

FORBIDDEN SEXUAL BEHAVIOR AND MORALITY

Also by R. E. L. Masters

THE HOMOSEXUAL REVOLUTION

Forbidden Sexual and Morality

AN OBJECTIVE RE-EXAMINATION OF PERVERSE



The Julian Press, Inc., Publishers

Behavior

SEX PRACTICES IN DIFFERENT CULTURES

R. E. L. M A S T E R S

Introduction by Harry Benjamin, M.D.

New York

Medical Library

✓
H
1
142

Second Printing , July 1962

© Copyright 1962 by R. E. L. Masters
Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 62-12196
Published by The Julian Press, Inc.
80 East 11th Street, New York 3
Manufactured in the United States of America
by H. Wolff, New York
Designed by Marshall Lee

70 - 1901 - 2

To Dr. Hans Karl Gunther
In fulfillment of an old bargain

CONTENTS

Introduction ix

BESTIALITY 1

The sexual relations of humans with beasts

HOMOSEXUAL ACTS 161

Sodomy, fellatio, tribadism, cunnilingus and masturbation

MISCEGENATION 249

Black Supremacy: Norman Mailer and the myth of Negro sexuality

SEX AND FORBIDDEN DRUGS 295

Mescaline and other "Aphrodisiacs"

ADULT-CHILD SEX RELATIONSHIPS 363

History and the crime of Humbert Humbert

Selected Bibliography 413

Index 423

INTRODUCTION

Sexology as a branch of science, that is to say, of medicine and psychology, is coming of age. The Kinsey Reports undoubtedly deserve some credit for this fortunate development. Mr. Masters' "Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality" and its publication by the Julian Press is evidence of attained maturity.

Sexology shows signs of maturing also in the field of sociology as the work of the marriage counsellors clearly indicates. Only in our legal statutes and with our law enforcement agencies is sexology still an infant, still living

Introduction

in the Middle Ages, with superstition, prejudice and ignorance replacing logic and scientific fact.

Thoughts like this readily come to one's mind in reading Mr. Masters' new and striking discussion of some of the forbidden things in sex. Much credit and thanks are due him for his fearless, diligent and painstaking examination of subjects heretofore treated only superficially and with much reluctance and caution, even by sexological writers.

Nowhere in the scientific or semi-scientific (which is also sometimes semi-pornographic) literature is anything found that can—in completeness and objectivity—be compared to the first part of Masters book dealing with "Bestiality." It may well be the "Bible" of all future studies of this subject.

There exists by now a vast literature on homosexuality. The respective chapter in the present volume nevertheless constitutes a valuable if not indispensable supplement for all students of the subject.

The section on "Miscegenation" may provoke more emotional reactions in American readers than the other four sections, excepting perhaps the last one dealing with adult-child sex relations. Far-seeing biologists have taken the stand that the final solution of all racial problems is integration and amalgamation. The student who wants to learn facts free from emotional preconceptions will do well to keep such an opinion in mind when reading Mr. Masters' scholarly discussion.

Many hitherto unknown facts have been assembled by

Mr. Masters in his chapter on "Sex and Drugs." Doctors and doctors-in-spe will study its contents to their advantage.

A British sexologist once wrote with justifiable sarcasm "scratch a general practitioner of medicine and you will find a puritan underneath." Such, of course, applies likewise to the specialist who decries the use of testosterone as unethical because—horrible dictu—it may in some few cases increase sex desire and potency.

The sober and factual study of the "Lolita" and related "complexes" contains much shocking material, but "shock" can be a valuable therapeutic agent for a number of mental disorders, for instance, apathy. Again, students of this "sex deviation" will have to acknowledge their debt to Mr. Masters.

Forbidden sex as it exists in Anglo-Saxon countries and in a Judeo-Christian culture is a wide and fruitful field for studies, for which the following pages give striking evidence. It is gratifying to know that Mr. Masters is preparing supplementary publications, not only on further aspects of homosexuality, but also on such problems as incest, sado-masochism, vampirism and, finally, prostitution.

To the extremists among our puritans, anything in sex that gives pleasure is forbidden. Even in the marriage bed, the pleasurable part of sex relations can be frowned upon. Procreation must be the aim, not recreation.

An educational sexological magazine published in the United States is not allowed to print the word "enjoy-

Introduction

ment" in referring to sex relations. The censor objects. "Satisfaction" is about as far as a writer may go in describing a sex act.

Among more specific forbidden sex behavior, this writer has had occasion to study numerous cases of transvestism and transsexualism, problems with which Mr. Masters will likewise deal in the future.

Transvestism, in sexological practice, chiefly refers to men who have the often irrepressible desire to wear female dress. Its more severe stage is represented by the (rare) transsexual who not only wants to appear as a woman, but wants to *be* a woman, as much so as medicine or surgery can make him one (Example: Christine Jorgensen). Although there is no law that expressly forbids a man to wear female attire, the sexual implications in the act make it "forbidden sex." On many occasions, these people have been arrested and imprisoned under such obtuse and legally indefensible charges as "masquerading," "disorderly conduct," or "impersonation." The repressive acts of police and the judiciary are unreasonable because transvestites as such are as harmless as masturbators, needing no sex partner for their particular pursuit of happiness, and therefore endangering no one.

The transsexual who desires a conversion operation in order to get rid of those organs that stamp him legally and anatomically as male, likewise enters the realm of "forbidden sex." His plight is often pathetic. Psychiatry, as proven over and over, has nothing to offer in such cases. Since, therefore, the mind cannot be adjusted to the body, an—at least partial—adjustment of the body to the

mind would seem logical. But few are the surgeons who dare follow such logic in the face of possible legal objections based on a law against mayhem. This law originated in the days of Henry VIII in order to prevent self-mutilation and injury to any part of the body needed to fight in battle. It stretches the imagination rather far to apply such function to the male genitalia.

The most frequent “forbidden sex,” fortunately to be dealt with in greater detail by Mr. Masters in a future book, is the sex that can be purchased, mostly for “normal”—often also for “perverted”—sex acts, and then doubly forbidden. I am referring to prostitution, the much-maligned and misnamed oldest profession. This “social evil” can and has been treated objectively, unemotionally and scientifically by sexologists, similar to the way Mr. Masters has treated his present five subjects. They came to the conclusion that purchasable “sex service” can have advantages for society and should not be condemned as “vice.” The opinions of thoughtful men and women have undoubtedly been influenced by these writings, but it will take many more of such efforts until their message may finally reach the minds of law makers and overcome their inherent inertia, so that a saner and fairer legal code dealing with human sexuality may emerge.

Harry Benjamin, M.D.

*New York City
February 1962*

BESTIALITY

The sexual relations of humans with beasts

"The anthropoid is more luckless and unintelligent than animals, and the remedy for his ills is not progress, going forward, which is always to his grave, but turning backwards. He has extirpated most of the beasts which he no longer has as tutors. As a result he does not know whether to cohabit with woman, with man, or with sheep, and there are some who are enormously aroused by the sight of a mare. There is a breed of dog that will copulate with a wolf, and it is believed that a species of dog is derived from the tiger, and there is the Babylonian cameleopard; but, for the most part, the stallion seeks the female of its kind, and the elephant hankers after the same sort of animal that bore him."

EDWARD DAHLBERG
in *The Sorrows of Priapus*

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Artists, looking upon the phenomenon of bestiality—human-animal sex relationships—from the vantage point of esthetics, have perceived it as beautiful or ugly, tender or terrible, grotesque or merely ludicrous.

Theologians, bowing to Biblical prohibitions and basing their judgments on the conception of man as a spiritual being and of the animal as a merely carnal one, have regarded the same phenomenon as both a violation of Biblical edicts and a degradation of man, with the result that the act of bestiality has been castigated and anathematized as sinful, unnatural, and depraved.

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

Present-day scientists, basing their opinions upon extensive and impeccable data, have concluded that man's desire to mate with members of species other than his own is quite natural, and parallels tendencies to be found among other representatives of the animal world. Therefore, science has decreed, bestiality may be condemned only in terms of arbitrary ethical and metaphysical doctrines and not as a violation of the natural order of things.

There are, of course, a host of other perspectives and blendings of perspectives. My own is closer to the esthetic than the theological or even the biological-scientific viewpoint. From this basically esthetic perspective, but utilizing certain insights and tools of various systems and schools of philosophical and psychological thought, I have undertaken to survey and analyze the meaning and content of the sexual relations of humans with beasts.

The esthetic vantage point from which I have proceeded has partially and sometimes largely determined not only the *matter* but also the *manner* of the writing. Thus, there is both levity and gravity which extend not just to the subject matter and the conclusions drawn from it, but also to the tone, the style, and the vocabulary of the presentation. While this has seemed to me to be the method most consistent with the pursuit of that chimeric *objectivity*, I am aware that it may also lead to a certain amount of confusion—an eventuality I hope to forestall by voicing these prefatory words of caution and explanation.

Undoubtedly some of the historical material included here is dubious and quite possibly apocryphal, and some

of the constructions I have placed on the material are debatable. It must be remembered that in dealing with remote historical data the separation of fact from phantasy is frequently impossible. Phantasy is often scarcely less important and illuminating than the fact. And any constructions placed upon any data of this kind, particularly when the subject is such a controversial and emotive one, will always be debatable.

Lastly, so far as these preliminary remarks are concerned, I would like to say that I have taken the late Dr. Kinsey at his word as regards the relatively great incidence of "animal contacts" in rural areas—and conceive of my labor as primarily a contribution to the well-being of the world's peasants. But I hope and trust, of course, that the work will also prove utilitarian, edifying, and of interest elsewhere.

PREHISTORY OF BESTIALITY

Since prehistoric man was pre-historic, it is doubtless unnecessary to say that we *know* nothing of his sexual behavior—save that he managed to copulate and thus reproduce his kind in sufficient numbers to prevent the extinction of genus *Homo*. The temptation to speculate about the sexual and other behavior of prehistoric man is great—as so many writers have demonstrated, by succumbing; but it seems best to resolutely resist the seduc-

tion save for a few brief and rather conventional remarks.

Early man was in all likelihood the possessor of a sexual instinct urging him on to coition and the resultant perpetuation of his kind. Differing little if at all from other animals in this respect, he could be assumed to have been guided instinctually to perform his sexual acts largely if not exclusively with members of the opposite sex of his own species. When his biological sex urges were compellingly present but the usual means of gratifying them were not at hand, he probably looked about—again like at least some other animals—for a substitute. It is in such a situation that bestiality, and conceivably homosexuality and masturbation as well, might first be expected to occur.¹

It is safe enough to speculate that only want of opportunity or lack of inclination (deriving sometimes, no doubt, from not having thought of it) would have deterred early man from promiscuous sexual intercourse with other animals. Religious, magical, moral, and esthetic objections would scarcely have entered the picture—so that danger, inconvenience and anatomical discrepancies would have been, once bestiality figured as a choice, the most likely obstacles.

Having no image of himself as a spiritual being, and probably not even recognizing any mental distinctions between himself and other animals, it is likely that prehistoric man differentiated between the earth's creatures only in terms of size, configuration, degree of threat to his physical safety, and—in some cases, as his intellectual capacity developed—adaptability to his personal cravings

and requirements. There could have been none of that sense of pride in his humanity—with accompanying contempt for beings of a lower order—which later, along with certain scriptural doctrines and theological speculations, led man to view bestiality as a descent, a degradation, and a sin.

Having discovered the possibility that other creatures could be used for sexual intercourse, early man was likely to have made many such attempts—though it is doubtful that he was so sexually omnivorous as the Christian and Jewish Adam, who, rabbinical interpreters of the Old Testament tell us, had intercourse with every creature before God finally hit upon the idea of woman and created Eve. Eventually, experience would have taught man that certain beasts were suitable for sex, just as certain beasts were suitable for food, while others were no good for this purpose, or too much trouble, or too dangerous to come by. Bestiality, as other facets of man's behavior, would have tended then, eventually, towards limitations and stereotype. The extension of these self-imposed practical limitations would have come only when, centuries and millenia later, the social units of mankind would have learned the lesson that in the suppression of sexual behavior (though not of sexual desires) lies one of the secrets of the acquisition and preservation of individual and institutional authority and power.

PRIMITIVES

Bestiality is not—though the generalization must allow for a good many exceptions—a sophisticated variety of sexual behavior. It is not unreasonable to suppose that prehistoric man, despite his limited intelligence and imagination, discovered this practice rather early in his career and, with the passage of time, even refined and developed its possibilities.

After man had reached the level achieved by some of the primitive peoples with whom we are familiar today, bestiality may well have been one of the regular, if scarcely preferred, features of sexual life. A factor contributing to this would have been the domestication of animals—dogs, horses, cattle, and other creatures with which sexual intercourse presents few problems, and which are, above all, readily available to the man or woman who wishes thus to use them.

“Doing what comes naturally,” primitive man did not have to worry about policemen arresting him and officialdom prosecuting and sentencing him for “monstrous crimes against nature.” On the other hand, even some primitive societies are not altogether lacking in disapproval of such sexual practices as bestiality—partially perhaps as a result of concern over the possible threat to population increase, a consideration which also played a

major role in determining many of the old Jewish anti-sexual prohibitions which anachronistically still reach out across the centuries to govern us today.

Malinowski, who noted that the Trobrianders have no laws against bestiality (or homosexuality, masturbation, exhibitionism, etc.), tells us that offenders are nonetheless subjected to punishment in the form of derision and contempt: "No one likes to penetrate excrement," says the Trobriand Islander (ignorant of the predilections of certain celebrated sodomists), and "No one likes a dog better than a woman." Meaning, of course, that one *ought not* to enjoy such things.

Other primitive peoples of modern times have also been observed to disapprove, though only mildly, of such deviant forms of sexual behavior as bestiality and homosexuality—and somewhat like the Trobrianders they express their lack of approval by poking fun at the miscreant rather than by officially condemning and punishing him. It is somewhat saddening to remark that the primitives display a more tolerant and possibly even more enlightened approach to sexual behavior than do the inhabitants of the so-called civilized countries—though it would be even more civilized, sophisticated, and admirably charitable if the deviant behavior were officially and generally ignored and, in the civilized nations, help made unobtrusively available to those who might choose to accept it. This is, of course, not likely to occur soon; contemporary societies continue to manifest—by their desire to punish—the neurotic impulses, repressed cravings, irrational beliefs and attitudes, and

similar phenomena of the psyche which continue to dominate them.

ANTIQUITY

With continuing though hopefully not castrate conciseness we will look here only briefly at the ancient world, arbitrarily limiting the discussion to the Egyptian, Greek, and Roman civilizations—which will be mentioned elsewhere in the text as well. Bestiality, it will have to be sufficient to say, existed as a rather widespread practice in all of the nations of antiquity of which we have adequate records. Where it is not specifically mentioned, it may be legitimately inferred on the basis of the over-all evidence. (I bring up this point because I should not wish to be accused of exposing to likely censure and malediction only the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans—as if I were an Arab, insisting that all that is erotically irregular in this world came out of Turkey.)

In ancient Egypt, the animal aspects of the gods insured that bestiality would be practiced both for religious and magical purposes. The representation of the Egyptian gods as beings of part-human forms was linked—a further impetus to bestiality—to the belief that living animals partook of the divinity of the gods and goddesses whose forms they shared.²

Humanity is indebted to Herodotus for the informa-

tion that religious bestiality was practiced in Egypt—the most famous example being, of course, the copulations of women with goats. Later, Voltaire spoke of sexual relations between Egyptian women and sacred goats, and cited Plutarch and Pindar as his sources. Another and still later commentator upon this matter was the scholar and anthropologist Lang, who advised us that the Egyptian women submitted to he-goats while the “men committed the sin of impurity with she-goats.” The most famous or infamous example of this was, as is well known, the Goat of Mendes, who was thought to be the incarnation of the procreative deity. In the temple at Mendes, countless persons engaged in worshipful bestiality with goats especially trained for the purpose.³

Besides the goat, the Egyptians were known to carnally consort with the Hamadryas baboon, a semi-divine and picturesque creature whose talents also included assuming postures of prayer in the temples, waiting on tables, and removing weeds from garden plots. (Elsewhere in the Middle East, and the East as well, the baboon was favored. At El Yemen, trained baboons were popular sex partners with men and women alike. Similarly, in the Nile and Indus Valleys, monkeys were instructed in the art of manipulating the genitals of both sexes. In India, Hindu holy men were much addicted to bestiality with sacred monkeys, and sometimes with sacred cows as well. It is recorded that dog-faced baboons once fornicated with women throughout Egypt and the length and breadth of the Arab world.)

It should not be supposed that sacred goats and semi-

divine baboons exhausted Egyptian ingenuity. To mention only one further example, it has often been related that the Egyptians mastered the art of sexual congress with the crocodile—this act being accomplished, say authorities, by turning the creature onto its back, which renders it incapable of resisting penetration. These reptilian cohabitations, it was held by the superstitious, would bring prosperity and restore the potency of men whose powers, whether owing to age or debauchery, were flagging.

Turning to the Greeks, we recall with Xenophon how, during the retreat of the Ten Thousand, there were abominable unions with goats. A further indication that the Greek—who perhaps acquired his predilection from the Egyptian—was sexually concerned with the goat, is the satyr, a mythical being, half-goat, half-man, who was noted for his virility and lasciviousness, and who exercised it freely with humans, nymphs, and other creatures. This leads us to the realm of Greek mythology which is considered by scholars to provide the best evidence for the thesis that the incidence of bestiality among the ancient Greeks was high, and that the attitude toward this form of sexual expression somewhat less than severely condemnatory.

For example, Norman Haire (*Hymen*) has noticed that “since the Greek myths contain many stories of gods who assumed the shape of animals in order to mate with mortals, we may judge that even bestiality was not regarded as revolting.” We may probably, without wanton imaginative excess, go a bit farther than Dr. Haire and

assert that bestiality appealed greatly to the Greek imagination—and not too infrequently to the Greek gonads as well.

Of the Greek gods who in animal form mated with mortals, everyone recalls Zeus, who appeared to Europa as a bull,⁴ to Leda as a swan, and to Persephone as a serpent. Or Apollo, who in serpent form made love to Atys. We recall, too, a goodly number of other instances of bestial intercourse related by the historians and mythologists: Among them, the matings of Aristo Ephesius with a she-ass, Semiramis, legendary foundress of Babylon, with a stallion, and Fulvius with a mare. From the union of Pasiphae and the bull was born the Minotaur, and the mythologists credited other bestial unions with bringing into the world Satyrs, Centaurs, and other strange and monstrous creatures.⁵

Robert Burton (*Anatomy of Melancholy*) adds to the list Sphynxes, saying that “not only men go with goats, swine and horses, but women are inflamed with mad passion for beasts, whence Minotaurs, Centaurs, Silvanuses, Sphynxes, etc. . . .” (Of both mythological bestiality and the resulting monstrous issues I will have considerably more to say in another place.)

Of the three great antique civilizations here dealt with, the Roman was the most lavish and factual in its recording of both public and private bestiality. Sometimes animal intercourse was the practice of shepherds, shepherdesses, and other rustic bumpkins; sometimes a whole population was given to it—as in the case of the Sybarites, noted for their sodomies and copulations with canines

(as were the Moors, rightly or wrongly, in later times); on other occasions bestiality was a spectator sport, as in the case of the exhibitions staged at the Roman Games; sometimes it was the voluptuous indulgence of noble Roman ladies; and sometimes even emperors were involved. (Nero, disguised as a wild beast, once invaded the arena at the Games to assault members of both sexes, a performance he concluded by casting off his costume and publicly falling into the embraces of Doryphorous, his male lover.)

Several writers—Martial among them—have related that Roman women inserted snakes into their sexual parts, not only as a means of arriving at orgasm, but also as a way of keeping cool and averting noisome genital stench in the summertime. According to Lucian, the snakes were also taught to suckle the nipples of the women's breasts. Births consequent upon the flagitious fornications of human females with ophidian paramours were of course widely reported.

For the Roman Games, male animals of all sorts were trained from the earliest possible age to copulate with and even forcibly ravish girls and women. Bulls, giraffes, leopards, cheetahs, wild boars, zebras, stallions, jack-asses, huge dogs, various kinds of apes, and other animals were taught—not without considerable effort on the part of their trainers—to perform these functions. Some of the more adaptable and enthusiastic ones were further tutored to commit sodomy on human males and females.

Especially popular at the Games were representations of scenes from the sexual lives of the gods, a particular

favorite being Pasiphae and the Bull. Needless to say, the bulls, stallions, and giraffes, and some of the other larger animals, inflicted terrible suffering, sometimes even death, on their victims, who were often virgins and not infrequently small children.

One appreciatively received spectacle is said to have been staged at which a hundred tiny blonde girls were raped simultaneously by a horde of baboons. Chimpanzees and ferocious but colorful mandrills, made drunk by wine and inflamed by the odor of females of their kind, were loosed upon girls whose genitals had been drenched with the urine of female chimps and mandrills.

On occasion, as a stirring climax to all of this, the beasts were permitted to kill and, if they wished, devour their human victims after assaulting them sexually. Such acts invariably brought down the house at the Games, and were even more popular than the often staged but never-wearied-of human sex orgies.

We need not descend from these heights of pageantry and lascivious frenzy to consider the mundane frolics of rustics with such commonplace creatures as goats, sheep, and ponies.

From the ancient world up through our own time, in all countries—though more frequently in some than in others—bestiality was practiced, thought about, dreamed of, and emerged as myth, fairy tale, folklore, literature, painting, and sculpture. At the same time, it claimed its human and animal victims.

Among the Jews, the zooerast (bestialist) was stoned to death. In the Middle Ages, he was burned, perhaps as a

reminder to other citizens that burning was the fate of the Cities of the Plain.

In 1468, Jean Beisse, accused of bestiality with a cow on one occasion, with a goat on another, was first hanged, then burned. The animal parties to the crimes were burned also.

In 1539, Guillaume Garnier, charged with sodomizing a she-dog, was ordered strangled after he confessed (under torture) to that abomination. The dog was burned, along with the trial records which were too horrible and potentially dangerous to be permitted to exist.

In 1601, Claudine de Culam, a young girl of sixteen, was convicted of copulating with a dog. Both the girl and the dog were first hanged, then strangled, and finally burned.

In 1735, Francois Borniche was charged with sexual intercourse with animals. It was greatly feared that "his infamous debauches may corrupt the young men." He was imprisoned. There is no record of his release.

And so on, up to the present. The sentences grow lighter; that is, there are fewer executions and lifelong imprisonments. Nonetheless, the individuals are destroyed. Where the law is lenient, society still takes its revenge: public scorn and hatred, ostracism, withholding of work. Always, once the matter has been brought to the attention of the community, the reprisals are vicious, unrelenting, remorseless, and total.

The cases cited above are of course only illustrative of the extremity of the penalties assessed. Many, many others were also "brought to justice." Despite this, bestiality is

far from eliminated, and perhaps not even deterred. At times, as during the witchcraft epidemic, and again in the eighteenth century, the act was especially commonplace. During these more sophisticated interludes, pleasure was less the end pursued by the bestialist than it had been formerly. Rather, bestiality became an act of revolt or defiance against God, or the state, or other authority. It was practiced *as a vice*, both to show one's contempt for official morality and to experience the sense of sinfulness which intensifies all pleasures.

When such ends as these are pursued, bestiality becomes the practice of the nobility, the intellectuals, and the artists, whose phantasies, particularly, are engaged. When, at other periods, it is pursued merely as a means of appeasing the sexual appetite—usually in the absence of an obtainable human sex partner—it is, as Havelock Ellis observed, a practice of clodhoppers.

MODERN TIMES

In modern times, the practice of bestiality has been reported with a greater thoroughness than was the case in the ancient world, and this despite the fact that in the West at least the practitioners have grown considerably more furtive. Certainly, the past two hundred years have seen nothing to compare with the spectacular bestiality of the Roman Games, a phenomenon unique in all of his-

tory. The "exhibition" persists, even down to the present day, but it is conducted stealthily, in defiance of law and society (though sometimes with the well-remunerated connivance of the police), and most frequently for secret circles of debauchees, wealthy tourists, and the like.

The covertness of Western bestiality is not quite rivalled by the less inhibited or more impassioned zoerasts of Africa and the Middle and Far East. This is especially the case with the primitive and less-than-civilized peoples whose relatively overt indulgence in bestiality has been widely and reliably remarked.

