, I think, a poor security risk.

4 . Here again homosexuals as a class do not necessarily solicit or seduce younger men or women with whom they come in contact. Some do and some don't, Just as some heterosexual people solicit younger people of the opposite sex with whom they come in contact in their jobs or socially. It is not necessarily in the nature of homosexuality to practice seductions indiscriminately.

5. If it should be decided that the overt confirmed homosexual is unsuitable for government service and hearings have to be held by some kind of personnel boards, then I certainly think that competent psychiatrists should be sitting in on such a hearing.

Very truly yours,  
Robert P. Knight, M.C.D.  
Medical Director

### **Policy Document 9**

BUTLER HOSPITAL

August 9, 1950 .

Francis D. Flanagan, Chief Counsel Senate Investigations Subcommittee United States Senate  
Washington, D. C

Re: File 40-17

Dear r. Flanagan:

In response to your letter of August 3rd, I have a definite feeling that the only way a Subcommittee can get united and accurate information, is to call a small group of experts together for a thorough discussion and their opinions, on the matter of the important problem of homosexuals. I think doing this by questionnaires may be more confusing than helpful.

I don't know whether you have read the Kinsey report. If you have, you will realize that indeed sex perversions are far more common and widespread than is generally believed. Whether the homosexual in the Federal Government is more vulnerable to blackmail and other attacks, would indeed need a lot of research. In every big group of employees, both male and female, there are always nearly some homosexuals some overt ones, some unconscious ones, and that differentiation is, in itself, a big question.

I will try briefly, in spite of my aversion to questionnaires of intricate problems, to answer your questions.

1. In my opinion, the homosexual can be diagnosed, with a fairly high degree, by a competent psychiatric examination. What would be the nature of such examination? Frankly, this would take a chapter on a book of psychology.
2. I believe there is a possibility of curing homosexuals with adequate and long continued treatment, in at least half the cases. Methods and facilities again would need another chapter in a psychiatric text.
3. I think the sexual deviate lacks emotional stability.
4. There is a danger of a homosexual soliciting or seducing other young men and women, with whom come in contact.
5. I believe that a panel of experienced psychiatrists would be of great value hearing board, to determine whether they would be a governmental liability.

Very truly yours,  
Arthur H. Ruggles, .D.

### **TV Commercial 1**

Inglewood Police Department Video (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EqIleGmhL2Q>)

I'm lieutenant Williams, a police officer attached to the juvenile division. I'm on my way to Monroe junior high school to talk to a group of young people.

Oh!... it looks innocent enough, doesn't it? Lots of young people hitchhike. It seems like a good way to get from one place to another but sometimes there are dangers involved that never meet the eye, so no matter where you meet a stranger, be careful if they are too friendly. One never knows when the homosexual is about.

Let's take the case of Jimmy Barnes. Jimmy played baseball all afternoon and he didn't feel like walking home, so he decided to summer ride. He'd done it a hundred times before. He didn't think anything was unusual. When the driver struck up a friendly conversation, in fact, he seemed like a real nice guy but what Jimmy didn't know was that Ralph was sick—a sickness that was not visible like smallpox but no less dangerous and contagious. A sickness of the mind. You see? Ralf was a homosexual—a person who demands an intimate relationship with members of their own sex. So no matter where you meet a stranger, be careful if they are too friendly, if they try to win your confidence too quickly, and if they become overly personal. One never knows when the homosexual is about, he may appear normal . . .