Among the Manghabei of Madagascar, for example, bestiality with calves, kids, and cows has been observed to be practiced by children and adults alike. Among the Malaysians, the Battaks of Sumatra were renowned for their addiction to bestiality and other extracoital carousals. And in Kamchatka, it was said of the women that they were much given to engaging in erotic practices with dogs.

The Negroes of Zanzibar—remarkable for apparently developing all of the so-called vices of advanced civilizations on their own—practiced and perhaps still do, amongst the multiplicity of their perversions, sodomitic intercourse with nanny-goats.

Felix Bryk, taking note of an interesting custom, reported that the "Suaheli and Arabians of the coast" were wont to necrophilously sodomize slain sea-cows, or *dugong*, an habitation which caused the missionaries much spiritual distress.

"This bestial lechery," Bryk writes,⁶ "is motivated,

according to the reports of many, by a superstition . . . it was absolutely necessary for the hunter of the dugong to cohabit with the animal he had slain, or at his next catch he would be dragged into the depths of the sea by another animal. But cohabitation with his prey would, on the other hand, insure him against such an accident on the open sea. This sodomy, consequently, is part of magic, as a preventive act of safeguarding.

“Whether caused by superstition or not, according to many reports the dugong, when dragged up on land, is to be mounted by none but fishermen. This is such a general occurrence that the people who buy the meat of the sea-cow make the Islamic fisherman swear by the Koran that he has had no sexual intercourse with the sea-cow he is offering for sale. They will not buy the meat from him unless he swears. They do not want the flesh of a creature that has served man as a beast of pleasure. That is cannibalism.”

That the fisherman should be obliged to take this particular oath on the Koran is, in a way, ironic. Unlike most of the holy books of mankind, those omniscient Baedekers to life in this world and entry into the next, the Koran makes no mention of sexual relations with animals. Since bestiality was not specifically prohibited by the Prophet, the Arabs have never taken quite so condemnatory an attitude towards the practice, and indeed a popular Arab saying had it that “The pilgrimage to Mecca is not complete without copulating with the camel.” (It should be added that the camel is a notoriously unfriendly beast, little given to affectionate dalliance of any sort with hu-

mans, and perhaps the saying hints at a greater incidence of such activity than has ever really been the case.)

So far as the Turks are concerned, it is said—by the Arabs, of course—that they are not merely ravening rapists and maniacal pederasts, addicted to every erotic enormity possible with one's fellow human, but that there is also no bird or beast, dead or living, with which they have not at least attempted bestiality. (It is well known that they are iniquitously enamoured of their mares which, moreover, they sodomize, rather than using in the less reprehensible vaginal way.) It may here be noted that the same has been said of German, especially Prussian, cavalrymen, and that Hungarian Hussars have also been victims of this possible canard.

The Egyptian shepherd boy, like his counterpart in the ancient world, is said to have been on occasion more than permissibly familiar with his ewes—a charge shepherds of other lands have also had to bear up under. The Egyptian, however, was said to especially favor fellatio, performed upon him by suckling lambs and goats, and if the animals required special inducement he would rub honey or candy on his penis in order to provide it.

G. Robinson Lees asserts that as recently as the early part of this century the nomads' practice of copulating with their cattle constituted an ordinary feature of pastoral life among the Palestinian Arabs. Raphael Patai (*Sex and Family Life in the Bible*) says that bestiality is found only rarely among the Rwala Bedouins, occasionally in Central Arabia, and frequently among the semi-Bedouins of Northern Palestine and in Mecca. In Mo-

rocco, he adds illuminatingly, the young boys practice bestiality with she-asses in order to make the penis grow. Grown-up men are ridiculed for the practice, but they are not punished so long as they confine their amours to their own livestock.

We should not take leave of this part of the world without pausing to consider certain behavior brought to our attention by Allen Edwardes (*The Jewel in the Lotus*): “Neglected or pathologic women, especially in Abyssinia and the Sudan, smuggled dog-faced apes (*girds*) into the harem. These were lusty brutes, known to kill men and rape women in many parts of the country; and an old Egyptian saying declared: ‘Nothing poketh and stroketh, nor lusteth after a female, more strenuously than the baboon.’ Trained, the cynocephalus, drilling vigorously, endured much longer than the hardiest eunuch. The only shortcoming was that the penis of the baboon proved more stiff and sturdy than long and thick, and concubines demanded ample girth for proper response. Yet those who could achieve venereal paroxysm by friction of the vaginal orifice and external genitalia were greatly enamoured of monkeys. Thus the Arab, student of medicine, definitely held that nymphomania was due to black and yellow worms in the vagina: black being bred by the strokings of a Negro, and yellow by the strokings of a domiciled baboon. Many such women having animal contacts were considered saints and *hooree-yehs* (nymphs of heaven).”

Turning westward, we may well be surprised, even astonished, after all this, to find the learned sexological pioneer Krafft-Ebing declaring that bestiality is, for the

human female, limited to intercourse with dogs. In *Psychopathia Sexualis*, that still instructive catalogue of man's sexual vagaries, Krafft-Ebing cites one such case (of intercourse with canines) of which he had knowledge—that of a Parisian woman who “showed herself in the sexual act with a trained bulldog, to a secret circle of roués, at ten francs a head.”

Herzog's *Medical Jurisprudence*, which goes into some detail concerning the various bestial practices of both men and women, is better, though still inadequately, informed where the female is concerned: “Bestiality in men is encountered in many forms. Horses, cows, donkeys, pigs, goats, sheep, dogs, and barnyard fowls are the animals most frequently used. In male animals the rectum is generally used, although in one reported case a man used the nostrils of a horse. In female animals the penetration may be into either the rectum or the vagina. In birds the penis is introduced into the cloaca of the bird and coitus thus accomplished. In many of these cases the animals used either sicken or die and an examination as to the cause may find severe injury done to the parts and throw suspicion on someone who may (then) be caught in the act.

“In most cases where four-footed animals are used in bestiality the man plays the active part in *pedicatio*, but there are instances where the animal is the active agent, the human male taking the part of the pathic; thus there is the case recorded where a farmer's rectum was seriously injured because he used a bull as the active agent.

“In other cases large dogs are used either for the active

or passive agent in pederasty. Where the dog is used as the active agent, if the act is interrupted before the dog has ejaculated, owing to the swelling of the glans of the penis, which occurs during coitus and which disappears only after ejaculation, the sudden withdrawal of the penis while the glans is swollen will often cause a laceration of the anus.

“. . . Bestiality in women is a great deal more prevalent than it is in men.” (The findings of the late Dr. Kinsey are in contradiction to this view, though they are of course confined to the U.S., while Herzog’s is perhaps a more global perspective.) “Not only lap-dogs and large dogs, both male and female, can be used for cunnilingus, but large male dogs are frequently used for actual coitus. Where large dogs are used for actual coitus in novices to this practice, there are generally marks from the claws of the dog, which can be found on the abdomen and on the inside of both thighs, in parallel arrangement.

“Not only dogs have been used by women in the practice of bestiality, but a case is related where a number of congenial souls amused themselves with fishes, by inserting the tail ends of the live fish into the vulva and then by pressing the head of the fish, would start it to squirming, thus tickling the vulva. Stekel relates a case where a young lady managed to use flies for her purpose. She would lie down on a sofa and separating her thighs would smear honey on and in the vulva. The flies thus attracted by the honey would tickle her until her sexual appetite was appeased.”

(The smearing of honey on the male genitalia in order

to experience titillation by flies is also known to have occurred. The *bites* of insects, particularly bees, have been solicited by males both masochistically to enjoy the painful sensations, and in order to cause the penis to swell and thus enlarge the organ, after which sexual intercourse was engaged in before the swelling had a chance to recede. Female “intercourse” with insects, it may be added, is said to have been the exotic *pièce de resistance* of erotic exhibitions. One such clandestine exhibition—doubtless the story is a fabrication—is said to have occurred at the World’s Fair in Chicago, where the theme was “A Century of Progress.” Even if there was such an exhibition—and whether actual or imaginary, it temporarily enriched the American vernacular of the ’Thirties with the term “fly-fucking”—there is no reason to suppose that it necessarily enjoyed the *imprimatur* of Fair authorities.)

Since the Herzog discussion calls attention to the matter, it might be well at this point to consider briefly the dangers associated with bestiality, and these are not all legal ones. Although the odds weigh heavily against such an occurrence, there are quite a few cases on record of individuals injured as a result of having sexual relations with animals, especially dogs.

Zooerastic (anal) intercourse with the larger animals in which the human plays the passive role is of course likely to result in injury to the man or woman involved, and this is particularly true when the individual is not an habitual passive sodomist and the anus has not made the accommodation to pedication noted by Tarnowsky (*Pederasty in Europe*), and others. For this reason, passive anal

intercourse with animals is rare, apart from the intentional torture of human beings by such means, examples of which are discussed elsewhere (and which is also now, happily, rare). But there is on record (it must be a different case from that cited by Herzog, or else a later version) the death of a farmer resulting from his attempt to have himself buggered by a bull. A few similar instances, involving bulls, stallions, and other large animals, have also been reported.

The dog, probably the animal most frequently used in this country for sexual purposes, may inflict serious injuries when he is the active agent in either sodomy or coitus, especially when the act is prematurely (before discharge and detumescence) interrupted. This results from the peculiar and apparently inutile structure of the dog's penis, which has a massive ball or knot near its midpoint. Once the dog's phallus has been inserted into either vagina or anus, and the ball has become engorged, painless withdrawal is almost impossible until after the dog ejaculates, when shrinkage and flaccidity of both ball and penis occur. On occasion, in copulation with another dog, the sphincter of the bitch will clench around the base of the dog's penis, preventing the withdrawal of blood from the organ, and thus maintaining tumescence—and it is then that dogs become locked painfully together, as many persons have seen to occur. Eugene Burns (*The Sex Life of Wild Animals*) observes that the function of the knot on the dog's penis—a structural oddity he shares with the fox, the coyote, and the wolf—is mysterious, since all of these animals are able to ejaculate without the knot's be-

coming tumescent. Indeed, its only function seems to be the infelicitous one of causing the male and female beasts to become the more inextricably joined together, a state which is invariably productive of suffering and has even been known to cause the deaths of the animals.

As mentioned, most human injuries resulting from intercourse with canines occur when the participants are surprised or startled and a forced withdrawal of the dog's erect organ is attempted. In one case, a woman was surprised in Washington copulating with a large English mastiff, and when the terrified couple endeavored to hastily sever the connection the dog's phallus was so forcefully removed as to bring about a fatal hemorrhage in the woman.

In another case, at Omaha, Nebraska, a sixteen-year-old boy had himself sodomized by a dog and when separation was attempted the dog "tore through the sphincter and an inch into the gluteus muscles."

Havelock Ellis (*Studies in the Psychology of Sex*) mentions the above cases, and another involving a girl: "In a Missouri case, which I verified, a smart, pretty, well-educated country girl was found with a profuse offensive vaginal discharge which had been present for about a week, coming on suddenly. After washing the external genitals and opening the labia three rents were discovered, one through the fourchette and two through the left nymphae. The vagina was excessively congested and covered with points bleeding on the slightest irritation. The patient confessed that one day while playing with the genitals of a large dog she became excited and thought

she would have slight coitus. After the dog had made an entrance she was unable to free herself from him, as he clasped her so firmly with his forelegs. The penis became so swollen that the dog could not free himself, although for more than an hour she made persistent efforts to do so." (sic)

Departing from the painful subject just dealt with, we note that Kinsey's inevitable finding (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* and *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*) that bestiality is more common in the country than in the city was anticipated in the nineteenth century by Pastor Wagner who, of course, found the same to be true for the German Empire of his day. Wagner published the results of his survey of rustic behavior in a massive work which, as the sexologist Moll observed, destroyed once and for all the myth of rural innocence.

Dr. Kinsey, in scrutinizing the sexual outlets of his American contemporaries, came to the conclusion that ". . . no other type of sexual activity . . . accounts for a smaller proportion of the total outlet of the total population" than bestiality. (This, it should be understood, excludes some of the more esoteric practices.)

"In the total population," Kinsey found, "only one male in twelve or fourteen (estimated at about 8 per cent) ever has sexual experience with animals." Among farm boys he found, however, that between 40 to 50 per cent had some kind of sexual contact with animals at some period of their lives, while in some specific Western localities the incidence reached 65 per cent or even higher. He believed the incidence for the total popula-

tion would be considerably greater if city youths had freer access to animal contacts—a view backed up by his finding that city boys visiting farms, where the animals are available for the act, tended to have such contacts far more frequently than while in the city. Kinsey found the total incidence of animal contacts among females to be far lower than among males—only about 3.6 per cent of the female population having experienced such contacts. He noted that one per cent of the females phantasied sexual relations with animals while masturbating, and that another one per cent had dreamed of intercourse with animals.

Kinsey also provided confirming data for the view that the sexual contact between male humans and male animals, either anal or oral, with the human either the active or the passive agent, *may* be a homosexual relationship as far as the participating individual is concerned. Homosexuals also, it has been reported, are sometimes able to obtain gratification simply by masturbating the male animal (usually a dog).

On the basis of the conclusion that bestial relationships may be also homosexual ones, we are probably entitled to suppose that acts of cunnilingus between human females and female animals *may* be homosexual. Where cunnilingus is concerned, the active agent is almost always the animal. Cases of human females performing cunnilingus on female animals do not seem to have come often to the public notice, but doubtless occur. (It is somewhat better known that the fellatio of animals takes place, and that both human males and human females engage in the

practice, though again the data are few and the event no doubt a comparative rarity.)

A point Kinsey does not mention, unless I have missed it, and which seems to have been neglected by other writers as well, is that while male bestiality is primarily the province of the country-dweller, female bestiality is more likely to be the province of the city-dweller, if only for the reason that the female can satisfy her desires with creatures adapted to city life—principally, the dog—while males are better matched anatomically with such creatures as goats, sheep, ponies, mares, and heifers. Probably, too, the city woman, being more sophisticated erotically, will be more inclined to experiment than the rural woman, who tends at once to lack privacy and to be more greatly affected by taboos.

Before turning to some of the legal vagaries historically associated with bestiality, there is one other matter to be touched upon: The American legend of the Western sheep-herder and his knee-boots, a piece of folklore no history of bestiality, however concise, should ever omit to consider. "A.F.N.," the able editor-translator of Dubois-Desaulle's *Bestiality*, the only full-length work on this subject available in English, notes the legend and comments on it with appropriate good humor: "There is no necessity of limiting this practice (bestial intercourse with the flocks) to Egypt; our own West has been and still is justly famous for its caprine amours. In fact, in some sections the very term *sheep-herder* carries a contemptible connotation. Might I pause, however, without throwing myself open to the charge of facetiousness, to reflect on

the infinitely greater advantages enjoyed by our contemporary Western satyrs? For the unharnessed Egyptian goat-herd, the restraining of a recalcitrant she-goat must at times have presented problems well-nigh insurmountable. But the well-known device of our sheep-herders, whose knee-boots readily permit the introduction of the hind legs of their wooly inamorata, at once impresses us with the advantages the progress of civilization has brought about in all fields."

Like A.F.N. (A. F. Niemoller?), I am inclined to think that the knee-boot represents, for the shepherd zoerast or zoophile, a certain advance and advantage over the barefoot approach of his precursors. Still, there are reasons to think that A.F.N. may be unduly enthusiastic and optimistic. For example, one would suppose that the hoof introduced into the boot, and which would have to remain at shin-level or thereabouts in order to bring human and animal genitalia into essential contiguity, would be less than comfortable. What the barefoot or at least bootless shepherd did about this disparity of elevation of the respective private parts has always troubled me. Whether he placed the rear feet of the animal on a pedestal, or whether he himself squatted, I have never been able to learn. Either way, the posture would seem to be an awkward one, and the necessity for restraining the beast would add to the awkwardness, and increase the chances of the shepherd's receiving a nasty kick, which must often have happened. It is said that when the knee-boots are worn the sheep-herder neither has to worry about being kicked nor needs to restrain the animal since a ewe in

this situation, one is told, will back up rather than go forward, thus facilitating the bestialist's efforts to fathom her depths. No doubt the sheep-herder, and the goat-herd before him, found satisfactory solutions to all of the problems I have raised. To the uninitiate, however, it must seem that the game could scarcely be worth the candle.

"Lex semper dabit remedium"

"THE LAW WILL ALWAYS
GIVE A REMEDY"

Prophets, kings, philosophers, legislators, and other would-be moral didacts and dictators of all times and places have laid down regulations and penalties aimed at suppressing the omnipresent practice of bestiality. Some of these edicts purport to be the revealed Word of the Almighty. Others, more modestly, claim merely to be the immutable, highest, and most sublime expressions of wisdom and ethics devised by mortal man.

It is not proposed here to examine each of the laws and ethical pronunciamientos conceived for the purpose of bringing to justice or branding as depraved, damned, and delinquent the hapless zoophile. With few exceptions, to examine a handful of these is to capture the flavor of them all. This becomes evident if we begin with the Jewish law of the *Old Testament* and then leapfrog across the centuries to the current U.S. statutes (which differ mainly in that the death penalty has been reluctantly abandoned for

lesser retributions, and in that the animal is no longer regarded as a party to the felony).

The *Old Testament* law with regard to bestiality is set forth in the book of *Leviticus* (and elsewhere):

Leviticus 18:23—"Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it is confusion."

Leviticus 20:15-16—"And if a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death: and ye shall slay the beast."

"And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman, and the beast: they shall surely be put to death: their blood *shall* be upon them."

One should always bear in mind, in considering the sexual prohibitions laid down by the Hebrews and the severity of the penalties for violating them, that they were based mainly on what was considered to be an urgent need to increase population, so that no sexual act was to be tolerated which was not aimed at procreation; and that the acts prohibited were quite commonplace among the people, so that there were, in fact, some legitimate grounds for regarding those acts as an at least potential threat to the achievement of the maximum population increase thought essential to survival. Once this is understood, we will recognize that neither of these factors any longer obtains; on the one hand, we have no longer such urgent need, real or imaginary, to increase our numbers—indeed, it is birth control that is the urgent necessity; on the other hand, bestiality is certainly not by any means a commonplace practice. In other words, we do not have

the problems the Israelites had, and cannot on a realistic, as distinguished from a superstitious, basis justify the severe penalties still meted out for this practice.

The law of the Hittites, which antedated the Biblical law by several centuries, also prescribed the death penalty for bestiality, but with the stipulation that any offender might be pardoned by the king, as distinguished from the *Old Testament* sentence of death, which was officially at least unconditional.

Just why the Hittites took a more benign view of bestiality with a horse or a mule than of the same offense with a cow, hog, or dog, my scholarship does not presently suffice to say. Doubtless they had their reasons, and the *Hittite Code* on bestiality, as cited by Kinsey, does make the distinction:

“If a man lie with a cow the punishment is death.

“If a man lies with a hog or a dog, he shall die.

“If a bull rear upon a man, the bull shall die, but the man shall not die.

“If a boar rear upon a man, there is no penalty.

“If a man lies with a horse or a mule, there is no penalty, but he shall not come near the king, and he shall not become a priest.”

Moving ahead to the eighth century, we perceive that the spirit of thrift is happily in evidence. That good merchant, Charlemagne, an economist of whom any Rotary Club or Chamber of Commerce might be proud, ordered that cows and she-goats involved in bestial relationships should be executed, but that their flesh should be used for dog food while their hides should be put to use on his

farms. Dubois-Desaulle remarks of this that bestiality must have been very commonplace for Charlemagne to consider it worth his while to mention the matter in his *Capitularies*.

Forging on to the tenth century, we encounter a comparatively easy-going policy inaugurated under the pontificate of Pope John XII—an ascendant to the papal throne whose distinction it is that he ended his mission as God's envoy on earth under circumstances unusual even for the papacy: That is to say, he died in the very act of adultery.⁷ Under John XII, persons convicted of the high crime of bestiality could evade the penalty if they would make a payment of 250 livres to the coffers of the Church.

The fine, as a punishment for bestiality, had also once been the practice of the ancient Romans, though only as the result of a legislative oversight. For a time, the penalty was a fine of 10,000 sesterces (the equivalent of a one thousand dollar fine, or thereabouts, today), but the death penalty was soon to be invoked.

As suggested, the earlier leniency is not to be taken as an example of enlightened Roman tolerance for the fleshly frailties of zoerasts. Rather, careless lawmakers had negligently lumped bestiality in with pederasty under the general heading of "sodomy," and found themselves in the impossible position of being unable to execute those whose tastes ran to animals without executing those whose tastes ran to homosexuality as well, the ranks of the latter having notoriously included high-ranking Romans from the emperors on down. Needless to say, astute Roman legislators soon sealed off this legal loophole through

which were slipping depraved goat-herds, debauched serving-girls, and other hardened bestialists whose infamies Imperial Rome felt obliged to punish by death.

Even previous to the pontificate of Blessed John XII, periods of penance were being assigned by Catholic confessors to persons confessing to the grievous sin of bestiality. These penances were set forth in the *Penitentials*, half-secular, half-ecclesiastical criminal codes in use up to the thirteenth century. The *Penitentials* not only specify varying penalties, according not to divine revelation, but to the differing views of their respective authors, but within the same document vary the penance according to the status of the offender. Thus, penance inflicted on bestialist bishops and priests were somewhat more severe than those handed out to mere laymen.

Generally, boys confessing to unholy cohabitations with beasts got off the lightest, a penance of one hundred days being stipulated by Egbert in the ninth century for this particular juvenile delinquency. Unmarried men commonly fared somewhat better than married ones; they received lighter penances because they had no wives upon whom to appease their baser appetites and were therefore more susceptible to the erotic allurements of animals.

Penances ranged in severity from the *Penitential Pseudo-Romanum's* one-year penance for married men, six months for bachelors, to a ten-year penance for bestiality ordered by the *Penitential Hubertense*. Burchard's *Penitential* assigned to unmarried men guilty of bestiality forty days on bread and water and seven years of penance; while married men received a ten-year penance. Women

having the abominable intercourse with horses drew a seven-year penance from Burchard.

In the Middle Ages, bestiality received full (some might even say excessive) attention from Catholic jurist-theologians, whose discussions of the matter would fill volumes. One thorny problem involved the relationship, if any, between sexual intercourse with animals on the one hand, and sexual intercourse with demons (*incubi* and *succubi*) on the other. This was an especially delicate and difficult theo-juristic subject for the reason that the Devil so often assumed animal form (as did his daemonic minions) for the purpose of concupiscently consorting with witches; and it was not always possible for even the most perspicacious and learned inquisitor to determine with certainty whether the animal was really an animal, or rather a demon in disguise. One solution to a portion of this grave dilemma was to distinguish between the crimes of *bestiality*—iniquitous carnal intercourse with animals—and *demoniality*—the most loathesome, heretical, meretricious, flagitious, and perverted sexual connection with demons. This did not, of course, enable witch-hunters to say with precision that a given goat was or was not a demon, but it did permit of a greater variety in statutes and writings dealing with the problems.

Demonology aside, Catholic theologians tended for a time to take the view that bestiality was a crime against God (it could not very logically be considered a crime against man), and that therefore the punishment was divine. This could be understood in two ways, and was. On the one hand, it might be taken to mean that punish-

ment for bestiality should be left to God, who would handle the matter in the felon's next life if not in this one. More commonly, however, the offender was punished in this life—with the understanding that his executioners were instruments of Our Father, acting not on their own behalf, but on His.

Penalties against men and women were, in the Middle Ages, combined with penalties against the animals involved, so that sometimes human and beast were executed together.

The Parliament of Paris, 1601, and the Parliament of Aix, 1679, justified the burning of beasts involved in bestiality not on scriptural grounds, but on the basis that permitting them to live would perpetuate among men the memory of the odious crimes to which the animals had been parties, albeit involuntarily.

Sometimes, human and beast were tried together, by the same judicial body and under similar laws, though the question of whether the beast had a soul, or could be credited with free will, and was thus capable of behaving criminally or sinfully, remained always a matter for strenuous and intricate debate.

Animals also, on occasion, underwent torture; their yelps and howls, as they were roasted over slow fires or suspended head downward by hooks inserted in their flesh, were taken as confessions of guilt. In one case at Chartres, in 1606, a dog was tried *in absentia* and hanged in effigy for its participation in an act of bestiality.

By the early seventeenth century, a few persons accused of bestial intercourse were being set free when the courts

decided that such connections were anatomically implausible (and also, in at least one case, that while man's depravity is not to be questioned, an animal will not go against the intentions of nature). Not so lucky was sixteen-year-old Claudine de Culam, who came to trial at Rognon, France, in 1601. In this case, the magistrate—at the urging of Claudine's mother, who was stoutly certain of the girl's innocence—agreed to put the matter to a scientific or at least pragmatic test.

Claudine, who allegedly had been caught red-handed copulating with a white, spotted dog, was taken, in the company of court-appointed female "experts," to a chamber adjacent to the courtroom. The dog was also brought into the chamber with the defendant.

"The matrons had the young girl undress completely in order to examine her, and immediately the dog, not waiting to be put to the test, jumped upon her, and went about knowing her carnally, 'which he would perhaps have accomplished had we not prevented him,' wrote the matrons in their official proceedings of the transaction."

Primarily on the basis of this evidence, both the girl and the dog were strangled and their bodies burned, and their ashes "thrown to the winds," that as little trace as possible might remain to remind mankind of their monstrous misdeeds.

(The case is described more fully by A. F. Niemoller, whose *Bestiality and the Law* is briefly quoted from above.)

Voltaire, taking as liberal a stand as he could at the

time, denounced the harshness of the penalty for bestiality as it was meted out in Europe:

“There is hardly a tribunal in Europe,” he wrote, “which has not condemned to the fire some miserable ones convicted of this turpitude; it exists, but it is rare in Europe. The question has been much discussed whether the penalty of the fire is not too barbarous today for the young peasants who alone are guilty of this infamy and who scarcely differ from the animals with which they couple.”

(We may assume that Voltaire’s choice of the word “infamy” is a concession to the times, and that he regarded bestiality as at most a misdemeanor. It is interesting to note that within the same sentence he describes bestiality as “rare in Europe,” while asserting that “there is hardly a tribunal in Europe” that has not condemned persons to death for it. This incongruity is perhaps in itself evidential of the distress he felt when contemplating the disproportion between offense and punishment.)

So far as courts-martial are concerned, it is safe to say without wading through any great mass of documents that the mechanization of modern armies has brought about a decline in the number of cases of bestiality coming before military tribunals. Before the passing of the horse cavalry, however, stories of bestial intercourse and cavalymen caught at it were campfire gossip in the armies of all nations, and penalties ranged from on-the-spot reprimands through fines and prison terms and dishonorable discharges up to execution by firing squads.

Even with the demise of the cavalry, the disappearance of the mule from camp life, and the banishment of most all other beasts from military establishments as well, bestiality has not vanished entirely from the juristic proceedings of the armed services. Thus, one U.S. case was being appealed as recently as 1960, and at least two others were tried in the European Theater of Operations during World War II. In two of the cases, the defendants were charged with carnal copulations with chickens, and in the other case the animal involved was a cow. Thus is reflected the oft-lamented decease of the cavalry as the great majority of all military bestiality cases used, in the good old days, to involve mares.⁸

Frederick the Great is said to have dealt with at least two such (equine, or equestrian) cases. On one occasion, it is told, he was asked to pass sentence on a cavalryman who had been caught in the act of copulating with a mare. Frederick is supposed to have responded: "The fellow is a pig, and should be transferred to the infantry."

On another occasion, he is said to have dismissed entirely the charge against another member of his armies, remarking (profanely and flippantly) that soldiers are entitled to sexual freedom. It is obvious from his comments in both cases that he regarded the offense as no more than a peccadillo.

Dr. Magnus Hirschfeld (*Sexual History of the World War*) quotes a Hungarian military physician who told him that on the Italian front during World War I the Hungarian Hussars quite frequently copulated with their mares, and that some of the officers also engaged in this

practice. According to Hirschfeld's informant, the (enlisted) offenders were not tried by courts-martial for their atrocities, but were flogged on the spot.

While U.S. legislators have shown admirable restraint where trial and punishment of animals is concerned, there have still been some quite curious courtroom proceedings in this country involving bestiality, actual or alleged.

In Indiana in 1858, for example, a slander suit was brought by Eli and Mary Ausman, man and wife, against a gentleman going by the name of Veal. This Veal, the plaintiffs charged, had accused Mrs. Ausman of giving birth to two puppy dogs in a haystack, with the unmistakable implication that she had been guilty of grossly irregular conduct with a male canine. Veal's defense attorney held, as a keystone of his client's plea of innocence, that there could be no slander for the reason that giving birth to puppy dogs is manifestly beyond the capabilities of any human female.

The court, however, in finding for the Ausmans, took due note of the limitless reaches of human credulity and ignorance, and stated that the story maliciously circulated by Veal might well, however preposterous, find its believers.

Isabel Drummond (*The Sex Paradox*) tells us that "In an Iowa suit a wife who saw her husband having sexual relations with a cow was granted a divorce, and an Ohio court decided that the husband's sexual relations with a beast, though not constituting adultery, did form the basis for 'extreme cruelty.' Unnatural practices of this kind, the court said, are an 'infamous indignity to the wife

and would make the marriage relation so revolting to her that it would become impossible for her to discharge the duties of a wife and would defeat the whole purpose of the relation.' " This would seem to be one of the few instances where a U.S. court of law has recognized that the "whole purpose" of marriage is to legitimize the copulations of the marriage partners.

To these oddities let us append only the datum that certain Catholic writers have pondered the question of whether bestiality should be a legitimate ground for separation—which, assuredly after much soul-searching, they decided it should.⁹

Looking now at the present state of legislation aimed at preserving us from demoralization by the route of rampant bestiality, most of the U.S. statutes dealing with animal contacts include this offense under the more general category of "sodomy," and possible penalties vary widely from state to state, as is the case with sex legislation generally in this country, one state punishing harshly what is penalized only lightly in another. (The astute American sex offender, it would seem, should study the laws of the several sovereign states, and then take care to reside in one which regards with relative levity the particular abomination to which he or she happens to be addicted.)

In order to protect society from the depredations of these (zooerastic and other) fiends, the U.S. offers punishments for sodomy, or "crimes against nature," ranging from a year's imprisonment up through life at hard labor, though a few states have a fine and/or imprisonment penalty.

Some states mention, in addition to animals, the possibility of outrages committed with birds and barnyard fowls, and specify that almost any kind of contact regarded as sexual shall constitute the offense. Thus, neither "penetration" nor spilling of seed, ancient yardsticks in sex offenses, need be proved, in most states, to have taken place.

While I have made no check of the matter, it is said that the average U.S. penalty for bestiality ranges from two to five years' imprisonment. It seems likely however that a good many offenders are permitted to go free on condition of future asceticism, or have their sentences suspended with the understanding that they will submit to the necessary psychiatric reorientation procedures.

The social penalties resulting from being brought to trial for bestiality are, of course, another matter. Where this offense is concerned, the attitude of the community towards the offender can readily be imagined, and however lenient the court may be, the mere fact that the individual's behavior is brought to public notice is sufficient to make future life in that locality impossible for him (while of course there is always the danger, which even spectrally is tormenting, that wherever he goes his sin may one day catch up with him). It is also worth noting, as Kinsey has done, that where persons are imprisoned for bestiality they customarily face unusually harsh mistreatment at the hands of both prison authorities and their fellow convicts.

The imbecility of American sex statutes is perhaps nowhere more evident to the dispassionate inquirer than in

this area. In most sexual acts which are punishable, there is at least the off chance that some other person will be injured in some way by the conduct of the person engaging in the prohibited behavior. But in the case of bestiality, no other person can possibly be injured, unless in the rare instance where domestic animals belonging to another person are used and subjected to sadistic or cruel mistreatment. And even here, in these extremely rare cases, the damage is one to property only, and property is quite adequately protected by legislation having nothing to do with sexual behavior. (We should perhaps grant one other exception: The possibility of cardiac arrest, little or large strokes, or other trauma that might be sustained by elderly ladies chancing to happen upon farmhands *in flagrante delicto* with the lap-dog or the livestock.)

But on what possible *rational* grounds can our society send to prison for many years, or otherwise severely punish, the individual who engages in the peccadillo of sexual relations with an animal? Moreover, given the rather substantial frequency of such behavior, especially in rural areas where there is abundant opportunity for it, how can society justify the undeniably scapegoat prosecution and persecution of that negligible minority of individuals who come before the courts to be tried or sentenced outright on guilty pleas to this offense?

Emotionalism run amok, magical and theological superstition, puritanism, and hysteria are invariably present, singly or in combination, in these cases, working to magnify the significance of the act and to create a psychical climate wherein few judges are able to function sanely,

dispassionately, and humanely, as they ought to. Most often, the offender is some poor farmer or other rustic, cut off from possibilities to engage in the multiple fornications enjoyed by the bulk of the male population. (I say *male*, because apparently only one conviction for bestiality has ever been obtained against a female in this country. Mentioned by Kinsey, the case is *State v. Tarrant* 1949:80 N.E. 2d Ohio 509.)

The question will arise, and it is a legitimate one: What of the rights of the animals? Should they not be protected by law from abuse at the hands of sex deviates and rural voluptuaries who would exploit them for erotic purposes? But in considering the protection of animals, the same criteria should be applied here as elsewhere—which implies that the question must be shorn of the magical-emotional aura with which sexuality tends to enshroud it. The question will then be seen to be one of whether the animal is injured, or endures pain, as the result of the bestial intercourse.

In acts of sadistic bestiality, which are primarily sadistic and only secondarily bestiality, the animal does, of course, require protection. It may be pointed out, however, that there are ample laws prohibiting cruelty to animals (ample *laws*, not ample *enforcement*), and it is these laws which should be invoked, whether the cruelty be sexually or otherwise motivated. There are, indeed, no grounds for a separate sub-species of legislation where sex-motivated cruelty to animals is concerned.

Where sadism is not present, there is considerable room for doubt as to whether there is any cruelty. It has always

been noted in fact, by ancient historians and up through Kinsey in our own time, that animals tend to become affectionately attached (not only physically) to humans who have sex relations with them, and sometimes have even been known to forsake intercourse with their own kind in testimony to their preference for relations with humans. Whatever one may think of bestiality, this does not sound as if it were an act of cruelty so far as the animal is concerned.

And it is in any case ironic and suggestive of hypocrisy that those who pronounce bestiality to be an act of cruelty to the animal, and who here evince such touching concern about the animals' welfare, are in most cases not at all so concerned about the use of animals for heavy labor, their unnatural confinement as household pets, their slaughter for food, their being placed on display in zoos, and, most odiously of all, their being hunted down and maimed or killed by so-called sportsmen—all practices which, beyond the slightest doubt, are more painful and more inimical to the beasts' welfare than is the sexual relationship with a human, in which the animal may even find considerable pleasure.

It must therefore, if we are to be at all realistic, be concluded that any infringement on the rights or protective needs of animals is a negligible one, and that it is not here that we should seek to justify our severe punishment of the individual convicted of bestiality.

I will have more to say about the role of the animal in the zooerastic and zoophilic relationships in another place.

DEVILS, WITCHES, AND
OTHER WONDERS

To the reader who is not familiar with this subject of bestiality it may seem that what has gone before is both inordinately bizarre and somehow detached from the real world. However, the discussion up to the present point is likely to seem down-to-earth and a bit commonplace when compared to much of what is yet to come. For we embark now on what is more than ever a voyage into the nightmarish phantasy world of the human mind, which has concerned itself with bestiality down the centuries, and which has sometimes wandered into areas where the traditional boundaries of the objective and the subjective, the conscious and the unconscious, waver, collapse, and merge into a grotesque microcosm of imagination and obsession wherein nothing is strange or improbable. We begin by touching, only scantily, upon the vast lore of bestiality in witchcraft, demonology, magic, and occultism.

That demons sometimes take the form of animals in order to consort bestially with humans was regarded, in the Middle Ages, as an indisputable and incontrovertible fact of existence. Dubois-Desaulle writes in this regard that "there were demons who took the form of goats or sheep and who accomplished the carnal act with the

witches. The girls and women each held their demon by the hand or by the hoof. The dances and shakings were followed by scenes of debauchery.

“Francoise Secretain, who was burned alive, admitted that the devil had known her carnally four or five times, sometimes in the form of a dog, a cat or a hen ‘and that his semen was cold.’ This Francoise, who called herself a witch, was perhaps simply given to bestiality and baptized the domestic animal which served to assuage her desires, a demon.

“Some women admitted that they left the Sabbat, sometimes on a goat, a bull, or a dog, sometimes on a horse, and often submitted to the assaults of the animal, who knew them carnally. There is to be read in a work on the history of France that in the year 1458 a great number of men and women were burned in the city of Arras, accused by one another. They confessed that in the night they had been transported to dances and that they had lain with the Devil, some under the human form and others under the bestial form.”

While the Devil (and his demons) most often assumed the form of that traditional symbol of (sometimes evil) virility, the goat, He could appear in any animal form which happened to suit His whim of the moment, and history records instances of His having assumed the forms of a multiplicity of serpents, birds, and beasts. He could, of course, appear in human form also; moreover He could transform humans into animals, and a bestial copulation could take place, say, between a goat who was the Devil, and a she-goat who was a human thus trans-

formed; or the Devil could assume the form of a man, say, and commit bestiality with a human in the form of a bitch, ewe, mare, or some other creature.

Notable amongst these data are instances of the Devil changing the sex of witches so that a male human might be transformed into a female animal, or a female human into a male animal, or, for that matter, humans might (most wishfully of all, one assumes) be changed into their human sexual opposites—all of these being examples of sex change accomplished less painfully than are the Christine Jorgensen transformations of the present day. True enough, the price for this and other benefits conferred was one's soul; but, on the other hand, the contemporary surgeon does not always charge much less.

Sometimes the Devil also tampered with the sexuality of animals. Thus, whether it were the Devil in disguise, or a creature which had made a pact with the Devil—a matter the court left unresolved—it is on record that in 1474, at Basle, a cock was tried and condemned to death for having laid an egg; and this despite a brilliant defense by the rooster's attorney, who argued that the laying of an egg is an involuntary act, and thus his client was both morally and legally blameless. (He might also, had it then existed, have argued in terms of the M'Naghten Rule that his client neither understood that the egg-laying was wrong nor was, at the time of the crime, able to distinguish between right and wrong. In any case, it is not likely that he could have won an acquittal where so monstrous an act was involved.)

By some accounts, demons also lured animals other

than human to their destruction by representing themselves as sexually attractive creatures of the same species, opposite (rutting, if female) sex. For example, real horses were destroyed by being led into swamps and quicksands or over cliffs by demons in the form of erotically desirable mares and stallions. What the monstrous couplings of demons with the lower animals were called I do not know. Bestio-demoniality?

In goat form, the Devil appeared at the Sabbat, and at other gatherings of the faithful, and received the “kiss of infamy,” or obscene osculation, on His bottom before proceeding to such matters as the defloration of virgins, and coitus, sodomy, cunnilingus, and fellatio with the remainder of the congregation. Sometimes, in the form of a bird-serpent, for example, He performed coitus and pedication and had Himself fellated all at the same time—a feat achieved by virtue of His possessing a lengthy and sinuous three-pronged phallus, which He kept, when it was not in use, coiled about His waist (“like a serpent,” in the words of some eye-witnesses). De Lancre, a noted demonologist, presents the typical attitude of the authorities towards these celebrations when he speaks of women (witches) “loving a violently stinking goat, caressing him amorously, becoming intimate and coupling with him horribly and impudently. . . .”

Unspeakable orgies of witches with boars had been duly noted by another, earlier, demonologist, Alphonsus de Spina, in the fifteenth century, who wrote that there were demons called *Bruxae* who caused old women falsely to believe they had magic powers. These victims of

demonic deception, he tells us, had a meeting place, where they gathered to kiss the backside of a boar and otherwise, and even more meretriciously, to provide tangible tokens of their adoration. Presumably they labored under the impression that this boar was their Satanic Master in porcine habiliment.

Yet another of the Devil's bestial transformations led to a popular saying still current: "The Devil has goose feet." This formerly referred to the Prince of Darkness' propensity for assuming the form of a goose in order to cloacally copulate with human males, and possibly to indulge in bestial tribadism as well, but not many moderns employing the saying may be presumed to be aware of its historic significance.

Not only devils but sometimes popes as well are said to have taken on beastly forms for zooerastic purposes. Thus, Cardinal Bermo, in his *Life of Hildebrand*, charges that that Pope made sacrifices to demons and assumed animal forms to have bestial intercourse with women.

The ceremony of ritualistic fornications of women with goats—more nearly in emulation of the carryings-on at Mendes than of those of the witches—is revived periodically by occultists and organizations of debauchees. A recent example is said to have been the "Love is the law" cult presided over by Aleister Crowley during the period of residence at the abbey of Thelema, Corfu, Sicily. Crowley's mistress, and perhaps other female Thelemites as well, are reported to have engaged there in acts of bestiality with a sacred goat. These acts of "Sex Magick" were supposed to "generate magical currents," and to be useful

in divining the future, attracting wealth, smiting one's enemies, etc. We may suppose that there was at least one other purpose—to provide entertainment for the Master Therion (Crowley), who enjoyed that sort of thing.

The most secret (and some not-so-secret) lore of occultism is replete with innumerable instances of humans copulating with animals of all sorts—materialized from their own ectoplasm, encountered whilst travelling on the (lower) astral planes, created as “thought-forms,” and so on. There are a host of techniques for materializing such animals. In some cases, the explanation is doubtless that the animals are voluntarily or involuntarily auto-hypnotically hallucinated, just as human forms have been intentionally or spontaneously hallucinated and put to the same usage. Or, in less frequent instances, another person hypnotizes the subject and then provides the verbal suggestions. Following such hallucinatory intercourse it is not at all rare that the body of the human participant bears the claw and/or tooth marks of the animal, inflicted in the heat of its passion.¹⁰

We will take note, before leaving this curious realm, of certain other occult notions and practices related to bestiality.

For example, the metamorphosis of humans into animals, generally (in occultism) called “transformation,” may lead to bestiality, although the transformation was not directly for that purpose. The lycanthrope or werewolf, especially, is said, once transformed into a wolf, to sometimes run with packs of real wolves and to have sexual intercourse with them. The werewolf, assuming

the form of a wolf, may also sexually and bestially attack humans. It is well known of course that some of these lycanthropes actually believe themselves to have assumed the forms of wolves, so that in their minds at least the sexual acts they perform are in a sense bestial ones. (This would be true whether the intercourse is with an animal or with a human: The werewolf conceives of himself not as a wolf entirely, but as a human or at least part-human consciousness in a wolf's body, and this remains true even at the height of the lycanthropic frenzy, although later the werewolf, a man again, may have no memory whatever of the episode just terminated. Thus, his relation with a wolf would be that of a man-wolf with a wolf, and his relation with a human would be that of a wolf-man with a human, and in either case the relation could be said to be bestiality.)

Obviously, it would not be often, and probably never, save under artificial conditions, that such an individual would succeed in actually cohabiting with a wolf. However, he could experience the cohabitation in dreams or hallucinations which would seem to him to be altogether real. Similarly, his sexual acts with women would occur largely on a phantasy or hallucinatory level, though occasionally psychical lycanthropes do commit actual rapes, sometimes accompanied by sadistic acts, such as rending the flesh of the victims with their teeth (which are experienced as lupine). But again, it does not much matter to the werewolf, from the standpoint of the "reality" of his experience, whether the act is performed in physical fact or even in psychological fact. And the memory of

the psychical event might well differ not at all from the memory of the factual one, so that later the lycanthrope could not distinguish in his mind between what "really" happened and what was dreamed or imagined. This same confusion characterized many of the witches, who believed their own testimony that they had copulated with the Devil in animal form and committed other sacrileges and crimes.¹¹

In Voodoo ceremonies, and in some other religious and magical rituals of both primitive and civilized peoples, the individual believes himself transformed into a wolf, tiger, leopard, goat, or whatever, and has sexual relations either with another human similarly transformed, with another human in human form, or, by prearrangement, with an actual animal of the kind he believes himself to be. In these cases, too, we are probably justified in concluding that there remains at least some awareness of the self as human, and of the act, therefore, as one of bestiality.

THERAPEUTIC BESTIALITY

The Goat-God of Mendes, according to a usually well-informed source, was not only the incarnation of the procreative deity and a pleasure partner for priests and parishioners but also had a healing role to perform.

The recipients of the therapeutic ministrations of the sacred goats of the temple at Mendes were nymphomaniacs who were locked up in the temple with the trained goats and forced to remain there until the beasts became too satiate to copulate with them further; at which point, presumably, the nymphomaniacs were pronounced cured. How successful this satyric shock therapy may have been we are lamentably not advised; but Ville-mont assures us that similar operations were performed in the temples of Astarte or Anaitis, and the fact that this medical technique was not confined to a single clinic may possibly be testimony to its efficacy.

More commonly, bestiality was regarded as a cure for venereal diseases; so widespread has been this belief that there are few places in the world where the remedy has not been regarded as sure-fire at one time or another.

Both the Persians, who cured gonorrhea (and leprosy) by means of bestiality therapy, and the Southern Slavs, according to Bloch, were firm believers in the effectiveness of this method of treatment. The same was true of the Tamils, who additionally believed that they could cure venereal diseases by raping young girls. The Moors believed that gonorrhea could be cured by committing bestiality with she-asses, though only if the act were performed unfailingly on three successive days. (Young Moors, as mentioned elsewhere, also attributed to bestiality the power of making the [not yet fully developed] penis grow, and believed that it increased virility in the bargain.) Westermarck contributed to the knowledge of this branch of medicine by informing us that in Andjra

it was believed that sexual relations with a black dog would almost certainly suffice to render the zoerast immune from either arrest or imprisonment.

Both medical prescriptions and ethical injunctions connected with the healing properties of human-animal intercourse are set forth in *El Ktab*, Omar Haleby's interpretation of the *Koranic* law:

"Do not couple, then, O men! nor fornicate with other men or animals! . . . This told, I ought to speak of the cases where, according to many doctors, who are in conformance on this with the opinion of famous physicians, it is permitted to fornicate with animals of large size, such as the goat, mule, etc. These cases are purely in the medical domain and can be put into practice only as a curative means in the sole interest of health. It is thus that one is permitted to fornicate with *female animals* when he is attacked with simple or syphilitic gonorrhea, strong inflammations of the Dkeur (phallus), and other affections. . . .

"Experience has demonstrated that, under the influence of this fornication, man unburdens himself of the virus causing his maladies, without the animal's contracting them, for this virus is immediately destroyed by the great heat residing in the animal's vulva, and by the bitter and acid qualities of the secretions of its mucous membranes.

"If, then, O men! you are sick and without medical aid, or if this latter has been powerless, you may fornicate with animals, as has been said above; but this fornication should cease, under penalty of the infraction of the law

of Islam, from the time that you will have regained your health."

It has also been held, however, that bestiality is the *cause* of venereal diseases. Peruvians believed intercourse with the alpaca to have been responsible for the origin of syphilis; while an English physician, John Lindner, held that syphilis resulted from sodomy committed with large apes (these apes being, he explained, the "satyrs" of the ancients). Van Holmont declared that venereal diseases came into being when a man had abominable relations with a mare at the Siege of Naples—the diseases being formerly of mares or horses only—and that these maladies were spread when the guilty individual subsequently had sexual relations with other humans.

While bestiality may be the cure in some cases, in others it is the complaint—a dread disease which itself cries out for the ministrations of the healer. Fortunately, such cases may be readily treated by that near-panacea for so many of the ills of mankind—satisfying coition with a member of the human opposite sex.

Thus, in the Babylonian Gilgamesh epic, the wildman-hero, Enkidu, has sexual relations with animals, who are the only sexual partners he knows. Later, however, he encounters a sacred prostitute, who seduces him, provides him with greater satisfactions, and thus induces him to forsake forever his zooerastic practices.¹² The prostitute, a representative of the cult of Ishtar, accomplishes her cure in the short space of one week—though it should be added that the therapy is unusually intensive.¹³

Along these lines, the anthropologist Raphael Patai in-

terestingly remarks that: "In exactly the same sense does Rabbi Eleazar, a Talmudic sage, interpret the Biblical story of the creation of Eve. After God had created Adam, we read in the book of Genesis, He said, 'It is not good that man should be alone: I will make him a helpmeet for him.' Thereupon God formed out of the ground 'every beast of the field and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto the man to see what he would call them . . .' Evidently the ancient Hebrew narrator presupposes here that one of the animals could have proved satisfactory for Adam to become his helpmeet. However, among all the animals 'for Adam there was not found a helpmeet for him.' The first series of experiments proved unsuccessful. Thereupon God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam and of one of his ribs made a woman and presented her to Adam. 'This time,' Adam immediately exclaimed, 'this is the bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh . . .' (Gen. 2:23). It is to this last verse that Rabbi Eleazar appends his comment: 'This teaches us,' he says, 'that Adam had intercourse with all the animals and all the beasts, but he was satisfied only when he had intercourse with Eve.' "

Thus, as with Enkidu, it is the woman who proves the more satisfying sexually, and who thus leads the man away from intercourse with animals, which was originally engaged in because the man knew no other sex partners. However, we note that the same claim is sometimes made in reverse, with persons previously experienced in sexual intercourse only with other humans turning to bestiality as a preferred and more satisfying means of erotic grati-

fication once they have experienced it. For example, two cases are cited elsewhere in this volume (see “Norman Mailer and the Myth of Negro Sexuality”) where women declare that “when a woman has tasted a dog, she will never want a man again.” The cynic might suggest here that the essence of the matter—whether in the cases of Enkidu and Adam on the one hand, or of the women just referred to on the other—is simply a desire for some variety.

By way of conclusion, it may be said that bestiality therapy, although presumably less than efficacious, is still a practice to be preferred over the one current in the Middle Ages when it was believed that gonorrhea could be cured by intercourse with a virgin, and not a few syphilitic and/or gonorrheic rapists desperately sought relief from their ravaging afflictions by having the prescription filled and refilled.

MONSTROUS ISSUES

If the folklore of therapeutic bestiality is widespread, that of monstrous births resulting from human-animal sex relationships is omnipresent. The old myths include tales of such births, they have been reported as matters of historic fact by writers of all times and places, and there are not a few persons who still today believe such hybridizations possible (including Russian scientists, who

as recently as the 1930's were reported deep in the wilds of Turkestan, there ardently endeavoring to cross-breed men with chimpanzees in order to establish once and for all the authority of evolutionary doctrine).

Together, all of this lore constitutes a formidable mass of superstition and misconception surrounding the possibility that animals may be able to fertilize humans—or that humans may be able to fertilize animals—with resulting pregnancies and curious creatures issuing forth from the respective maternal wombs. While such tales have, for obvious “reasons,” great apes and gorillas for their most frequent animal heroes and heroines, there are probably few beasts which someone has not suggested at some time or other to have impregnated or become pregnant by a human sex partner. A call of the roll would not find rats, rabbits, and pachyderms omitted.

Old-time skeptics used to argue against the possibility or likelihood of hybrid beings resulting from bestial intercourse on the ground that, if such a thing could occur, the world would long since have become a “chaos of monstrosities”—an argument which carries the implication that bestiality was not altogether uncommon in those periods when the objection was put forward. Later authors, better grounded in the discoveries of materialistic science, have noted, however, that this reasoning overlooks the important fact that hybrids are always infertile, so that the total population of monsters on hand at any given time would be only the relatively few born of actual recent bestial relationships. That is, the monsters themselves would be unable to reproduce their kind, and their

race could not thus be multiplied to produce a "chaos of monstrosities."

Nonetheless, Greek and Roman mythology offered its own chaos of monstrosities, some of which—minotaurs, satyrs, centaurs, and so on—we have already mentioned. Not always, however, were the offspring of bestial intercourse monstrous for the mythologists. Thus, as a result of her sexual union with the swan (Jupiter), Leda, wife of Tyndareus, king of Sparta, gave birth to Pollux and Helena; at the same time, according to the myth, but as the result of her marital relations with her husband, she gave birth, litter-like, to Castor and Clytemnestra.

Clement of Alexandria, not to be thought duped or deluded in this matter, denied that Centaurs were the result of bestial intercourse betwixt men and horses. Plutarch, however, declared that he knew personally of a child begat by profligate intercourse with a mare, and of yet another resulting from bestial relations with a she-ass. It was well known of old that in the temple of Aesculapius women employed snakes for carnal enjoyment—a dissolute practice discovered to afford such keen erotic ecstasies that Roman women took snakes into their homes, where they would be available at all times, and not just on occasions of worship. It was established beyond possibility of reasonable doubt, much-revered authorities assure us, that Roman matrons conceived as a result of these impure serpentine amours, and it was held with almost equal certainty that their incontinent copulations with asses and canines also sometimes bore fruit.

In the fifteenth century B.C. Ugaritic mythology had

already proclaimed that the god Baal once copulated with a heifer, and as a result of this divinely bestial coition a child called Mes or Mos was born.

To Saxo, we are beholden for the information that a king of the Goths was born¹⁴ as the result of the coupling of a virgin with a bear, and Richard Burton, who must be considered a leading scholar of our subject, has confirmed that sexual intercourse at least, between bears and human females, is an accomplished fact.

The immortal Saint Jerome, not one to rely on mere hearsay, affirmed that he had seen with his own eyes satyrs born in the desert as the result of the lascivious unions of girls and apes. (Most authorities hold, however, to the more conservative view that satyrs are the result of the intercourse of men with she-goats and of women with he-goats. Distinguished theologians have added the observation that satyrs must indeed be post-Great Flood hybrids, since there is no record of any having been taken aboard the ark by Noah.) Saint Jerome receives at least some backing from Portuguese history, which records that a woman of Lisbon once gave birth to two children as a consequence of her unchaste submission to the erotic embraces of an ape. Whether these children were satyrs, we are not, however, informed.

Dubois-Desaulle noted numerous instances of alleged monstrosities born of the corrupt commerce of human females with animals. He cites the prominent inquisitor Martin Del Rio, who said that women have "been seen to give birth to a dormouse, another to a savage rat, and another to a monster resembling a bear. Torquemada

thinks that these are punishments God sends to women who give themselves to disordered and abominable couplings.

"Among other examples: Alcipe gave birth to an elephant. In Switzerland, in 1278, a woman was delivered of a lion. In 1471, at Pavia, a woman gave birth to a dog. Finally, in 1531, another woman gave birth, from the same womb: first, to a male head enveloped in a film; secondly, to a serpent with two feet; thirdly, to a whole pig."

In the latter instance, one shudders to contemplate the perverse and promiscuous practices which must have preceded so peculiar a parturition.

However, some of these cases, and especially the last one, may well have had some basis in fact—though, of course, the facts would have had nothing in common with the folklorish interpretations popularly laid upon the matter. But monstrosities born to women (as a result of merely human insemination) may indeed have curious forms, and the "head enveloped in a film," particularly, imparts a ring of basic authenticity to the story (as any competent teratologist, or informed layman, will at once recognize).

In the seventeenth century, Francesco-Maria Guazzo, a friar and well-known author (*Compendium Maleficarum*), and an eminent prosecutor and burner of witches as well, reported a case of issue resulting from the copulation of a man with a cow.

A lewd fellow in Belgium, said Guazzo, had to do with a cow, which soon became pregnant and after a time gave birth to a foetus which was not a calf but a male

human child. A number of persons were present when this less-than-blessed event took place, and they actually saw the baby issue from the cow's womb, whereon they retrieved it from the ground where it was lying and turned it over to a nurse.

This human child lived, grew up, was baptized and instructed in the Christian life, and devoted himself to pious contemplation and penance for the evil deed wrought by his paternal progenitor. But despite all of these evidences of full-blown humanity, he discerned in himself certain cow-like tendencies, such as an unseemly and insatiate appetite for grass, and a recurring desire to chew his cud, which was repressed with the uttermost difficulty.

The learned Guazzo had no doubt that the father of this youth was a man, but he doubted that the mother was a cow. Seeking a "more rational" explanation, he came up with the theory that the Devil, aware of the father's bestial behavior, caused the cow to appear pregnant, and then when the cow fell into false labor pains, which He had also caused, the Devil, unnoticed, placed a child He had obtained elsewhere in the vicinity of the cow's womb, so that those present would think the cow had given birth to it. After that, speculated Guazzo, the Devil let the wind out of the cow so that she could return to her normal size and complete the deception.

Though Frater Guazzo does not say so, we must, apparently, regard the lad's bovine propensities as strictly psychogenic phenomena, evidential of neurosis rather than of any maternal hereditary influences. The story

is interesting in that it relates one of the relatively few allegedly factual instances where the monstrous issue is said to have been a normal human in appearance and to have survived into adulthood.

Medical belief in the possibility of fruitful unions between beasts and humans extended in many cases well up into modern times, and medical interest in the problem of human monsters remains, of course, intense at the present time. While it was rather widely known in the nineteenth century and even earlier that bestial connections are inevitably sterile, there was nonetheless a considerable resistance to the acceptance of this knowledge—based in part, no doubt, on reverence for the teachings of classical theologians, and in part on a reluctance to declare impossible and perhaps fraudulent so many historic cases apparently so extensively and authoritatively documented. This reluctance has not been altogether abandoned even today.

A more or less representative selection of historic cases, some of them originally reported by persons of considerable eminence, is offered by Gould and Pyle, in the still fascinating and instructive volume, *Anomalies and Curiosities of Medicine*:

“According to (Ambroise) Paré there was born in 1493, as the result of illicit intercourse between a woman and a dog, a creature resembling in its upper extremities its mother, while its lower extremities were the exact counterpart of its canine father . . . Lycosthenes says that in the year 1110, in the bourg of Liège, there was found a creature with the head, visage, hands, and feet of

a man, the rest of the body like that of a pig. Paré quotes this case and gives an illustration. Rhodiginus mentions a shepherd of Cybare by the name of Cratain, who had connections with a female goat and impregnated her, so that she brought forth a beast with a head resembling that of the father, but with the lower extremities of a goat. He says that the likeness to the father was so marked that the head-goat of the herd recognized it, and accordingly slew the goatherd who had sinned so unnaturally.

“In the year 1547, at Cracovia, a very strange monster was born, which lived three days. It had a head shaped like that of a man; a nose long and hooked like an elephant’s trunk; the hands and feet looking like the web-foot of a goose; and a tail with a hook on it. It was supposed to be a male, and was looked upon as the result of sodomy. Rueff says that the procreation of human beings and beast is brought about (1) by the natural appetite; (2) by the provocation of nature by delight; (3) by the attractive virtue of the matrix, which in beasts and women is alike.

“Plutarch, in his ‘Lesser Parallels,’ says that Aristonymus Ephesius, son of Demostratus, being tired of women, had carnal knowledge with an ass, which in the process of time brought forth a very beautiful child, who became the maid Onoscelin. He also speaks of the origin of the maiden Hippona, or as he calls her, Hippo, as being from the connection of a man with a mare. Aristotle mentions this in his paradoxes, and we know that the patron of horses was Hippona. . . .

“Writing in 1557, Lycosthenes reports the mythical birth of a serpent by a woman. It is quite possible that some known and classified type of monstrosity was indicated here in vague terms. In 1726 Mary Toft, of Godalming, in Surrey, England, achieved considerable notoriety throughout Surrey, and even all over England, by her extensively circulated statements that she bore rabbits. Even at so late a date as this the credulity of the people was so great that many persons believed in her. The woman was closely watched, and being detected in her maneuvers confessed her fraud. To show the extent of discussion this case called forth, there are no less than nine pamphlets and books in the Surgeon-General’s library at Washington devoted exclusively to this case of pretended rabbit-breeding. Hamilton in 1848, and Hard in 1884, both report the births in this country of fetal monstrosities with heads which showed marked resemblance to those of dogs. Doubtless many of the supposed results of bestiality, if seen today, could be readily classified among some of our known forms of monsters. Modern investigation has shown us the sterile results of connections between man and beast or between beasts of different species, and we can only wonder at the simple credulity and the imaginative minds of our ancestors. . . .”

Primitive peoples have their own abundant lore of monstrous issues, but I will here cite only one instance: Indians of the Amazon River country believe that tailed men among the Uginas are the result of the intercourse of women and apes. (Apes again! Intercourse with almost

every variety of monkey and ape has been reported in one place or another. The mandrill is said to be especially attracted to human females, while the same is said of the gorilla. It is certain that monkeys and apes caged in zoos have made sexual advances to women and, less often, to men. Such events have been witnessed frequently, and by reliable observers, wherever zoos are maintained; and it is claimed that there is an aberrant variety of human female who obtains sexual gratification from witnessing and being the object of such advances, and who is consequently a conspicuously regular visitor at zoos.)

Gould and Pyle, marvelling in the late nineteenth century at the "simple credulity and imaginative minds of our ancestors," sang a premature dirge for the belief in the productivity of bestial unions. Vance Randolph, a contemporary author, has written (*The Ozarks*) that "Sexual acts between human beings and domestic animals are rather common in the Ozarks, and nearly every native believes that these unions are sometimes fruitful. Women giving birth to litters of puppies, mares bringing forth colts with human heads, and a great variety of similar phenomena are related and very generally believed. I have never been able to locate a hillman who has actually seen any of these monstrosities—'th' folks allus puts 'em out o' th' way,' as one old man told me." (I will comment on this observation of Vance Randolph's—being myself a resident of the Ozarks—by noting that, at least presently, belief in the procreative potential of human-animal sex relations does not seem to be quite so general as he suggests. However, there are still sufficient numbers of

believers to render unduly optimistic the Gould and Pyle swan song for this particular shred of superstition.)

And if the natives of the Ozark hill country had totally abandoned the faith for a cynically scientific negativism, there would still be the Russians. As recently as 1932, the American Association for the Advancement of Science was advised that a team of Russian scientists, headed by Dr. Elie Ivanoff of Moscow, was at work on this problem and hopeful of coming up with a man-ape hybrid. The Russian scientists were expecting eventually to be able to display to their colleagues and the world "a complete chain of specimens from the perfect man back to the perfect anthropoid." This Soviet team was conducting its experiments in "the wilds of Turkestan," and at last word in 1932 was anticipating success in the imminent future. I have seen no further reference to their activities (which are mentioned a bit more fully in the notes to Dubois-Desaulle's *Bestiality*).

A Dr. H. S. England, who informed the Association of the work of the Russian team, said also that for a quarter of a century he had been hopeful that some Western institution of good repute would attempt similar experimentation. Dr. England further mentioned that a Berlin biologist, Dr. Herman Klaatsch, was attempting, in the early part of this century, to produce gorilla-native African hybrids, who were to be used for heavy labor. His work was interrupted by the start of World War I, and apparently was not resumed.

At the risk of disillusioning some readers, I will conclude this discussion by adding that the Russians were

pursuing their ape-man by means of *artificial* insemination of the apes.

OF LOVE AND LUST

Is it possible for a human being to be in love, in the romantic sense of that expression, with an animal? Is it possible for an animal, within the limitations of its nature, to reciprocate such affection? These are questions which have interested philosophers, authors, artists, intellectuals, and even scientists, over the centuries.

Theorists have long made a distinction between two quite different psychological states to be supposedly encountered among practitioners of bestiality. In this area the attitudes and emotions with which the (human) subjects approach their (animal) objects are considered decisive.

In what has been called "zoophilia," there is said to be a genuine feeling for the animal on the part of the human, and in exceptional cases it may approximate what is called "erotic love" when humans only are involved. Sometimes the term zoophilia is extended to embrace morbid or exaggerated emotional attachments to animals where no sexual intercourse occurs and sexual desires are not consciously present. In any case, zoophilia is an unusual, aberrant psychological condition, likely if not certain to

interfere with normal heterosexual expression and fulfillment of the normal sexual instincts.

On the other hand, the word "zoerasty" (which is also narrowly used to denote anal intercourse with a beast) has sometimes been employed to designate the sexual use of animals where no such emotional involvements exist. Zoerasty, in terms of this definition, is in fact quite akin to masturbation, and the sexual organs of the animal do not differ much, so far as the practitioner of zoerasty is concerned, from an artificial phallus, verge, or fascinum; or from an artificial vagina or vagina-substitute, where males are concerned. The emphasis is primarily upon the individual's erotic gratification and the elimination of sexual tensions, and upon the constellation of pleasure sensations as a whole. The analogy to masturbation may be qualified with the observation that zoerasty is perhaps to be understood as masturbation of a somewhat higher and more complex order, since it does involve a concrete object, or Other, in the act of fulfillment. But even so, from the psychological point of view there is little in zoerasty that is morbid or seriously aberrant, especially when, as is usually the case, the act is regarded as a substitute for intercourse with a human sex-object who, for one reason or another, is not available. (It should be understood, of course, that there may be some overlapping between zoerasty and zoophilia, the words referring to the dominant as distinguished from an exclusive psychological aspect of the relationship.)

By far the greater majority of those who engage in bestiality are, as is probably obvious to everyone, zoerasts.

True zoophiles are encountered with comparative rarity, and their condition is, of course, one calling for psychiatric (or, better, psychoanalytic) intervention—unless they are happy with it, and otherwise well-adjusted, in which case it would be better if society rose to the challenge posed by nature's wealth of variations from the norm and just let them alone, not attempting to interfere with an equilibrium which can in no way result in injury to anyone else. Zooerasts, too, need be of no concern to society, since they do not involve others in their behavior; neither should they, commonly, be regarded as medical problems, since in most cases they are no more ill than any other masturbator, and will switch to a human sex partner whenever an appropriate one becomes available to them.

Though comparatively quite rare, as mentioned, there do occur cases of true zoophilia—of human beings who genuinely “fall in love” with animals, a love which includes sexual relations, but also such “romantic” elements as tenderness, spiritual affection, and even jealousy.

While living in Europe in the late 1940's, I was reliably informed of an East German ex-nobleman who suffered from this malady. He was in love with a (Harlequin) Great Dane bitch, and maintained a pack of these dogs to keep her company—or did, until he apprehended her copulating, as he felt, adulterously, with a male Dane, whereupon in his jealous rage he slew not just the animal that had cuckolded him but the entire pack (excepting, of course, his beloved though unfaithful mistress).

This gentleman is said to have run at night sometimes with his dogs, traveling on all fours, and to have joined them in such canine activities as chasing rabbits and howling at the moon.

Being a man of considerable wealth, and the owner of an estate which provided him with sufficient privacy and seclusion, he was able to indulge this curious passion until his death (which, probably fortunately, occurred near the end of World War II, and before the Soviets had a chance to dispossess him). The dismissal of his servants, after his strange affection for the bitch had already been noted by them, naturally led to a great deal of gossip and scandal, which eventually escaped the bounds of the state and reached Berlin where, of course, the tale was received with an inordinate delight, and even Hitler is said to have been amused by it. However, though much talked about, the zoophile was not interfered with, a few persons who covertly spied on him from positions of concealment in clumps of bushes and behind trees excepted.

Apart from his bestial perversity, the nobleman gave the appearance of being altogether normal in every respect. Old acquaintances and friends who called on him, expecting to find him raving mad and raveningly lecherous, went away disappointed and often somewhat skeptical as to the truth of the stories circulating about him. Tradesmen and a few other persons with whom he had dealings noticed nothing unusual or eccentric in his behavior. The physician who attended him on occasion found him absolutely lucid and rational; and when this same physician performed an autopsy on the body after

the nobleman's death, he found "no signs of unusual degeneration" of any sort. (What he expected to find in the way of such signs I cannot say.)

There is said to be still in existence a journal left to his heirs by this zoophilic gentleman, but no one has thus far been able to persuade them to release it for publication or even for brief perusal. It is alleged, however, to be of high literary quality, the prose somewhat reminiscent of Rilke's in *Malte Laurids Brigge*, and to describe in a wealth of psychological and other detail the author's "all-consuming love and passion" for his sub-human paramour.

We are told, through mayhap the story is to be taken *cum grano salis*, that upon the zoophile's death the Great Dane bitch languished at his graveside, refused all food, and soon perished. Then, as stipulated in her owner's last will and testament, she was buried in a grave alongside his own. (It would seem that lacking here are only twin rose bushes, arising from each of the two graves and reaching out to intertwine eternally. On the other hand, there are many authenticated cases of dogs pining away in grief at the death of a beloved, though not necessarily zoophilous, master or mistress.)¹⁵

That cases of the sort of the one just summarized are so rare is probably much more surprising than that there should be such cases at all. One would expect to find, at least in the literature of bestiality which is fairly voluminous, quite a number of tales, both authentic and fictional, of human-animal "love affairs." It is not, after all, so incomprehensible that a lonely, unloved, perhaps un-

lovable, individual should lavish upon an animal the emotions and affections which press for expression and which can find no human outlet. Yet the instances of such relationships cited in the literature are extremely few, quite isolated in time and space, and together make up no more than a scant handful, with most of these merely anecdotal.¹⁶

On a more strictly sexual and animalistic plane are the tales one often hears, usually from travelers who in turn have heard them elsewhere, of native women in the jungles of Africa and other remote places who prefer the embraces of monkeys, apes, and sometimes small horses, to those of men, and who are referred to by other natives as the "brides" or "wives" of these animals. It may be that most or even all of such stories are without foundation in fact, but a great many travelers have related them, and tales of encountering human females living in the company of bands of roving apes have been fairly often recounted by persons who claim to have seen the women and their simian or anthropoid consorts with their own eyes.

The counterpart of the phenomenon of human erotic love for animals—the passionate devotion of animals to humans with whom they have been united sexually—receives more frequent mention in the lore and literature of bestiality (perhaps on the basis that animal desire for humans is at least, in a sense, an aspiration to unite with a higher form of life, while zoophilia, on the other hand, is a spiritual descent for and degradation of the human partner). However that may be, there are quite a few

stories, myths, and purported case studies of animals imbued with erotic passions for human lovers, and these are to be found not only in the writings of the antique historians and medieval theologians, where we might expect to find them, but in the works of some reputable modern authors and scientists.

Kinsey, for example, along with other scientists who have traversed this still largely untrodden field, accepts as factual that animals may develop great fondness for humans who have sexual relations with them. Some of these animals, it is said, become exclusive devotees of the bestial relationship, evidencing no further interest in sexual intercourse with their own kind. Kinsey mentions only male dogs that have been masturbated, but similar results have traditionally been described where the intercourse has taken the form of coitus, sodomy, and other practices with a variety of creatures.

Although bestiality (like, on occasion, miscegenation, and no less fallaciously) has been damned on the grounds that it is contrary to nature—the alleged evidence for this being that animals other than (depraved) man do not seek out sexual intercourse apart from their own kind—there is a vast amount of data to prove that this assertion is erroneous. The demonstrable affection conceived by animals for their human sex partners is a further blow to this doctrine unless one argues that the animals have been corrupted and led into unnatural and previously repugnant or unattractive practices which they have come pervertedly to prefer.

Apes and monkeys, as already mentioned, will solicit

the sexual attentions of humans, and this without any known previous experience along such lines. Nor are their advances confined only to humans, since monkeys have been observed to attempt to copulate with such diverse creatures as serpents and skunks. Birds, too, will attempt to mate with members of other species, and generally the phenomenon of attempted cross-breeding is not at all as uncommon in the animal world as was once supposed. Thus, as with homosexuality and other varieties of deviant behavior branded “unnatural” by human legislators, we find that in nature—whence our notion of the “natural” is presumably derived—the activity is almost commonplace.

The ready enthusiasm with which goats and baboons have historically taken to their erotic assignments has been mentioned. We are told, too, of ancient times, that pederastic priests of Baal were wont to sell the services of dogs trained for shameful ends, and that these sodomist-ecclesiastics stood in the entrances of the temples to inquire of every worshiper whether he or she had need for the dog-service.

Creatures of mythology, born according to some authorities as the results of profligate dalliance of humans with beasts, were notoriously lecherous of human females, and the satyr became so renowned in this respect that the medical term “satyriasis”—insatiable male sex desire with persistent erection—still keeps his memory fresh amongst us today. Centaurs also were much enamoured of women, and according to Apollodorus, the centaur Nessus once attempted to ravish Deianira, the wife of Hercules. Her-

cules foiled the onslaught and slew the would-be rapist, but the dying centaur gave Deianira a recipe for a love potion, and when she had concocted it and given it to her husband, it proved a lethal poison. Thereupon, stricken by grief and remorse, she killed herself, and the revenge of the frustrated centaur was complete.

Pasiphae, lustful of the bull but unable to enlist his co-operation save by guile and duplicity, had constructed a hollow cow of brass (or, as some say, of wood) inside of which she was able to arrange herself in such a manner that her vagina was in position to accept the penetration of the bull. The deception was completed by procuring the urine of a heifer in heat and with it anointing the brass cow's vaginal orifice—after which the union was successfully consummated with not unfruitful consequence. (The reasonably erudite reader will recall that De Sade describes a torture in which a hollow elephant with a woman inside is used in this way, though with painful as distinguished from ecstatic effect.)

A well-known Eskimo legend, the meaning of which has always seemed to me obscure, is concerned with the love affair of a young girl and a whale. The girl's brothers attempt to separate her from her lover by spiriting her away in a magic boat, but she manages to leave behind them on the water a trail of objects the whale is able to follow, and at length, spurred on by the whale-like vastness of his ardor, he overtakes the boat and retrieves his human mistress.

Montaigne, to continue on the gargantuan stratum, tells us that Aristophanes once had as his rival for the

affections of a young woman, an elephant. This impassioned pachyderm, when walking in the fruit market at Alexandria, would steal fruit from the stalls and carry it to the one of whom he was enamoured. Moreover, he followed the young woman about like any jealous lover and would "put his truncke into her bosome, and feele her breasts." I am obliged to confess ignorance both of the outcome of this uncommon rivalry, and as to whether the elephant ever managed to attain to further intimacies with the object of his affections.

Lastly, we should consider the case of what is undoubtedly one of history's most notorious canines. He is that dog who claimed the attention of Europe's leading demonologists and theologians by habitually lifting the habits of the holy sisters at the nunnery in the diocese of Cologne, after which he would force them to the ground, lick their inviolable secret parts, and then fall upon them with a lust which always proved irresistible.

The ranks of the demonologists and inquisitors were split asunder by this enterprising beast, some holding that he was a demon, perhaps even the Devil Himself, in dog's form, others that "it was no demon but a righteous dog." This latter point of view was vociferously and vigorously expressed by the great Bodin, who added that he was aware of the case of a woman in Toulouse who cohabited freely with her dog, according to common gossip, and sometimes shamelessly submitted to its embraces even when in public.

The question of whether bestial relations are physically painful to the animal has already been discussed, and

need be touched upon only casually here. It is desirable to investigate more thoroughly, however, the question of the psychological and emotional effects of such intercourse upon animals.

The psychophysiological responses of the animal to sexual contacts with humans are largely, though it would not do to say entirely, dependent upon the methods of approach and consummation, both physical and psychological, employed by the human party to the sexual act.

Thus, most obviously, the human may largely preclude the possibility of physical suffering on the part of the beast by taking commonsense precautions against inflicting such suffering. Generally speaking, it is only through sadism or brutal negligence that the animal is made to suffer in these contacts. It is evident also that a gentle manner will suffice to alleviate much of the psychological discomfort—anxiety, terror, panic, etc.—which the animal might otherwise experience in a situation both strange and sometimes seemingly menacing.

It is well known that most or many animals appear to respond in kind to the mental states of humans with whom they come in contact. Anxiety and tranquility are engendered in the beast by way of the human, particularly so once animal and man are familiar to one another and elementary rapport has been established. Even very large and sometimes ferocious animals—the gorilla and the lion, for example—have often been noted to be psychically susceptible to the mental and emotional states of humans.

In unaccustomed, close physical contact with men and

women, particularly where, as is often the case in bestiality, the human is in a state of unusual excitation, this excitation and contact, especially if the latter consists partly of restraint of the animal, are likely to generate in the animal feelings of anxiety which in some cases may reach the proportions of terror and even panic. On the other hand, it is reported in some cases that sexual excitation and desire for physical contact are responded to in kind. In yet other instances, doubtless the great majority, the psychical and emotional states of the animal are not spectacular and probably blend elements of both anxiety and erotic arousal.

It is particularly worth noting that the animal's response is far more likely to be an erotic one if, as is the case with human females, it has been subjected beforehand to a lengthy period of caresses and what may be called "love play," leading through fondling to the masturbation of the animal and, in some instances, the repeated apposition of the genitalia of the animal to the part of the body of the human with which contact is to be had. The bestialist no less than the human lover must, in other words, and bizarre as it may sound, "woo" the chosen sex-object, in order to allay anxieties, and in order to bring that object to a pitch of erotic arousal similar to his own (animals responding to rape even less satisfactorily, and often with more vigorous resistance, I am told,¹⁷ than women). Where this (arousal process) has been artfully managed and fully accomplished there is not, of course, any longer a question of psychical suffering on the part of the beast. It is further reported by

initiates that animals, again like women, respond to competent erotic training by becoming conditioned eventually to an increasingly swift response to the needs of the sex partner, so that "love play" need not be so prolonged as when the animal was still a novice to the zoophilic relationship.

Perhaps the best evidence that an animal need not suffer either physically or psychologically as the result of human-animal sex contacts is the already discussed observation that animals often tend to become very devoted to the humans with whom they have such contacts, and thereafter may shun intercourse with their own species. While this is, of course, speculation, it seems necessary to assume (on the basis of eliminated alternatives) that the greater pleasure derived by the animal—and it must be greater to induce the animal to forsake sexual relations with its own kind—is largely the product of the psychical and emotional climate of bestiality, to which the beast responds pleasurable. That is to say, it is not at all likely that the superiority of the experience for the animal resides solely or even mainly in the physical aspects of the coition, which may be surely more satisfactorily enjoyed on a purely biological plane with another animal of its own species and opposite sex. Rather, one seems forced to conclude, the animal derives a considerable psychical and/or emotional pleasure from sexual contact with a being of a higher nervous, emotional, and intellectual organization, who is somehow able to provide the animal with non-material rewards which another animal is not able to offer.

We are speaking, of course, probably in the great majority of instances, of *male* animals, which either perform coitus with women, commit sodomy on members of either sex, or which are masturbated (or occasionally fellated) by either men or women. It is these male animals which, by almost all reports, become especially attached to their human lovers, and which may consequently abandon other methods of sexual expression. There are few and perhaps no authentic cases of a female animal that has thus behaved—even our eccentric German nobleman's Great Dane was unfaithful to him, *nicht wahr?*—and there is very little evidence that a female animal can be aroused to any degree of sexual excitation by a human. This has to do largely with the phenomenon of rut or heat characteristic of the female animal, which generally cannot be sexually aroused when out of heat by stimuli of either a physical or psychological variety; and is explained also by the almost unbridgeable gap of the disparity between the sexual organ of the human male and the respective sexual organs of the various female animals with which men commonly attempt to have sexual congress. (Of course, no animal, male or female, can be stimulated to arousal by a human—masturbation apart—until experience has conditioned it thus to respond; but this is not too infrequently true of humans, especially females, also.)

In any case, it is the male animal, most frequently the dog, but sometimes also the monkey, ape, goat, and others, which comes to desire and even prefer erotic intercourse with humans, and which has been observed to

make obvious sexual advances to humans—something only monkeys and apes have ever been reliably reported to do among female animals.

MYTHS, LITERATURE, AND ART

“One constant rule of mythology,” writes Robert Graves (*Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology*), “is that whatever happens among the gods above reflects events on earth.” It is similarly obviously true that whatever happens in the “unreal” worlds of literature and art reflects physical and psychical events in the “real” world of human desires, frustrations, and fulfillments.

Among the ancients, bestiality, as practiced or phantasied on earth, was reflected in the behavior of the gods, who transformed themselves or their mortal love-objects or both into animals, then engaging in sexual acts. In more recent times, fiction and folklore have provided most of the imaginary accounts of bestial intercourse, again reflecting the “real world” cravings and behavior of mankind.

It is, of course, true that in mythology, folklore and fiction, and perhaps especially in fairy tales, the love relations of humans with beasts are usually not *just* that. There are allegorical depths to be fathomed, and magical, theological, and other supernatural aspects to be considered. The animals, especially in myth and fairy tale,

are seldom ever *really* animals, but rather gods or men in animal forms which have been assumed by them purposefully, or which have been forced upon them by means of magical spells, enchantments, and other divine, diabolic, or occult interventions; moreover, these forms may themselves be symbols beyond the symbolism already inherent in the gods.

Nonetheless, and whatever the symbolic or allegoric significance of the narrative, there remains in any story of love or sexual relations between a human on the one hand and a beast on the other, the aspect, primary or secondary, of bestiality. And the bestiality aspect comes increasingly to the fore as the myth or allegory is withdrawn in time from the people whose conscious and unconscious concerns it represented.

For example, the copulations of Leda with the swan, Europa with the bull, and Dia with the stallion, exist today largely, in perhaps the majority of minds cognizant of the stories, on the level of eroticism. Many do not know that in each case the animal was Zeus in bestial form. Many others, who are aware of this, are little concerned with the mythic elements of what has become an imagination stimulating pseudo-historic event: The coition of the woman with the beast.

But even in ancient Greece, and in the Greek-dominated mythology of the Romans, and in the mythologies of other nations and peoples as well, the bestiality aspect of the myth cannot have been totally overshadowed even contemporaneously by other more symbolic meanings. Robert Graves is correct with admirable simplicity: The

doings of the gods *reflect* the desires and actions of mortal men and women. It seems especially clear that where one encounters animal-human sex relations in myth and literature most copiously, bestiality itself will be most widely practiced and thought about. (This observation is confined to civilized peoples.)

Moreover, and it is an important point, the popular concern with human-animal sex contacts, as reflected in myth and literature and in supposedly factual reports of actual behavior, is customarily found to be greatest precisely among those peoples who, at the time when the literature is most abundant, are least repressed and inhibited sexually. This is especially so where the so-called perversions and other exotic forms or methods of erotic union are sought after—for example, the Greeks and Romans of Antiquity, the Europeans (peasants and lower classes) of the period of the witchcraft persecutions, the Arabs and the Turks well up into modern times, and the French and English of the eighteenth century.

If this is true, and if it is also true that myths and dreams—as is often maintained—arise or erupt from a common or similar source in the human unconscious, then we would seem to have raised a significant objection or at least qualification to the view that wild animals and other animals noted for their sexual vigour and generally “free” expression of their erotic urges, are likely to represent in dreams wild, animalistic, or passionate impulses *of which the dreamer is afraid*, and which are presumably exclusive of bestiality desires—and that, more generally, wild animals, along with the “sexy” animals such as goats,

bulls, stallions, etc., may be taken to refer in dreams to libido.

Freud, whose view (in general) this is, has also noted that various animals may function in dreams as genital symbols: "Many of the beasts which are used as genital symbols in mythology and folklore," Freud wrote in his *Interpretation of Dreams*, "play the same part in dreams: e.g., fishes, snails, cats, mice (on account of the pubic hair), and above all those most important symbols of the male organ—snakes. . . ."

None of this is to suggest that wild and other sexually active animals do not sometimes represent anxiety-provoking passions or lusts in dreams (and myths); or to deny that animals may function in myth, folklore, and dream as genital symbols. It is to suggest, however, that these functions are far from being exclusive or even necessarily paramount ones. And we may comment additionally that much less than an adequate amount of attention has been paid to animals in dream, myth, folklore, literature, art, etc., as reflecting interest in or concern with the phenomenon of bestiality itself, though it seems strikingly apparent in some cases (too apparent, too obvious, one supposes) that no other interpretation of the content will do half so well.

If a spinster dreams of erotic relations with a man, or of being attacked in any way by a man, we are likely to take the dream at its sexual face value and regard it as a wish-fulfillment, literal or only very thinly veiled. If, however, she dreams of sexual relations with, say, a goat, or of being attacked by a large dog, we are almost certain to invoke

the shades of ancient historians, myths, and fairy tales, and to superimpose elaborate analyses upon the presumed symbolism of the animal sex partner. Schrenk-Notzing told of a woman who, while masturbating, phantasied herself being covered by a stallion. Such cases—animal sex partners in masturbation phantasies—are also far from rare, and these too send us off on analytic and scholarly safaris in pursuit of the elusive and massively complex symbolic content—which would not be the case were the stallion rather a handsome young man. But it is at least worth considering whether, in a good many cases, the dreamer does not simply desire, as a variant of normal relations and perhaps for more profound reasons, coition with a goat; and whether the stallion is not, in the masturbation phantasy, simply a stallion (that is to say, an erect, indefatigable, and very large phallus adjoined as it happens, to a horse—a creature credited by popular imagination with such virile phallic endowments).¹⁸

Women are said to dream not infrequently of being attacked, sometimes in an overtly sexual way, by wolves. The dream seldom has to do, one supposes—and especially nowadays when “wolf” is a commonplace sexual slang term referring to the erotically aggressive male—with a desire for actual bestial intercourse with that animal. The *improbability* that such intercourse could ever be actually effected is great and, along with the symbolism and mythic and legendary material associated in such wealth with the wolf, inclines us to the belief that the dream-lover is symbolic. A dream of sexual relations with a dog, on the other hand, may be considerably more evi-

dential of desire for exactly such a contact, though of course the dog *may* function as a symbol just as well as may the wolf or some other creature. The point is that it is surely an error to understand *all* animals appearing in sexual dreams and phantasies as symbols. The literal or semi-literal wish-fulfilling dream and phantasy is a reality here as elsewhere, and quite possibly rates first interpretative consideration in cases where, as with a dog, the chances of translating phantasy into action are not too remote.

Norman Haire, as mentioned, and other scholars, have agreed that the prevalence of bestiality in the Greek myths indicates that the Greeks found this relationship attractive, or at least, as Dr. Haire puts it, not revolting. By extension, similar sentiments may be attributed to other peoples whose myths and literature deal extensively with the subject (the crucial point being, in my view, not so much that the behavior is attributed to the gods, as that it is repeatedly dealt with in an imaginative and not unattractive way). In the light of the foregoing, we might now take a look at bestiality as it occurs in mythology, examining some of the myths of various nations and peoples, but especially those of the Greeks and Romans. The survey will be, of course, by no means exhaustive; nor need it be exhaustive to indicate the spirit in which the subject of bestiality was mythologically approached.

In ancient Egypt, the goddess Mut, assuming the form of a cow, was loved by the god Amon. Bast, the cat-goddess, had human lovers, and was a patroness of sexual pleasures and fertility, also protecting her devotees from

venereal diseases. Dog-headed apes (Thoth), cows (Hathor, later Aphrodite), and bulls (Mont, or Menthu) copulated with humans.

The great god Ptah, the Egyptian mythologists related, inseminated a virgin heifer, and as a result of this union was himself reborn as the Bull Apis, which resided at the temple of Ptah where he was tended and revered by the priests. When a sacred bull, supposed to be Ptah or Apis, died, it was mummified after a lavish funeral and buried in an immense tomb of pink granite, after which another bull took its place.

The god Osiris, his body cut into fourteen fragments by Set, was magically put together again and restored to life by Isis, his wife and sister. Missing only, when this restoration was completed, was the god's penis which had been eaten by a crab, the Oxyrhynchid. Isis, enraged at being thus deprived of the phallus of Osiris, cursed eternally the Oxyrhynchid—a curse which resulted in social strife and even warfare among the Egyptians, though that story cannot be related here.

Among the Assyro-Babylonians, Ishtar, goddess of voluptuousness, was worshiped in Erech, city of the sacred courtesans, and when she descended to earth she brought with her an extensive entourage of strumpets. She had innumerable lovers—men, animals, and gods—and whoever lay with her was sure to be rewarded with cruelty or death. In the case of animals, lions seduced by this barbaric and nymphomaniacal goddess later fell into pits where they were impaled on sharp stakes, while stallions

who served her insatiable venery were afterwards condemned to heavy labors, beatings, and starvation.

Chinese mythologists told of a beautiful young woman whose father had been kidnaped by pirates, and who vowed to marry the one who managed to save him. The vow was overheard by her horse, who coveted her lustfully, and who managed to rescue the father and restore him safely to his family. But when the horse came forward to claim the young woman as his wife, the outraged father ordered the animal slain and skinned—an inadequate measure after all, since the skin returned to life and made off with the girl. She was, however, spared the ordeal of becoming the horse's bride when her plight came to the attention of the ever-watchful August Personage of Jade, who turned her into a silkworm and installed her as a favorite among his concubines.

In Teutonic mythology, Valkyries in the forms of swans sometimes mated with men. One of these "swan-maidens" was the Valkyrie Kara, mistress of the mighty warrior Helgi. She customarily accompanied her lover into battle, where she would help him achieve victory for the Icelanders, but one day Helgi raised his sword to smite an enemy and accidentally killed his mistress, Kara, who was flying just overhead. Helgi's sorrow, it is recorded, was not to be assuaged, and endured for the remainder of his tormented life.

The Middle Ages offered the charming tale of Melusina, the water sprite who married Raymond, son of the Count de la Forêt. Six days of the week the beautiful

Melusina lived with Raymond as his wife, but on Saturdays she retired to her tub—her lower body becoming that of a fish or a serpent. Her many children, born of the union, were all monstrously deformed in one way or another, but despite their handicaps distinguished themselves among men by their intelligence and courage.

(There are of course many stories of the unions of men with mermaids, undines, and similar beings. Since the lower bodies of mermaids are those of fish—posing certain problems where copulation with mortal males is concerned—it was necessary to endow these creatures in many cases with the power [possessed by Melusina] of transforming themselves into human form. On the other hand, certain ingenious souls resolved the problem by endowing the mermaids with *two* fish tails, which take the place of legs, and which allow for the female genitalia to be situated between them as with human females. There is an abundance of scientific evidence, or what passed for it in the Middle Ages and some other periods, for the existence of mermaids, including many eye-witness accounts of mermaids and mermen captured or closely observed. The most impressive, however, is the report of seven mermaids and mermen captured by fishermen and turned over to the Jesuits. They were all dissected by Bosquez, physician to the Viceroy of Goa, who described both their internal and external structure, asserting that they were quite similar to human beings. This was in 1560, and the capture took place near the island of Mandar, off Ceylon. Just three decades earlier, another merman had been captured and was presented to Sigismund,

king of Poland, who kept the creature at court for several days, where it was seen by hundreds. The King of Portugal, it is further reported by historians, was once involved in a lawsuit over the possession of a mermaid.)

Turning to the Greeks and the Romans, the bestial amours of Zeus, ascendant to the throne of Olympus, were many and varied. As a bull, he raped Demeter, who bore Persephone, and lay later with Persephone also, though this (incestuous) time in the form of a serpent.

Also as a bull, Zeus lecherously embraced Europa; while in swan form he copulated with Leda—an event much commemorated by artists, including Da Vinci and Michelangelo. In another assault, artistically recaptured by Watteau, he ravished the sleeping Antiope, this time as a satyr, and as a result were born twins, which the mother left to die on a mountainside.

As an eagle, Zeus bore away and made his mistress the nymph Aegina, who gave birth to Aeacus. In the form of a cuckoo, he seduced his sister, Hera, who yielded to him only, however, on the condition that he afterwards marry her.

As a pigeon, Zeus accomplished the seduction of Phthia, and as a stallion he fornicated with Dia, wife of Ixion.

Almost equally ravenous along bestial lines was Poseidon, whose amours are distinctive on two counts: Probably no other deity spawned more or more hideous monsters as a result of his sexual unions. Poseidon was also given to assuming beast form in order to ravish women also transformed into beasts.

Thus, as a stallion he overpowered and ravished De-

meter, who had assumed the shape of a mare in an attempt to escape him. Two offsprings were born—a daughter, and Arion, a wild horse with human right feet and the power of speech. Demeter, it may be added, could claim the disinction of having been raped once by a bull (Zeus), and once by a stallion (Poseidon). Probably no other goddess could make that statement.

Also in the form of a horse, Poseidon gained carnal knowledge of Medusa—an event which occurred in the temple of Athene; and it was for this profanation that Athene punished Medusa by turning her hair into writhing serpents.

Like Demeter, Theophane was transformed into an animal—though by Poseidon himself—and as a ewe received his embraces, the god having taken the form of a ram. Of their union was born the famous ram with the golden fleece.

Other animals and monstrous beings could claim Poseidon as their paternal procreator, including the Molionids, the Aloadae, and the Cyclops Polyphemus, whose single eye was put out by Odysseus.

It was also Poseidon's doing that Pasiphae conceived her raging passion for the bull, which the god instilled in her after being angered by her husband, Minos, king of Crete. As a result of Pasiphae's impudicity was born, of course, the Minotaur—a monster with the upper body and head of a bull, the lower body of a man, destined to be slain by the hero Theseus.

Hermes, pander and procurer for Zeus, homosexual seducer of youths, and the god credited with bringing the

gift of masturbation to mankind, was himself a bestialist, lying as a he-goat with Penelope, who bore Pan—though that is only one of many accounts of the god Pan's origin.

Arcadia was sexually assaulted by a bull, which was slain by Argus. Pan assumed the form of a white ram the better to seduce Selene, the moon-goddess. The centaur Eurytion sought to ravish Hippodameia, bride of Peirithous, king of the Lapiths, but was thwarted, and as a consequence the Centaurs and the Lapiths fought a bloody battle, with the Centaurs being defeated and driven into exile.

The Centaurs, half-men, half-horses, were said by some to have come into being when Centaurus—spawn of the union of Ixion with a cloud in the form of Hera—coupled bestially with mares. The Centaurs, remembered for their lechery far more than the Satyrs, were lascivious, cruel and drunken, forever inflamed by lust, rapists by predilection.

The god Apollo, in serpent form, indulged his lubricity with Atys, and as a tortoise achieved yet other amorous successes. The wind god Boreas took stallion shape to mate with mares, and resulting were the dozen famous light-footed horses who could run over the sea without wetting their feet. The sirens, half-bestial creatures, were notorious succubi, preying upon mortal men, who were afterwards destroyed.

Atalanta, daughter of Iasus, was suckled by a bear and raised by hunters. Herself a huntress, she struck down two Centaurs, Rhaecus and Hylaeus, who attempted forcibly to penetrate her. Later, she was turned into a lion, along

with her husband, for the crime of profaning the temple of Zeus.

The temple of Faunus, or Lupercus, was situated at the grotto where the she-wolf suckled Romulus and Remus, founders of Rome. There, priests, disguised as animals in the skins of goats, dogs, and wolves, flagellated and fornicated with women desirous of fecundation. Faunus himself, according to Ovid, was an ever-concupiscent deity who once attempted, by mistake, to rape Hercules, the latter having playfully changed clothing with his mistress, Omphale. It is recorded that Hercules, an undeviating heterosexual and athlete of the boudoir who once deflowered and cudgeled to climax all fifty daughters of Thespis in a single night, saw little humor in the mistaken identity and, outraged, thrashed Faunus soundly for his attempted assault. One recalls, too, that the orgiastic festivities in honor of Fauna—wife, daughter, or both, of Faunus—were renowned as being even more frenetically lubricious than the Lupercalia of Faunus himself.

The Silvanus, a satyr-like Latin divinity physically resembling Pan, was an agricultural, or aboricultural, god whose father, a shepherd, sired him by spilling his seed in a she-goat.

And so on. The list could be much extended, but the examples are doubtless sufficient (save for placating those whose interest in these matters perhaps transcends legitimate scholarly boundaries).

Apart from myths, and an abundance of folklore—largely, and lamentably in this case, not set down by au-

thors—there are many literary works dealing to some extent with, or skirting the edges of, bestiality. There are also paintings, sculptures, films, outright pornography, sermons, moralizings, occultist works, philosophizings, scholarly and scientific treatises, and so on—an impressive mass of material when one considers the supposed comparative rarity of, and lack of general interest in, the phenomenon of bestiality.

The *Psychopathia Sexualis* of Krafft-Ebing was the prototype for many subsequent catalogues of sexual aberrations, some of them obviously more literary than “scientific,” which describe cases of persons who have come to the attention of physicians and/or the law as a result of engaging in bestial relationships. However, bestiality tends to receive even less than its due, which is relatively slight, in such encyclopaedic volumes, where male and female homosexuality, sadism and masochism, fetichism, and similarly oft-encountered deviations receive, appropriately, most of the space and the author’s best efforts. Nor is the short shrift accorded bestiality in the comprehensive works compensated for, as is the case with most esoteric facets of eroticism, by a special technical literature; of works in the English language dealing exclusively with bestiality, I am acquainted only with four, and of these only one in any way pretends or intends to adequately survey the subject.

Three are slender booklets: *Bestiality and the Law*, and *Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times*, both by Niemoller; and *Animal Contacts* by that prolific pamphleteer, Dr. D. O. Cauldwell. All three booklets were

published by the late Haldeman-Julius and are still rather easy to obtain. The fourth is a full-length work, *Bestiality*, by Gaston Dubois-Desaulle, published in a limited edition of two thousand copies by the Panurge Press, New York, in 1933. The book was written at a considerably earlier date, but the well-informed notes supplied by the translator are helpful in bringing it up to date as of the time of publication. Even now, in 1960, *Bestiality* remains the best—indeed, the only—major source book in English for students of this subject. Unfortunately, copies are rather expensive and difficult to come by, and it might be hoped that the book will be reissued and further “modernized” in the light of contemporary writings of psychologists, anthropologists, attorneys, and others who have, since the early 1930’s, shed additional illumination on the subject from their respective vantage points.

Of literary works dealing with human-animal sex relationships, in a major way or only slightly, the following list can be compiled, but again the list is not at all intended to be exhaustive: *The Golden Ass* of Apuleius, *The Arabian Nights*, *The Pentameron*, Mace’s *l’Abbe en belle humor*, Balzac’s famous desert love tale of the soldier and the pantheress, Louis Noir’s *Le Lion du Sudan*, Charpentier’s *Le Roman d’un Singe*, Emile Dodillon’s *Hemo*, Rachilde’s *l’Animale*, Scheffer’s *La Charmeuse*, Crowley’s *White Stains*, *Memoirs of a Russian Princess*, Beardsley’s *Venus and Tannhäuser*, Herbert’s *A Night in a Moorish Harem*, Robinson Jeffers’ *Roan Stallion*, Clement Wood’s *The Monkey*, the anonymous

Lascivious Hypocrite, Djuna Barnes's *Nightwood*, March Hastings' *Obsessed*, Jean Dutourd's *A Dog's Head*, Mandiargues' *The Girl Beneath the Lion*, R. E. L. Masters' *Mishka Rediscovered*, W. B. Yeats' *Leda and the Swan*, and many others—including, especially, a host of pornographic novels not generally available.

An example of bestiality as it occurs in the pornographic novel is to be found in *The Lascivious Hypocrite*, mentioned above, where a woman copulates with a dog for the benefit of enraptured voyeurs. The novel, *A Dog's Head*, is of interest in that it explores, by means of a half-animal hero who is attracted to both canine and human females, the problem of man's relationship to other animals generally; and considers also, from this imaginative perspective, man's body-mind dualism, the problem of man's "animal nature," etc. In addition to the above-mentioned works I have encountered on several occasions references to a recent and reportedly superior French novel which relates the erotic love of a young girl for a stallion, but unfortunately I cannot give the title of this work, having been unable to track it down.

It has been suggested that another example of bestiality in literature is to be found in Poe's *Murders in the Rue Morgue*, but I personally find this assertion about as plausible as I would find the view that zoophilia is the dominant theme of Burroughs' *Tarzan and the Apes* series. Bestiality, or other perverse content, has also been attributed to such children's favorites as *Little Red Riding-Hood* and *Beauty and the Beast*—and in the case of the latter, some of the illustrations produced from

time to time in connection with this charming tale would clearly indicate that it is at least subject to that interpretation in some minds. Where the other story is concerned, we are told both that Little Red Riding-Hood "likes the wolf in bed," and that there is more to the wolf's devouring of grandma than the discerning childish reader admits to his more inhibited and therefore less perceptive elders. I, however, am here inclined to go along with Dr. F. S. Perls, as quoted in Eisler's *Man Into Wolf*, who asserts that the wolf's eating of granny has nothing to do with sex: The wolf is simply hungry, and in that prosaic fashion is related to an empty belly. However, the story is a very interesting one, certainly lending itself to a variety of interpretations, and when so perceptive a writer as Djuna Barnes manages to find something subtle, sexual, and sinister in it, we should hesitate to assert dogmatically that what she finds is altogether absent.

Phyllis and Eberhard Kronhausen (*Pornography and the Law*) observe that bestiality is an almost invariable and essential ingredient of the obscene book. They further remark that such subject matters as human-animal sex contacts is very likely to run afoul of censors and other vigilant guardians of the public morals—one reason, certainly, for the paucity of zoophilic and zooerastic material in American fiction.

Bestiality is also a stock ingredient of collections of obscene and pornographic photographs and drawings, and, less commonly—owing, one supposes, to casting difficulties—is encountered in pornographic or obscene motion pictures. In this regard, the eminent sexologist Iwan

Bloch discovered that especially popular among the salacious photos and French postcards of his day were those portraying acts of sodomy (one supposes that the gamut of bestial relations, and not just anal intercourse, is meant by "sodomy") between humans on the one hand and asses, monkeys, and dogs on the other. The present-day variety of pornographic (bestiality) photos is perhaps greater than in Bloch's time, though still less than extensive as compared to the range of photographic portrayal of some other sexual deviations.

Human-animal sex intercourse was long a favorite subject of theologians, who titillated their congregations of readers and pewsitters with descriptions, often graphic, of such unconscionable and damnable lubricities. Dingwall (*The American Woman*) tells us, for example, that the erotopathic witch-hunter Cotton Mather, as we might expect, was much concerned with this matter.

"Mather tells one tale," writes Dingwell, "of a man whom everybody believed to be a saintly character until his particular predilections were made public. We do not know why this husband and father seemed to prefer the lower creation, but Mather assures us that he had had a cow, two heifers, three sheep and two sows, whilst his wife had actually seen him having relations with a bitch and his son had once caught him 'hideously conversing with a sow.'"

It is not unlikely that Mather drew the inspiration for his account of this detestable and heinous career of vice from a then recent case in Scotland, rather than from amongst the ranks of his own flock of sheep. The case

was that of Major Thomas Weir, a prominent evangelical leader and pillar of community life, who was executed in 1670, when he was a septagenarian, after confessing to bestiality, incest, and assorted other enormities.

As early as 1651—nineteen years previous to his confession—this eminent holy man had been apprehended whilst sodomizing a mare by a woman who lodged a complaint against him. So hallowed was his reputation, however, that he was not only able to evade punishment or even suspicion himself, but was able to have his accuser flogged through the streets of Lanark by a hangman, as was only appropriate for the chastisement of one conceiving so base and baseless a slander.

Weir had already been careless where incest was concerned. He had been caught in bed with his sister years before by his sister-in-law, who revealed at Weir's trial that when she happened upon the brother and sister they were "lying together in the barn at Wicket-Shaw, and that they were both naked in the bed together, and that she was above him, and that the bed did shake, and that she heard some scandalous language between them."

In view of the treatment accorded his other accuser, Weir's sister-in-law did well, at the time of her discovery of the incest, to keep silent. And it was not until he was seventy-six years of age, and confessed, that Weir's life of pious hypocrisy and outrageous crime, hitherto veiled by an aura of sanctity, came to light. He was then, on his own confession, charged with attempting to rape his sister Jane when she was ten, and with incestuously cohabiting with her from her sixteenth through her fiftieth

year, when he “loathed her for her age”; also with incestuously lying with his stepdaughter, Margaret Bourdon; with several and diverse adulteries; with clandestine copulations, over a period of twenty years, with his serving maid; and with bestiality with mares and cows. Though he was not formally accused of it, testimony also indicated that Weir was a powerful sorcerer, heretic and blasphemer, and a consulter of witches, necromancers, devils, and other disreputable and diabolic persons and spirits.

It is generally believed nowadays—as indeed it was by a good many at the time—that old Major Weir was insane, and that his offenses were all or mostly imaginary.¹⁹

If we are to define pornography as that which by intent (conscious or unconscious) has the primary effect of titillating the erotic sensibilities, then it is at once apparent that preachers and other theologians have probably been the most persistent and ardent pornographers to be found in any distinguishable group within the ranks of humanity. Certainly, theological writings down the ages include a sizable portion of the obscenity created by man, the writings of Catholic theologians and the recorded lives of the saints being especially noteworthy in this respect.

As for bestiality, where can one find it dealt with more often, at greater length, or more passionately and leerily than in the writings of the fathers of the Church? And how, one wonders—as if one did not know—are the censors able so consistently to overlook these facts?

The *art* of bestiality is more extensive than the creative literature, and only a few examples will be mentioned.

Many others are to be found in such works as the famous *Bilder Lexikon der Erotik*, *Titanen Erotik*, *Japanischen Erotik*, and similar volumes, and in the world's larger collections of erotica. Additionally, one may find a good many examples of art works portraying bestiality, and the related "demoniality," in the works of the classical demonologists and other writers on witchcraft. A notion of this latter class of works may be obtained from an excellent current volume, Robbins' *Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology*.

Of the more famous paintings, we have already mentioned Da Vinci's *Leda and the Swan*, which is innocuous, the *Leda* of Michelangelo, which was presumably more potent, and a number of paintings by lesser artists dealing with this same mythological incident. The *Leda and the Swan* of Michelangelo, unfortunately, was destroyed by a puritanical minister of Louis XIII, after the Duke of Ferrara, who commissioned the painting, had sent it to France, to the court of Francis I, for fear that it would fall into the hands of the Inquisition.

Mention has been made, too, of the *Antiope and Satyr*, painted by Watteau, which now hangs in the Louvre. An *Abduction of Europa* is to be seen at the National Museum, Palermo, and I am uncertain whether this painting is Titian's, also called *Rape of Europa*, or another. There is also a *Rape of Deianira*, by Pollaiuolo, and a great many other paintings might be listed of women in more or less specifically sexual relation to centaurs, satyrs, and other half-bestial mythical beings, of which Rubens' *Nymphs and Satyrs* is one of the more fa-

mous examples. Pasiphae and the Bull, like Leda and the Swan, was a favorite subject of Renaissance painters, and quite a few of these works are still to be seen in the various European galleries and museums.

Sex lore, myths, art works, etc., dealing with the intercourse of women with snakes are usually to be understood as allegorical, the snake being symbolic—representing the phallus, the principle of evil, or whatever—but that is not to say that every representation of this kind is to be understood as symbolic. We know, for example, that the snake—and the crocodile and lizard, which sometimes substitute for the snake in myth and dreams—has been used sexually by humans. In the Berlin *Museum für Volkerkunde* there are or were several sculptures with this subject matter, though whether they refer to myths or actual happenings or are to be understood still otherwise I have not attempted to determine. One carved wooden figure is of a crocodile inserting his snout into a woman's vagina; another is of a crocodile emerging from a woman's vulva; while a third is a representation of a snake preparing to make its entrance into a human vagina.

The Naples Museum has or had a highly regarded piece of marble statuary found at Herculaneum, which affords the spectacle of a satyr having sexual relations with a goat. Somewhat similarly, the Renaissance poet and diplomat Aretino noted that in the Palazzo Chigi there was a sculpture of a "marble satyr attempting a boy." Whether the work still exists, I cannot say. But Aretino, arguing from this work and its acceptance, made a plea

for freedom from prudishness and hypocrisy in the arts, urging specifically that human sexual intercourse be recognized as an appropriate subject for the painter and sculptor. ("What is the harm if we see how a man mounts a woman? Shall animals enjoy more freedom than men?")

In the temples of India, too, are to be found some notable examples of sculpture, the figures being humans in sexual connection with animals (and with other humans, both children and adults). A famous Gothic cathedral once sported a naked nun erotically besieged by monkeys.

In addition to the erotic episodes in frankly pornographic motion pictures which display women, and occasionally men and children, in intercourse with animals—usually dogs and ponies—there have been produced a large number of popular films which suggest in varying degrees of specificity the possibility of bestial intercourse, usually brought about by kidnapping and subsequent rape (which last would occur if the heroine were not, as she invariably is, rescued just in time to prevent it).

A good many examples of the cinematic art have been produced, for instance, in which women are carried off into the jungles by apes and gorillas, and that these scenes are very popular with audiences is made clear by the frequency with which they are selected to illustrate the large posters found in the fronts of the theaters where the films are being shown. Even so, I wonder if we may assume, as some writers on the subject have, that the majority of the audiences are consciously responding to an erotic (bestiality) situation—that they expect the women to be ravished by the animals. It may well be

that a good many spectators, consciously or unconsciously, do entertain such precisely defined erotic expectations, but I think it equally likely that a good many others do not, deriving their thrills, instead, from the anticipation that the women will be killed, agonizingly, of course (which may also afford erotic gratification to the spectator, but in a somewhat different way than most amateur analysts suppose).

Closely related are the so-called monster movies, or horror films, where the heroine, usually in a filmy negligee or with clothing revealingly torn or dishevelled, is borne off by Frankenstein's monster, the Wolf Man, the Mummy, the Mole Man, or some similar creature. Here the erotic element is more manifest—perhaps because the monster may in most cases be presumed to have human or human-like genitalia and more nearly human desires—and is probably understood by a considerably greater portion of the audience, including the children who especially appreciate, as evidenced by their attendance, productions of this kind.

A film like the ever-popular *King Kong*, a classic of the genre, raises some special questions. The heroine is an attractive young woman, scantily attired (clothing ripped to expose one breast, etc.); the giant ape Kong is obviously attracted to her in a way that can scarcely be other than erotic; but the sexual element is discouraged (intentionally minimized or kept in check?) by the extreme disparity between the physical dimensions of Kong on the one hand and those of the girl on the other. One wonders, indeed, if much of the film's appeal is not bound

up with this (actually somewhat tragic) situation in which the monstrous Kong finds himself loving a human female who can neither return his affection nor fulfill his desires.

In most of such films the spectator is able to find pretty much what he wants (and is equipped) to find. The possibility of a strongly erotic interpretation is unquestionably present, but the film may still be understood and appreciated if the eroticism is excluded from the spectator's appreciation. For this and other reasons I would suggest that it is an error to insist that bestiality is necessarily present and well-defined in a great many jungle, travel, and monster films; or to insist, at any rate, that the films must be understood in this way, and that the audiences, in large part, so understand them. Unless the eroticism is quite explicit, and it rather rarely is, we should consider that it is more a matter of the spectator bringing the bestiality motif to the film than of the film offering this motif as more than an alternative interpretative possibility to the spectator.

In concluding this particular discussion, I think it may be said without fear of serious challenge that bestiality appeals greatly to the human imagination, which is not to suggest that this implies a general desire for active participation. But it is a matter of record that bestiality has appealed, esthetically as subject matter for their work, to some of the very greatest writers and artists, and to many lesser minds and talents. There is something strangely beautiful in the vision of Leda's submission to the swan, and in similar scenes wherein women are embraced by stallions, bulls, and the great cats. The

mating of man and ape has about it the esthetic allure of the grotesque.

It has been said that bestiality is "a vice of clodhoppers," but it must be acknowledged that it is equally, in phantasy at least, the pleasure of the most highly developed imaginations and the keenest esthetic sensibilities.

PSYCHICAL BESTIALITY

By "psychical bestiality" I mean practices which yield erotic gratification or stimulation as a result of behavior in which animals figure, but in which there is no direct physical sexual contact between the human and the beast.

This would include, for example, sexual stimulation, sometimes to orgasm, as a result of watching animals copulate with one another—a practice to which has been given the formidable nonmenclature "mixoscopic zoophilia"; similar stimulation derived from watching exhibitions of bestiality; masturbation phantasies of animal-human or animal-animal sex relations; day-dreaming to orgasm or excitation with bestiality phantasies; fur or (animal) hair fetichism; bestiality in books, art works, or photographs experienced as an erotic stimulus; nocturnal emissions with bestiality the subject of the dream;²⁰ phantasies of animal torture with accompanying stimulation;

erotic phantasies of humans attacked and mutilated by beasts; and so on. Of these, only the first two—gratification or stimulation derived from exhibitions of animal-animal and animal-human sex contacts—will be discussed at any length here.

Exhibitions of animal intercourse have always been popular, and were especially so in modern times in France and England of the eighteenth century, when the nobility (as was also true of the Renaissance) particularly delighted in witnessing the copulations of stallions with mares.

Havelock Ellis, in *The Psychology of Sex*, related a number of interesting cases of persons sexually excited and/or otherwise gratified by the spectacle of animal intercourse. In this regard he correctly observed that “the coupling of the larger animals is often an impressive and splendid spectacle which is far, indeed, from being obscene, and has commended itself to persons of intellectual distinction.” He also noted however, and again correctly, that such sights may be, especially where “ill-balanced minds” are concerned, both prurient and morbid.²¹

As an instance of the latter, he cites the case of a nun, “sexually hyperaesthetic,” who was powerfully aroused by the sight, or even the recollection, of flies in sexual connection. Ever since childhood, such a sight had caused her to masturbate compulsively, and she recalled having this experience, after becoming a nun, more than four hundred times.

As instances of highly-developed intellects and sensibilities attracted to the spectacle of the intercourse of

animals, Ellis cites the Countess of Pembroke and the rather notorious Pope Alexander VI (and his daughter, Lucrezia Borgia):

“The Countess of Pembroke, Sir Philip Sidney’s sister, appears to have found sexual enjoyment in the contemplation of the sexual prowess of stallions. Aubrey writes that she ‘was very salacious and she had a contrivance that in the spring of the year . . . the stallions . . . were to be brought before such a part of the house where she had a vidette to look on them.’ . . . Although the modern editor’s modesty has caused the disappearance of several lines from this passage, the general sense is clear. In the same century (the fifteenth) Burchard, the faithful secretary of Pope Alexander VI, describes in his invaluable diary how four race horses were brought to two mares in a court of the Vatican, the horses clamorously fighting for the possession of the mares and eventually mounting them, while the Pope and his daughter Lucrezia looked on from a window ‘cum magno risu et delectatione.’ . . .”²² To this we will append the datum that several of the Roman emperors, also men of highly developed imaginations and esthetic sensibilities, took similar delight in spectacles of animal copulations, and of bestial connections as well.

Sexual arousal at the sight of animals copulating has been reported by a great many persons, both famous and obscure, who have added that such arousal leads sometimes to acts of bestiality, sometimes to masturbation, and occasionally to heterosexual coitus with anyone available. (That this latter result may be forthcoming has always

been well known to operators of houses of prostitution, who have staged exhibitions of animal coitus and of bestiality for the express purpose of stimulating the carnal appetites of their patrons and thus inducing them to avail themselves of the services of the waiting ladies of pleasure.) That witnessing animal intercourse may have a somewhat loftier effect is evidenced by the case of the late Wilhelm Reich. Dr. Reich, we are told, was motivated by his boyhood interest in such phenomena to pursue a scientific career, which he did with the greatest distinction.

Havelock Ellis found a symbolic character present in spectacles of animal coition, and an "association by resemblance; the animal sexual act recalls the human sexual act; the animal becomes the symbol of the human being." ²⁸

This observation, which will be found to be true in at least a sizable number of cases, raises an interesting question: To what extent does the human individual participating in an act of bestiality regard the animal sex partner as a *person*?

There is probably no sexual anomaly which does not in some sense, in at least some cases, posit its object as human or as related to the human. In bestiality this occurs when human qualities, especially emotional ones, are anthropomorphically and/or empathetically attributed to the beast.

Even when, to take a very extreme example, the tail of a fish is inserted into a woman's vagina and she derives gratification from its squirming movements, we are in

fact dealing with a variety of masturbation, in this case with a kind of verge or penis-substitute, the use of which implies an awareness of the human sex partner as absent and therefore compensated for by the employment of an object which is used in lieu of the missing phallus and thus invested with certain of its attributes.

But to return to bestiality in its more common forms, when it is not merely masturbation with only a substitute for the human penis; here, the bestialist substitutes the animal for another person in at least some sense. In extreme cases, he woos it, as he might woo another person, with caresses and love play, attempting to excite it. He anticipates that the animal will derive gratification from its intercourse with him, as another person would, and he is disappointed if this reaction does not occur. In general, he attributes to the animal partner a variety of human, as distinguished from animal, emotional and even intellectual capacities and responses—in short, regards it as a personality, a human-like consciousness which differs from him erotically more in form than in spirit. This is, in part, why individuals are able to “fall in love” with animals, especially with those animals with which they have had repeated sexual experiences (and repeated opportunity to expand and perfect the personalization process). Such anomalous falling in love, or zoophilia, would usually not occur if a more or less humanistic consciousness and emotionality were not attributed to the animal which, by virtue of this humanization, in addition to its ready compliance with the human sex desires, is able to fulfill in at least some measure the

role of a human love-object. (It is even an inducement for the zoophile, in some cases, that the beast's "fidelity" is [optimistically] regarded as certain; and that, where human females especially are concerned, there is no likelihood of an unwanted pregnancy resulting from the relationship, though this last is, of course, a practical consideration, distinct from the problem of anthropomorphism.)

On the other hand, the animal-as-animal exerts its appeal also in bestiality relationships, and especially so, one supposes, in the case of the more intelligent and imaginative spectator whose appreciation is in large part based precisely upon the idea of the union of the man or the woman with the beast.

The voluptuary, the roué, and the sophisticate, not lacking in opportunities for human sex contacts, are not at all likely to resort to the humanization of animals by either spectator association or participant anthropomorphism. For who, after all, craving voyeuristic stimulation, and able to observe the more intricate and skillful and—if so regarded—depraved love-making of humans, would substitute for this experience the witnessing of the copulations of animals *if* the animals were then to be humanized through an "association by resemblance" such as Ellis suggested?

Exhibitions of human-animal sex intercourse have never received the psychological analysis and other attention they quite richly merit. It is true that research in this area would present many problems, but the insight achieved might well be worth the trouble. Besti-

ality exhibitions have been popular throughout recorded human history, and it is evident therefore, that they fulfill profound psychological cravings on the part of the spectators, and perhaps on the part of the human participants as well.

Looking at the matter only superficially, it is probably safe to suppose that these spectacles are enjoyed, (1) because of their bizarre erotic character which appeals to the imagination, and especially to the visual esthetic sense; (2) there is a strong element of sadistic gratification for the spectator, resulting from the assumed degradation of the prostitute through her contact with a lower animal; (3) cravings for bestial intercourse may be vicariously appeased, without the guilt which would be engendered if the spectator himself (or herself) participated in such an encounter; and (4) there is the pleasurable sexual excitation which results from watching almost any kind of erotic behavior, experienced by most persons who are not, as a result of artificially imposed moral inhibitions, conditioned to revulsion or strong disapproval or the upwelling of painful guilt feelings. There is, of course, also the true voyeur, for whom such spectacles are a means to complete sexual gratification; and doubtless many other motivations and sources of gratification could also be mentioned.

As for the prostitute or other person coupling with the animal under these conditions, it is likely that (1) masochistic cravings are satisfied by means of the implied degradation which is greatly intensified by the fact that an audience bears witness to the "shame" of the partici-

pant; (2) exhibitionistic urges may be gratified; (3) there may be considerable indifference to the performance on the part of the prostitute, whose only conscious motive may be a desire for financial reward (while no profound unconscious needs or purposes are involved); and (4) there may be actual erotic gratification, accompanied probably by one or more of the aforementioned responses, but with paramount emphasis on the physical and psychological pleasures resulting from the act as experienced apart from any responses contingent upon the other factors mentioned. Again, it is to be assumed that thorough analysis, based upon extensive on-the-spot observations, interviews, etc., would yield other motivations and sources of gratification.

Additionally, it would be most illuminating to learn the ease or difficulty with which animals are taught to perform under the conditions of the bestiality exhibition—conditions which may vary greatly, ranging from the boisterous climate of the “smoker” to the sultry exoticism encountered in brothels catering to a sensualistic clientele whose voluptuousness is greatly refined.

BESTIALITY AS PERVERSION

In general, the perverted individual will be defined here as one who, for whatever reason, has been diverted from the normal path of heterosexuality and who is,

therefore, unable to express himself (or herself) sexually with, or to feel loving toward, a normal opposite-sex love-object. At the same time, the path of normal love and normal sexuality being closed to him, he has broken—or, better, irrupted—through the barriers erected against his love and his sexuality, but in an abnormal or deviant way, so that the course his love and/or sexuality takes is toward an abnormal love-object. The sex pervert is thus a man or woman who (1) is unable to love and to derive sexual gratification from a normal love-object; and (2) possesses desires, equally as intense as those of the normal individual, for an abnormal love-object. This object is determined in its nature not by any vicious volition of the pervert but by psychological or physiological factors, or a combination of these—inborn, acquired, or both.

For the practical purposes of the discussion to follow, this view does not differ much from the more common one that the sexual perversion is a form or mode of sexual activity which, for the deviate, supplants the heterosexual coitus regarded as the normal and healthy method of sexual expression natural to mankind. Also, in this common view, in true sexual perversion the perverted individual usually has no desire for normal coitus, or is unable to obtain gratification from it or to perform it, and instead must, or at least greatly prefers to, obtain his sexual gratification from the mode of sexual activity peculiar to his perversion.

By either view, and by most others as well, there is no such thing, speaking precisely, as a perverted sexual act;

rather, there are only the sexual acts of perverted persons, which are called “perverted acts” for reasons of linguistic convenience—a facility purchased at the expense both of accuracy and justice. When we understand clearly that the perversion resides in the pathological psychology of the pervert, of which in his case the act is a symptom, then we will understand, too, that the behavior is diseased because the individual is diseased—and not the reverse. That is to say, it is not necessarily true that we may infer from a specific sexual act, even an extreme one, which happens to be the one performed by a certain kind of pervert, that all acts of this kind are perversions and that all individuals who engage in such acts are perverted.

This is especially clear in the case of bestiality. It is true that there is a perversion—bestiality (or zoophilia)—in which the pervert’s desires are exclusively, or customarily and preferentially, and for reasons beyond the individual’s control, directed towards animals rather than towards humans of the opposite sex who are desired as partners in coition. However, and as should have been made clear by now, in considering all acts of sexual intercourse with animals we find that only a small minority of these are performed by perverted individuals—that is, by those who can only obtain gratification in this way, or who are only feebly stimulated by the sex-object socially and legally regarded as legitimate. (The injustice stemming from the linguistic convenience mentioned above results, of course, from the fact that when we customarily speak of a particular act as being perverted,

or a perversion, then we habitually go on from there to assume that whoever engages in the so-called perversion is a pervert—which is obviously not the case.)

But if we thus distinguish between pervert and non-pervert, and classify as perverted only those who fulfill the conditions of the definition, do we not then deprive the non-pervert offender of what might be his only defense—that his is “a medical problem”—against a charge of outright viciousness and corruption? Under present legislation, which deals erroneously in “perverted acts,” and which, almost all authorities agree, is outmoded and based upon notions of what is sinful rather than, rationally, upon what is socially deleterious, it might well be that this is the case. (Though, of course, it is not quite so simple as all that, and such words as “vicious” and “corrupt” can, in any case, scarcely be brought into play with validity. And moreover, however much my sympathies may lie with the individual subjected to irrational legalistic persecutions as the result of a minor transgression, it is still not my task here to refrain from pursuing factuality in order to leave standing loopholes through which the offender may slip to avoid punishment, however unjust.)

Of the cases of bestiality mentioned in the foregoing brief historical survey it will probably be accepted by almost everyone that many are by no stretch of the imagination instances of sexual perversion. I refer to human-animal sex relationships practiced as a means to other than erotic gratification, such as religious bestiality, in which the sex act is a metaphysically meaningful ritual or

an act of worship; magical bestiality, in which the purpose is to generate magical "currents," divine the future, effect material changes in the world, etc.; and therapeutic bestiality, as a cure for venereal and other diseases. That in some cases magic, ritual, and therapy may have been rationalizations, mere devices for legitimizing the otherwise forbidden, may be granted. But there is no basis for arguing that this was true in more than a small minority of the cases whereas there are many reasons for assuming that bestiality was in fact primarily a means to the desired supernatural or therapeutic end.

Apart from the cases where bestiality is a means to a non-sexual end, we have already distinguished a variety of classes or types of individuals who at any given time may be found to be engaging in animal contacts, and who provide us with a multiplicity of motivations.

"Three conditions," wrote Havelock Ellis, "have favored the extreme prevalence of bestiality: (1) primitive conceptions of life which built up no great barrier between man and other animals; (2) the extreme familiarity which necessarily exists between the peasant and his beasts, often combined with separation from women; (3) various folk-lore beliefs such as the efficacy of intercourse with animals as a cure for venereal diseases, etc."

While we may wonder what Ellis meant by "extreme prevalence," the rest of the statement seems clear enough, and is all right as far as it goes. That it does not, unfortunately, go far enough was the result of Ellis' belief that ". . . this offense is usually committed either by persons who are morbidly abnormal or who are of so low

a degree of intelligence that they border on feeble-mindedness." ²⁴

Obviously, the majority of persons who have had some experience of bestiality do not fit either category, though, with some reservations about the near-feeble-mindedness, the majority of *habitual* practitioners probably would. But by far the larger proportion of all those who have had one or more experiences of a sexual nature involving animals are neither abnormally feeble-minded nor morbidly abnormal; they are, rather, normally sensual persons without strong inhibitions against such contacts who have found themselves in situations where desire coincided with opportunity for gratification by means of bestiality.

Ellis also neglected an important, though a minority, class, whose components include the jaded voluptuaries, the highly imaginative individuals for whom bestiality is an esthetic as well as an erotic experience, the sexually amoral and curious individuals for whom the act may be said, without facetiousness, to serve an educational purpose, and so on. Intellectually, persons making up a group of this kind are at the opposite extreme in many cases from the feeble-minded peasant, and they are not necessarily abnormally morbid, or morbidly abnormal, either, unless one fallaciously infers that the mere fact of participation in the tabooed behavior makes them so. Representatives of the same group will be found to be participants, at least occasionally, in most of the other more exotic sex practices, and some of the greatest names, especially the literary and artistic ones, of any given

period will always be numbered among them. If epithets are to be here applied, we ought perhaps to speak of such persons as “polymorphous perverse,” or almost so, rather than merely sexually perverted.

Dubois-Desaulle correctly noted many years ago that bestiality need not be taken to imply sexual perversion:

“Bestiality,” he wrote, “does not always take its origin in psychopathological conditions. A complete absence of morality or an irresistible sexual impulse which cannot be satisfied naturally are sometimes the principal reasons for this satisfaction against nature that is met with among men and more rarely among women.” (To which we must add that “complete absence of morality” is, of course, too strong, and that what should be understood, rather, is the absence of overwhelming moral inhibitions against this particular method of erotic gratification.)

A position more consistent with the contemporary spirit and thinking on this matter is taken by Dr. D. O. Cauldwell (*Animal Contacts*), who bases his remarks largely on the findings of Kinsey and others:

“In former times,” he writes, “sexual experiences between man and animal were regarded as a form of perversion on the part of man. More recent studies indicate that man, in having sexual relations with the lower animals, is merely pursuing basic biological instinct. Psychologists who have given the matter serious study from an unbiased point of view are of the opinion that the sexual urge and an outlet are of far more importance than the nature or form of the outlet. It is, therefore, the opinion of such psychologists that man’s sexual experi-

ences with the lower animals represent *a diversion* (because a more convenient outlet than the autoerotic is not at hand) *rather than a perversion.*" (Italics mine.)

On the biological and only primitively psychological level, Cauldwell's view is a correct one. It does not, however, take into account either the cases of true perversion, or those where the motivation is primarily intellectual, imaginative, and esthetic.

Yet another aspect of this problem requires that we consider the possibility that the individual's practice of bestiality, while not a perversion, still stems from some pathological or otherwise abnormal conditions which are usually psychical or emotional but may sometimes be physical, as in a case mentioned by Bloch.

It has been claimed that underdevelopment of the genitals may lead to indulgence in deviant behavior, and a case of this kind which resulted in bestiality was described by Gyurkovechky. Bloch, summarizing it, wrote that "To this category belongs the case . . . of a young aristocrat with extraordinarily small genitals, which made intercourse with women impossible for him, so that *faute de mieux* he practiced sodomy with a hen."

Krafft-Ebing rightly noted, three-quarters of a century ago, certain pathological conditions which are sometimes present in individuals committing sexual acts with animals. Among these: Impotence for heterosexual coitus, and epilepsy, with impulsive performance of the animal contact. In addition, we may mention various forms of anxiety neurosis and religious and moral neuroses and psychoses, with profound conviction of the sinfulness of

coitus, which, when accompanied by powerful sexual urges, may lead the victims to seek relief with animals and/or in other ways productive of less anxiety or less overwhelming feelings of guiltiness. In some of these cases, it is apparent, the bestial intercourse is no less *faute de mieux* than was that of Gyurkovechky's young aristocrat. Equally apparently, the behavior does not or need not constitute perverted bestiality.

Krafft-Ebing was also correct in making the distinction between the occasional and the habitual practitioner of bestial intercourse. It is doubtless generally true, he wrote, that "Whoever seeks and finds sexual gratification exclusively with animals, although opportunities for the normal act are at hand, must at once be suspected of a pathological condition of the sexual instinct. . . . The zoerast (bestialist) as compared with the sexual invert (homosexual) is much farther removed from the normal object. This would qualify the perversion of the former as a much graver condition—because more degenerative—than that of the latter."

With this latter point—that the exclusive bestialist or zoophile is much further removed from the normal object—it is quite possible to take issue. Schwarz, paraphrased by M. Boss (*Meaning and Content of Sexual Perversions*) has put forward an extremely seminal and interesting view—which certainly has at least partial validity—"that the homosexual person never desires the body of the partner, that he (or she) only desires the partner's masculinity or femininity representing meaning or material." We are quite justified in wondering, espe-

cially if we accept the view of Schwarz, whether the zoophile, who "humanizes" his opposite-sex animal love-object, is truly "farther removed from the normal object" than the homosexual, whose object is invariably an abnormal one, and, if Schwarz is correct, is even further removed from the realm of the sexually normal by idealization at the expense—and obliteration—of the material aspect of the relationship as centered in the body of the Other.

Boss also mentions in his absorbing study of perversion theories the view of H. Kunz who, in his "anthropologic" theory of perversions, suggests that among other criteria a sex act is to be regarded as perverted when the element of tenderness is excluded from it. Here we see at once, however, that in bestiality, on the contrary, the greatest amount of tenderness is to be found precisely where the behavior is the most perverted—or at least the most "disturbed"—that is, in cases of true zoophilia where the animal sex-object is regarded in much the same manner as a beloved and therefore tenderly and passionately affective woman or man is regarded by the normal individual.

In concluding this brief and perforce largely speculative discussion of bestiality as a perversion, I am inclined to put forward the tentative view that human-animal sex contacts may be regarded as perverted only when the relationship is a zoophilic one; that is, only in cases where the animal is excessively "humanized," is a symbol and a personalized substitute for the human love-object denied the perverted individual by the very nature of his per-

version. That much or all of the complex psychical mechanism by which this is brought about occurs on an unconscious or extra-conscious level is probably an invariable condition of the process.

To the extent that the zoophile's unconscious psychodynamics compel him to anthropomorphize or humanize or personalize the animal object of his affections, his conscious condition is an aberrant one, and it will determine the degree to which he departs from the "world of reality" into the world of his own delusions and fabrications, with the result that the increasingly bizarre and grotesque character of his perceptions and behavior will be less and less obvious to him. At length, though he may remain relatively normal in other respects (like the nobleman running with the pack of Great Danes and making love to his harlequin bitch, but otherwise displaying no notable eccentricities) he may be able, as did a young farmhand mentioned in the psychiatric literature, to fall in love with a cow on the consciously acknowledged basis of her beauty, her name, and the melodious tinkling of her cowbell, and perhaps be able to see very little or nothing out of the way in this behavior.

The zooerast on the other hand, using the animal indifferently and as a substitute for heterosexual intercourse—a kind of masturbation—entertains neither illusions nor delusions and in no way, or at most very slightly, humanizes the animal sex-object or otherwise departs from or loosens his hold on the real world as experienced by him both apart from and inclusive of his sexual practice.

It is to be concluded from the discussion, even if one rejects much of the speculative and theoretical material presented, that, of the practitioners of bestial intercourse, only the zoophile may be regarded as perverted, and as “a medical problem.” Thus, where the law is concerned, the ironic situation presents itself that the only true pervert in this field of endeavor is also the very one who deserves to escape the law’s clutches via the route of psychotherapy. Society then has left at its disposal, for purposes of retribution, only the non-perverts, the transient bestialists who commit their offense only once or a few times at most, and who should thus be of least concern to a society concerned with avenging itself against perpetrators of that monstrous and corrupting crime against nature—coitus with animals.

RELATED PERVERSIONS

Of perversions related to bestiality we will attend briefly to two: Sadistic torture and murder of animals, and the usually innocuous, and rare, sexual practice which prescribes an animal role, achieved by the wearing of skins, furs or hides, for one or both sex partners.

Sadism, when it results in any serious degree of injury to one or both parties to the act, is the most clear-cut example (along with masochism) of perverted sexuality. It inverts and mocks the very essence of the sexual act,

which even above and beyond its procreative function is a means of giving and receiving pleasure, and a vehicle for the expression of love.

Alongside this phenomenon of sexual pleasure derived from inflicting pain and even death on another, sexual acts in which the beast is represented by persons wearing the skins of animals seem ludicrous and inconsequential indeed. Nonetheless, the existence of such a mode of erotic gratification raises many and interesting questions—so many and so interesting that volumes could be filled with speculation and data exploring the subject.

Sexual intercourse, usually between unclad females and males dressed in the skins of animals, is encountered among both civilized and primitive peoples. Among the latter—and perhaps among the former as an atavism—the practice is to be explained at least partially in terms of supernatural beings, werewolves, werefoxes, weretigers, and the like, which are symbolized or represented by an individual clad in the skin appropriate to the creature being symbolically invoked. However, it is likely that the element of bestiality, too, is in some degree present. The presence of fetichistic elements is also doubtless common, especially among the civilized participants in the practice.

Sexual relations between males and females both attired in the skins of animals appears to be, on the other hand, a “sophisticated perversion,” found only among civilized peoples, which may possess both bestial and fetichistic (and other) components.

This subject will not be further discussed here, but

the interested reader will find considerably more light shed on the matter in Robert Eisler's book, *Man Into Wolf*. (Eisler, by the way, mentions two classical cases, at least one of them fictional, of men donning wolf pelts in order to have their way with desired females. A troubador, Pierre Vidal, is said to have fallen in love with a woman known as *La Louve*, the she-wolf, of Penaultier. Hoping to seduce her, he put on a wolf-skin, but the lady, unimpressed, set her dogs on him and drove him away. The other instance occurs in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*, in which a peeping tom shepherd in wolf's clothing attempts to rape Chloe.)

The mutilation and murder of animals for the purpose of achieving sadistic sexual gratification constitutes a sad and brutal page in the annals of humanity's erotic history. One of the practices most frequently described seems to have originated with the Chinese, though some say the Egyptians. Here, the bestialist sodomizes a goose, strangling or decapitating it at the approach of his climax, so that the death convulsions of the bird will intensify the orgasm and other pleasure sensations of the sodomist. It has also been suggested that the decapitation is necessary in order to raise the dying fowl's body temperature, thus providing a further titillation.

Among the addicts of this revolting practice was Tipoo Sahib, the sultan and "Tiger" of Mysore, for many years the scourge of the British, and a sadist the equal in viciousness of any who ever lived. Crediting the Chinese with conceiving the technique, he delighted in sodomizing geese and cutting off or pulling off their heads as his

climax approached. He was also given to copulation and buggery with sows and goats, and to defecating upon the bodies of captured British children, whom he then raped, mutilated, murdered, and violated necrophilously.

According to De Sade, a variant of this bestial pleasure with the goose was to be found in the Parisian brothels of his day. Known as *avisodomy*, it was accomplished, as described by the Marquis, in this way: “. . . the girl holds the bird’s (turkey’s) neck locked between her thighs, you have her ass straight ahead of you for prospect, and she cuts the bird’s throat the same moment you discharge.”

Another famous torturer of animals was Dmitri, son of Ivan the Cruel, who derived “unspeakable pleasure” from the death agonies of sheep, chickens, and geese. Don Carlos, son of Philip II of Spain, tortured both animals and little girls. He enjoyed watching the latter being whipped, and in the case of the former he would closet himself at night in the stables with horses, mutilating them with the dagger that was his constant companion. Impotent, sadistic, and insane, Don Carlos would doubtless have rivaled Nero or Heliogabalus for cruelty and depravity, had his premature death not prevented his accession to the Spanish throne. (Of Cesare Borgia, slayer of bulls by the dozen, I have spoken elsewhere.)

A reversal—in which the beast is made the torturer of the human—has been described, also by De Sade. In Siam, wrote the renowned scholar and champion of all vice, an adultress is “delivered unto the elephant. A specially prepared contraption into which she is placed allows it to

enjoy her in the belief it is a female elephant it is tuppering."

Many instances of sexual sadism with animals, including such monstrous practices as ripping open the animal's belly and copulating with its still pulsing entrails, are described in the textbooks of *psychopathia sexualis*. Everyone, however, is probably acquainted with cruel and sadistic mistreatment of animals which is not quite so blatantly sexual but affords erotic and other gratifications nonetheless.

The sexual bond which sometimes exists between the torturer and (human) tortured has been well established. In the case of the torture of animals, as with zoophilia, there undoubtedly often takes place at least some measure of humanization or personalization of the animal which permits the sadist to experience, by means of this distortion, a pleasure akin to that which would be experienced were he inflicting pain upon a human victim linked to him by a sexual bond similar to that which unites torturer and tortured. If we do not suppose this to be the case, the torture and/or murder of the innocuous animal becomes either meaningless or vapid—the animal being of itself scarcely a proper vehicle for the expression of the sadist's self-hatred and hatred for others, which is usually or frequently part and parcel of his deviant sexuality. The pleasure of the sadist is contingent, as Sartre has indicated, upon his experience of the Other as a freedom and a subjectivity—a freedom to be annihilated or enslaved, and a subjectivity to be objectified through pain. Only by means of the process of humaniza-

tion or personalization may the animal be invested with the attributes essential to the metamorphosis the sadist strives to effect.

George Ryley Scott (*The History of Torture Throughout the Ages*) accurately makes the point that "It is important to distinguish between cruelty *per se* and sadism. The popular assumption, due largely to the loose way in which the term is now used in popular fiction and in newspapers, that sadism is a synonym for cruelty in any form, is a fallacy. Sadism is a sexological term, and, strictly speaking, it should never be employed apart from its sexological connotations. . . .

"The sadist, in most cases, either practices or delights in the witnessing of cruelty, but his pleasure is concerned exclusively with and is limited entirely to sexual excitation or relief. Cruelty, in any other circumstances, does not appeal to him. Moreover, the moment the sexual repercussion has spent itself he takes no further interest in the practice or expression of cruelty. In addition, the sadist usually expresses his cruelty along well-defined and restricted lines."

That all cruelty to animals, even where humanization of the animal is a psychological fact and motivation, is not sadism, is obvious from Scott's remarks (with which I do not otherwise concur in every respect). In any act of torture, murder, and lesser mistreatment of animals, we find that sadism may be, but is not necessarily, present.

Just as sexual excitation and gratification may be experienced as a result of watching animals copulating, or by witnessing exhibitions of bestiality, so erotic rewards

are available to some who witness the torture of animals (and the torture of humans). There can scarcely be a better popular example of this than the bullfight, where the so-called moment of truth is always for some the moment of orgasm or extreme sexual excitement. Few "sports" (the *afficionado* prefers a loftier word) are so laden and dripping with sexuality as bullfighting, and a strong case could be made indeed that this phenomenon presents in almost equal proportion elements of both symbolically veiled bestiality and sadism. To test the conclusion that bullfighting is experienced erotically, and not just by a few, it is only necessary to observe the spectators, especially the female ones, who not infrequently display unmistakable signs of sexual excitation and even, in a few cases, at the "moment of truth," when the bull receives the sword's fatal thrust, the observable phenomena associated with orgasm. One must visit a fundamentalist revival to encounter similar numbers of spectators responding in so obviously erotic a way to a spectacle supposed to afford stimulations and gratifications of quite another sort. (Observers have often noted the sexual excitation of females at various spectator events, and have assumed from this that women respond more strongly to such stimuli than men. I think it is rather that women more readily display their erotic arousal by means of characteristic facial and other bodily reactions—an observation which may be confirmed by noting these mannerisms in fully aroused women engaged in coition.)

A number of cases have been reported of sexual arousal

experienced as a result of watching animals being slaughtered at stockyards. Allied to this is the sadistic gratification sometimes obtained by means of dismembering animals (usually dead ones). It is a matter of clinical record that more than one butcher has been drawn to his "profession" by the fact that it presents the opportunity to experience gratification without risking the conflict with the law that would result from attempts to satisfy this particular predilection otherwise.

Hunting, "training" of animals, their extermination at dog pounds, vivisection for scientific purposes, and in general any and all occupations and avocations where mutilation, killing, or the infliction of extreme pain are involved, *may* be only subterfuges employed by sadistic individuals exploiting animal victims for erotic gratification. To this will be added only the observation that cruelty to animals where sadism is not a factor—that is, where there is no powerful impelling psychosexual drive urging the individual on to his crime and the cruelty is for its own sake—is even more to be condemned than sadistically motivated cruelty, since it lacks the mitigating factor which must be considered in evaluating the sadist's offense.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This rather brief discussion of bestiality may be thoroughly justified—if any justification is needed—on at least two counts: First, there is no widely accessible book or monograph in the English language which treats the subject even so thoroughly as I have treated it in this far from exhaustive survey; and second, so long as the sex statutes of this country remain unaltered, in the face of all expert opinion as to their injustice and inadequacy, there are going to be victims of those statutes; and any work which is instrumental in illuminating a given sexual offense, and attempts to put it in its proper perspective, as I have sought to do here with bestiality, is sufficiently justified on the basis of its good intentions alone. If it contributes to the education of the public, and hence to the more appropriate treatment of even a handful of offenders, then no one can question that the good intentions have been crowned with good results.

Scientific knowledge of human sexuality has increased immeasurably in the last century—especially in the last half century, under the impetus given the study of both normal and aberrant sexual phenomena by the work of the truly great Sigmund Freud, his colleagues and followers, and laborers in the fruitful vineyard of psychoanalysis generally.

However, and as many persons still do not seem to recognize, the knowledge of the phenomena of sex acquired in recent times has by no means been provided exclusively by psychoanalysts. Psychoanalysis is identified in the public mind with investigations of sexuality, particularly of deviant sexuality, and it is true that psychoanalysis provided the decisive *élan vital* for such thoroughgoing investigations as we have seen in the last fifty years; but that should not be taken to mean that other sciences and areas of scholarship have not by now made their own extensive, significant, and influential contributions.

Psychology and psychiatry, along with anthropology, sociology, philosophy, various non-psychiatric branches of medicine, and law, have all made—along with still other disciplines—important studies and findings in the erotic realm. The result is that there now exists a vast body of knowledge in the area of human sexuality which is not yet complete or very well integrated, but still valuable and illuminating.

In view of this, it is not only distressing (*tragic* is doubtless the more appropriate word), but also most curious, to find that sex legislation in this country continues to be based upon unscientific, supernaturalistic religio-ethical notions and no longer existing practicalities current at the time of Moses. The phenomenon is particularly curious when one is aware that within the legal profession—which is not as reactionary, stupid, and ill-informed (perhaps only less prolifically literary) in these matters as sexologists often assume—there is a widespread and perhaps

almost general recognition of the inadequacy and inequity of contemporary legislation dealing with sexual behavior and powerful sentiment in behalf of statutory revisions to conform more nearly with the realities of the present-day situation where sexual knowledge, beliefs, and behavior are concerned.

Even though attorneys, judges, and professors of jurisprudence are not lacking in appreciation of the irrationality, barbarism, and absurdity of the American sex statutes, the ground for criticism remains that the statutes continue to exist. Moreover, impetus to reforms that may be called effective has come not, in the main, from those concerned professionally with the law and with law-making and legal reform, who might have been expected to provide such leadership, but from workers in the sciences who have had not only to provide the requisite knowledge, but have tackled the almost overwhelming job of re-educating the public in sexological matters as well. Some will feel, indeed, that the very fact that the legal profession is *not* lacking in an understanding of the inequities of contemporary sex legislation places that profession in an even worse light than would be the case were its members merely ignorant.

The American Law Institute's proposed *Model Penal Code*, which seeks to bring United States legislation more nearly into line with the comparatively enlightened French *Code pénal*, is an example of just this kind of juristic awareness on the one hand and impotence on the other. Modern jurists recognize the principle that sexual acts between adults, which are private and take place by

mutual consent, should be excluded from statutory consideration; but apart from drawing up recommendations, to be perused and praised by fellow attorneys and academicians of other disciplines, they do little to implement their own findings—the best method of implementation being, of course, the introduction *and wholehearted backing* of genuinely remedial legislation.

In defense of the ineffectuality and velleity characteristic of attorneys and legislators where sex laws are concerned, it is argued that the public will not support any liberalization of the statutes, and corrective legislation is not introduced and/or supported because, as Morris Ploscowe has put it, “of the fear that a vote for repeal would be branded as a vote for immorality.” Whether the legal profession, and the legislative representatives of the people, are here offering a valid defense is for the reader to decide. However, we have recently seen expressed, most notably in the U. S. Supreme Court’s desegregation decisions, the philosophy that it is up to legal and legislative leaders to lead, and this whether the masses of the people wish to be led or not—the prerequisite being that the direction taken should be towards, and not away from, a position consistent with contemporary notions of what is moral, just, and socially realistic.

Whether they would wipe most of the sex “offenses” from the statute books altogether, or punish masturbators by burning them alive and strewing their odious ashes to the winds, the typical attorney and judge are likely to be painfully aware of the need for *uniform* sex legislation which will end once and forever the idiocy that what is

no offense at all, or only a misdemeanor, in one jurisdiction, is a heinous crime warranting the most severe retributions in another, and perhaps adjoining, jurisdiction.

For example, fornication is punished in Virginia with a twenty-dollar fine while the same offense committed in Arizona may result in a three-year prison term. Two other states, North Dakota and Rhode Island, penalize fornicators and fornicatrices with thirty-day jail sentences (North Dakota) and ten-dollar fines (Rhode Island).

Homosexuality, a misdemeanor in New York when the relationship is between consenting adults, can send both parties to prison for the rest of their lives in Nevada.

Penalties for prostitution may vary, in the various states, from fines or brief jail sentences to five-year prison terms.

Age of consent ranges from twelve years in some states to the ludicrous extreme of twenty-one years in another. Intercourse with an underage female may or may not be rape, depending on where it occurs, when the girl in question is a sexually mature prostitute who has actively solicited the intercourse.

And so on.

To suppose that such a travesty upon judicial logic and common sense as this hodgepodge of conflicting legislation represents is the will of the people, is probably to underestimate the intelligence of the public—a feat rarely accomplished by lawmakers or anyone else outside of the film and television industries. Legislators in a position to do something about sex laws, and the legal pro-

fession generally, have been too long fearful of the noisy pressures of a minority which no longer speaks for the people—if it ever did.

To propose and support remedial sex legislation of a liberalized variety is to incite a highly vociferous and vicious rabble of fundamentalist preachers and other neurotics, psychotics, and demagogues who are always looking for just such an opportunity to win headlines for themselves and inflame the emotions of their followers. But the political power of such spokesmen for the illiterate rabble—who readily accuse of seeking to legitimize vice any spokesman for the liberal sex-legalistic viewpoint—is certainly disproportionate to their public influence generally. Against them, though lawmakers seem never to have noticed, is thrown not only the politically negligible weight of the intellectual and scientific communities, but also the weight of the larger and more powerful churches, which are the bitter foes of radical fundamentalism and which have, in many cases, already gone on record as being aware that contemporary restraints of a legal kind upon human sexuality are unrealistic and generally unenforceable. Unfortunately, since they no longer believe it quite proper to lift their voices, the larger and more intelligent religious groups are often drowned out by the hysterical screams and shouts and strident screechings of the fanatics. However, that does not at all mean that the rabble-rousers and their followers control anything like a majority of the votes, as seems often to be assumed.

What it does mean, and this has long been true, is that a minority of anachronistic (and atavistic) ethical and

theological cultists, by dint of sheer lung power and uninhibited vituperation, have imposed upon the majority of non-fundamentalists a dictatorship of the ignorant in the area of official sexual morality as reflected in antisexual legislation. The majority of Americans have for some time now been prepared for statutory revisions, but are often cowed, as are so many legislators, judges, and attorneys, by the outcries of the demagogues, so that they are hesitant to make their views publicly known. One can thus only ponder with sadness and wonder a situation wherein a noisy minority is permitted to endure as the arbiter of official sexual morality by a majority which could overturn the minority rule at any time, if only it could find the necessary courage and initiative to undertake the effort.

The foregoing should not be taken to imply of course that the majority of Americans—especially the majority of church-going Americans—are in favor of condoning sexual promiscuity or other transgressions against the old Biblical codes. Rather, what is suggested is that a probable significant majority of spokesmen for the more responsible religious and juristic viewpoints are now prepared to make the distinction, which should have been made long ago, between *sins* on the one hand, and *crimes* on the other; and that if this leadership were vigorously exerted, a sizable majority of all Americans would almost certainly go along with some sane legislative changes, especially in the direction of uniformity, but even in the direction of liberalization consistent with reality.

What is needed, obviously—though doubtless it will

be necessary in the beginning to settle for something less—is to eliminate the whole notion of “sex crimes,” placing actual crimes against persons, such as rape and child-molesting, under other more appropriate headings, and eliminating from statutory consideration altogether such matters as (adult) homosexuality and the various sexual practices of men and women, such as fellatio, cunnilingus, and anal intercourse, presently punishable as felonies even when occurring between husband and wife.

It is too often impossible to obtain justice where behavior labeled “sex offense” is concerned. The whole area of sex is so beclouded by emotions, superstitions, and puerilities as to preclude the possibility of rational approach. While placing rape, child-molesting, and other offenses against persons under other headings would not eliminate prejudice altogether, at least it would be helpful in procuring a somewhat more dispassionate climate both of general opinion and in the courtroom.

In addition to abolishing the concept of “sex crimes” as a special class of offenses unto themselves, great care should be taken to avoid terminology which, by its very nature, generates emotionality and thus makes impossible the objectivity essential to reasoned consideration of the facts in any given case if justice is to result.

Such terminology as “crimes against nature,” which is not only emotion-generating but scientifically inaccurate as well, should be barred from all statutes and from the courtroom deliberations. Similarly, any semantical revision should prohibit the use of such words as “pervert,” “perverted,” “sex fiend,” and others which, it is clear,

tend to interpose blind emotivity between the facts and the reasoning processes of those who must try to evaluate them.

The abolition of the whole concept of “sex offenses” may seem to some too sweeping a measure, but it is demonstrably evident that nothing less will now suffice to eradicate the evils arising out of superstition, misconception, and hysteria engendered by the sex offender witch hunt of recent times. The alternative is to persist in the repugnant present practice of scapegoat prosecutions and wholesale hypocrisy where a few unfortunates too often suffer, cast up as offerings to the prejudice of our forbears, in order that society may seem to prohibit what is generally practiced or may be permitted to be practiced without the slightest detriment to the social structure.

Returning to bestiality in particular, the word “silly” has often been employed to describe the offense of the exhibitionist—indicating that it is a minor one and not to be taken seriously—and it would be both well and just were bestiality also to be regarded in the vast majority of cases as at worst merely “silly.” Instead, it is commonly considered, even by some “experts” who ought to know better, along with such “extreme acts” as necrophilia and coprophilia—both behaviors usually indicative, as bestiality usually is not, of serious mental disturbance.

The philosopher Immanuel Kant, who seems to have died a virgin at eighty, once argued that, on the principle of *jus talionis*, persons engaging in bestiality should be cast out of human society and deprived of all rights commonly

accorded human beings. In effect, after other vengeance has previously been exacted, that is just about what happens to the convicted bestialist in contemporary American communities. Philip Roche (*The Criminal Mind*) has suggested that the present-day fear and pursuit of the sex offender is analogous to the witchcraft persecutions of the past, and in the case of bestiality (and of some other deviations as well) it is by no means rare that one encounters hate, hysteria, and other emotional aberrations which must be quite similar to those encountered in the climate of the witchcraft epidemic of a few centuries ago.

We are wont to congratulate ourselves that the witch hunt is over, or at least that it flares up only infrequently, but it would seem that self-congratulations are premature.

NOTES

1. [*page 6*]

According to the Hindus, the Romans, and the Greeks, masturbation was rather a gift of the gods—Krishna, Hermes, and Mercury, respectively, to be precise—and these deities could best, therefore, be worshiped by means of ritual manustuprations. Homosexuality, on the other hand, was given to humanity by the demigod Orpheus, and both he and other deities are patrons and patronesses of tribades, fellators, pedicators, and other homosexuals and may be worshiped accordingly.

All this, however, would not have been of much assistance to prehistoric man who, in addition to his intellectual handi-

Notes

caps, had no gods, and therefore was faced with the necessity of inventing sodomy, masturbation, etc., on his own. In the case of masturbation, it most likely came into being when men and women itched, and scratched (or possibly, where the male is concerned, when he was moved by curiosity to investigate the phenomenon of his organ's erection, conducting the exploration vigorously enough to acquire the key to the mystery. At this point, man's fate as the master of this world and the species nearest to the angels must have hung precariously in the balance. Suppose (being ignorant of the link between copulation and procreation) he had preferred masturbation, on the ground that it could be accomplished at any time, any place, without requiring the co-operation of another person? Fortunately he did not, and a potentially grave menace to the survival of mankind was circumvented thanks to the superior raptures of coition).

2. [page 10]

The Egyptian belief in metempsychosis was another favorable factor. Where there is belief in metempsychosis, or "transmigration of souls," with the notion that any or every animal may be a former human repeating the interminable cycle of alternating between human and animal forms, there will certainly be less resistance to bestiality, especially on the ground that by engaging in intercourse with a beast a man or woman is descending to the bestial level and thus degrading the human spirit.

3. [page 11]

Some authorities hold that Herodotus (and writers after him) erred in describing the sacred animal of Mendes as a goat—that it was, in fact, a ram. If this is correct, ritual magic includes a good many cases of females assaulted by he-goats who ought, instead, to have been embraced by rams.

Whether they (or their magic) lost or gained by this historical error—if it was that—I cannot say.

The ram, incidentally, was a favored animal form of the god Osiris, who also appeared at times in the form of a bull (Onuphis) and at other times in that of a bird (Bennu). Ram form, and goat form also, were assumed by the god Khnum, who was a fecundity deity.

4. [page 13]

Lewinsohn (*A History of Sexual Customs*) reminds us that there was also another Europa, unravished though much trod, an Athenian prostitute celebrated and immortalized in an epigram by Antipater:

“Six obols will buy you Europa, the beauty of Athens;
never reluctant or cross, nothing whatever to fear;
Bed as clean as can be, and properly heated in winter;
This one won’t ask you, Zeus, to turn yourself into a bull!”

5. [page 13]

Although dogs are the most common bestial lovers of women, and doubtless have always been, I am not aware of a single instance where one of the Greek gods appeared to a woman as a dog. Indeed, the dog was in mysteriously evil repute among the Greeks, leading Simonides of Amorgos, and later Phocylides, to declare that certain types of repulsive and ill-natured human females descended from bitches. This is apparently the origin of the still-current epithet “bitch” as used to describe objectionable females. (Cf. Lewinsohn, *Animals, Men, and Myths*.)

The Romans, one should add, did not hold this bias to the same extent, and copulations of Roman women with dogs were frequent. As always, dogs were favored by prostitutes:

Notes

“Jeanette shall visit you, her bitch-pup accompanying her; complacent is the hound to its mistress, the lady complacent to men.”—(Panormita)

6. [page 18]

Bryk is quoted by Niemoller in his booklet, *Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times*.

7. [page 34]

Widely believed to have sold his soul to the Devil, John XII (pope, 954-964) was distinguished additionally for his blasphemies and his many erotic escapades. The Roman Synod of 963, convoked by the Emperor Otto and composed of cardinals and bishops, charged the Pope with assassination, perjury, profanation of churches, incest with his parents and with his sisters, the proposing of drunken toasts to the Grand Master of Hell, and invocations of demons and pagan gods and goddesses, including of course Venus. John's successor, Leo VIII, is also said to have died of a paralytic stroke while copulating.

8. [page 40]

In U.S. vs. Lebel, tried by General Court Martial at Oxford, England, it was charged that the defendant violated the 96th Article of War in that on or about October 10, 1944, he committed the crime against nature by wrongfully and unlawfully having carnal copulation with a fowl. The defendant made a plea of not guilty, but was convicted and sentenced to dishonorable discharge and two years at hard labor. The Board of Review held that the evidence was adequate to support the inference that the accused effected penetration of a chicken.

One Malone—U.S. vs. Malone, General Court Martial,

Ipswich, England, September 8, 1943—was convicted of sodomy with a cow and sentenced to dishonorable discharge and three years at hard labor.

Malone's apprehension came about, according to evidence presented at the trial, when a British farmer saw him chasing a cow through the dusk and alerted the police. The law enforcement officials, arriving after dark, testified that they saw, transfixed by their automobile headlamps, a man mounted on a cow, in position to have illicit sexual relations with it.

They then descended upon the zoerast, who was overtaken while in an unclad condition, carrying his clothing and his shoes in his hand. It was testified that when apprehended he was drinking but not drunk, though admitted by stipulation was medical evidence that he was found to be intoxicated to an extent impairing his mental powers, and that his penis was erected and tainted with cow manure, while his hands were also incriminatingly crusted with dung.

The crux of the defense in this case seems to have been that penetration of the cow was not proved since it was not actually witnessed. The farmer could not, in the gathering darkness, see clearly enough to be certain of the penetration while the police apparently so frightened the defendant that he at once dismounted and took to flight. However, the constables testified that the hindquarters of the cow were imprinted on Malone's thighs, and it was held—finally by the Board of Review—that the evidence was sufficient to sustain the conviction.

U.S. vs. Ricardo Sanchez, Private, U.S. Army, is unusual in that the defendant was accused both of indecent acts with a fowl ("penetrating the chicken's rectum with his penis with intent to gratify his lust") and lewd and indecent acts with a

Notes

three-year-old female child. It is quite rare (psychotics and mental defectives apart) that the individual guilty of bestiality is a perpetrator of other sex offenses also.

On February 2, 1960, the Court of Military Appeals affirmed the conviction of Sanchez, for the offenses committed by him at Landstuhl, Germany, in 1957, upholding the sentence of dishonorable discharge and three years' confinement (reduced from five).

One of the judges, interestingly and most vigorously, made the point that while moral behavior generally is a private matter, the conduct of Sanchez had been such "as to bring discredit upon the service, and it would be an affront to ordinary decency to hold that an act such as the one here committed was not criminal *per se* and would not dishonor the service in the eyes of a civilized society."

9. [page 42]

There is no end to Catholic wonders where bestiality is concerned, and in the Church the "Holy Lamb" was sometimes the object of unusual—and perhaps less than completely spiritual—affections.

Some of the female saints, as history has amply recorded, aspired to the closest possible relationship with the Almighty. Thus, Veronica Juliani had herself married to the Holy Lamb and then took a real lamb to bed with her to suckle her breasts, even managing to produce a few drops of (miraculous) milk from her nipples, though technically a virgin. Presumably, marriage to a Holy Lamb, even when this included unusual intimacy with a quite fleshly one, did not constitute bestiality or require subsequent penance.

It may also be mentioned that Jeanne de Cambray and Angelina de Foligny went further yet, claiming to have had

actual sex relations with the Deity, Who had appeared to—or unto—they. Saint Mechtildis made a similar claim, saying: “He kissed my hand, pressed me to Him, whispered to me to give Him my love, and I surrendered my all to Him and in return tasted of His divine essence.”

10. [page 52]

Extremely interesting subject matter related to bestiality in occultism may be found by the discerning reader in William Seabrook's volumes *The Magic Island* and *Witchcraft, Its Power in the World Today*.

11. [page 54]

Pierre Burgot, burned alive as a werewolf following trial by Dominicans of the diocese of Besançon in 1521, claimed repeatedly and unwaveringly, under torture, to have had sexual relations with actual wolves while himself in wolf form. It is quite possible that he did, in the same manner as the witches copulated with the Devil; that is, in hallucinations, dreams, phantasies, etc., which afterwards seemed just as real as any physical act might have.

In China, there was long a belief in werefoxes, which seem to be allied to the *incubi* and *succubi* of the West. The male werefox mated with human females, and the female werefox with human males. They were said to appear to their human consorts in either fox or human form, and when they appeared in the latter guise their fox form would become visible if they went to sleep or if they drank too much, which they often did, being notorious tipplers inordinately devoted to wine and other spiritous beverages.

A variant of the idea of humans transforming themselves into animals to have sexual relations with humans was found in Baluchistan where black bears were said to sometimes turn

Notes

at night into women of great beauty, and to solicit the embraces of men who were sometimes hugged to death during the frenzy of the coition.

12. [page 57]

Some versions hold that to accomplish her initial seduction of Enkidu the prostitute is forced to put on the skins of wild beasts—a lion's skin or a wild dog's skin or both—perhaps so as to ease the transition from bestial to human intercourse.

13. [page 57]

That Enkidu is cured of his bestiality by virtue of the more excellent and ecstatic qualities of intercourse with a human female is the interpretation placed upon this incident by most classical erotologists. However, another interpretation is at least equally plausible in the light of some versions of the epic: Once Enkidu has had intercourse with the woman, he is rejected by the animals who want no more to do with him. That Enkidu is rejected by the animals, rather than the other way 'round, is of course the view least flattering to humanity, which may account for the preference shown the coital cure version by the scholars.

14. [page 62]

As for royalty and nobility descending from bestial intercourse, Emperor Henry VII himself claimed to have descended from the union of Raymond, son of the Count de la Forêt, with Melusina, whose body was half that of a fish or of a serpent. Indeed, after Melusina's story became well known, there were numerous competitors for the distinction of having descended from her—including the famous families of Luxembourg, Rohan, and Sassenaye.

15. [page 74]

The newspapers quite often report authenticated cases of

dogs dying at the graveside of a deceased master or mistress, or wasting away and dying, refusing all food and consolation, etc., after their owner's death. A famous historic case, which cannot, however, be said to enjoy the status of "beyond doubt," is that of the famous German soldier, physician, and Magus, Henry Cornelius Agrippa von Nettesheim (1486-1535). Wherever Agrippa went, he was accompanied by a huge black dog, which was reputed to be, variously, the Devil, Agrippa's familiar, or his *succubus*. At any rate, upon Agrippa's death, as has been often told, the dog hastened from the chamber where its master had just breathed his last and flung itself into the river, where it died by drowning.

16. [page 75]

The founder of the Turkish nation, Suleiman Shah, was said to have married the she-wolf which rescued and raised him after he was abandoned as an infant and left in the wilderness to die. Presumably, it was the head of this wolf that he had emblazoned on his banners.

There is said to be a form of insanity—the therianthropic delusion—in which individuals may not only be enamored of animal love-objects but believe themselves to have been transformed into animals, and seek out the company of "their own kind."

It was apparently this therianthropic delusion which fell upon King Nebuchadnezzar, who is said to have lived among oxen, grazing on the pastures, ". . . till his hairs were grown like eagles' and his nails like birds' . . ." It is also recorded that the daughters of King Proitos of Argos lived among cows, wandering over the countryside stark naked, believing themselves to have been transformed into bovines. According to Hesiod, their "madness" was nymphomania, and they were

enamored, like Pasiphae, of bulls. It is said that their psychosis infected ultimately all of the women of Argos.

17. [page 81]

I cannot, regrettably, lay claim to having interviewed a great many persons experienced in bestiality, but I have been fortunate enough to interview at considerable length, and in some depth, a few persons so experienced. These subjects, it should be added, were none of them zoophiles, but belong rather to that class of bestialists who, having no strong inhibitions or moral convictions preventing such contacts, might be called also sexual experimentalists—persons who, out of curiosity, or for want of a human sex partner at a time of sexual arousal, have engaged in erotic relations with animals. Apart from these few persons (both males and females), I have interviewed or talked with—much less satisfactorily from the standpoint of information received—a small number of males who had intercourse with animals on one or more occasions while “boys,” but who did not admit to any adult animal contacts. My remarks on the reactions of *animals* to bestial intercourse are based almost entirely upon these two groups of interviews, as are my remarks on the techniques and methods employed by humans to seduce animals and prepare them for acts of bestiality. My remarks on the psychology of *humans* in bestial relationships are, on the other hand, based to a much greater extent on views of other writers which my findings have tended to confirm. Unfortunately, none of these matters have been dealt with in any detail by competent authors (with whose work I am familiar), and one is obliged for the most part to speculate and guess in order to fill in the gaps left both by previous authors and the subjects interviewed. My conclusions are therefore at best fragmentary and tentative, which is why I have not attempted

a more thoroughgoing analytic presentation, but even so are probably the most complete available to the reader at the present time.

18. [page 88]

Phantasies of bestial intercourse, quite possibly indicating a desire for bestial intercourse, are encountered with considerable frequency among prostitutes, where the bestiality would doubtless serve a purpose made clear in the pages of the essay on Negro sexuality, which follows; that they also occur with frequency among non-prostitutes, where the function of the phantasy is similar, is quite likely.

It is very interesting to remark how often the mention of intercourse with animals crops up in prostitutes' conversations and in their dreams and day-dreams, which are revealed only to the analytic prober, so that one cannot say that the animal is merely a device for spicing up the language, or a figure of speech used to make a point having nothing to do with bestiality.

For example, Carla C., a call girl, told the psychoanalyst Greenwald (*The Call Girl*): "Black, white, what difference does it make? I'd screw a zebra for fifty dollars; and anything new they can invent I'm all for." Another call girl, Beverly, confessed to Greenwald that her erotic phantasies consisted of having sex with animals; namely, apes, gorillas, etc.

Carla C.'s typical statement is echoed by Rita Marlowe, another prostitute, who told sociologist Sara Harris (*They Sell Sex*): "Hell, I'd love an elephant up if there was enough loot in it."

19. [page 103]

Since the above was written I have learned that on June 6, 1662, at New Haven, a man named Potter was executed—along with a cow, two heifers, three sheep and two sows—for

Notes

the crime of bestiality. It therefore seems probable that it was to Potter, rather than to Weir, that Cotton Mather made reference.

20. [page 109]

In at least some cases of true (zoophilic) perversion, the sexual dreams of the subject will consist largely or entirely of dreams about bestial intercourse (as the true homosexual will dream about homoerotic intercourse, etc.). A number of confirming cases have come to my attention.

21. [page 110]

Ernest Jones, Freud's biographer and an analyst worthy of attention in his own right, has observed (*On the Nightmare*):

" . . . Doubtless the feature of animals that most attracts a personal interest of untutored minds is the freedom they display in openly satisfying needs, particularly those of a sexual and excremental order, which with human beings have often to be restrained; in fact, the expression 'animal passions' is generally employed to denote sexual impulses. Children often owe their first experience of sexual activities to the sight of animal copulation, and every psychoanalyst knows how important the influence of this can be. Animals therefore lend themselves to the indirect representation of crude and unbridled wishes. Analytical experience has shown that the occurrence of animals in a dream regularly indicates a sexual theme, usually an incest one, a typical example being the maiden's dream of being pursued or attacked by rough animals."

While animals usually represent humans in dreams, or may be genital symbols or refer to undirected libido, and while desires aroused by the activities of animals are usually desires for sexual relations with humans of the opposite sex, it is also true that these experiences may create a desire to engage in

bestiality, especially when a human sex partner is not available. On the most obvious level, persons caught *flagrante delicto* with animals have stated that their erotic passion was aroused by watching the animal in question in sex intercourse or, less commonly, in masturbation or in a state of obvious sexual arousal.

22. [page 111]

Cesare Borgia, son of Pope Alexander VI and brother of Lucrezia, was also dedicated to the exploitation of animals for his pleasures, but in a somewhat different, though perhaps related, way. Cesare, it is recorded, would order bulls, in lots of a dozen, brought into a Vatican courtyard where he would amuse himself by spearing them to death. Any analysis of this pastime is perhaps complicated by the fact that the bull appeared on the Borgia coat of arms. Cesare, it may be added, was his father's own son when it came to lubricity. Both Alexander and Cesare fornicated incestuously with Lucrezia, and father and son were equally noted for their orgies with prostitutes.

23. [page 112]

The sixteenth century French eroticist Brantôme, apparently voicing a belief prevalent in his time, wrote that "Weasels are touched with this (lesbian, or female homosexual) sort of love, and delight female with female to unite and dwell together. And so in hieroglyphic signs, women loving one another with this kind of affection were represented of yore by weasels. I have heard tell of a lady which was used always to keep some of these animals, for that she had dealings with this mode of love and so did take pleasure in watching her little pets in their intercourse together."

The Kronhausens, who quote this passage, remark that it is the only story of homosexual animal intercourse for exhibi-

Notes

tionistic purposes related in a work of "erotic realism" that has come to their attention. I am familiar with gossip concerning a famous trainer of animals who is said to have induced both male canines and male rats to perform homosexually for exhibitionistic purposes, but of course gossip is not a work of erotic realism, and I must concur with the Kronhausens' verdict that Brantôme's story seems to be unique.

24. [page 121]

Professor Tarnowski (*Pederasty in Europe*), after Mierzejewski (*Forensische Gynaekologie*), asserted that imbeciles evidence an unnatural tendency to intercourse with animals. This is probably one of those "clinical observations" derived from moralistic wishful thinking which permeated medical literature dealing with the perversions until fairly recently (and is not altogether unknown today). In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries there was something amounting almost to a general medical conspiracy to make bestiality a "vice of clodhoppers" and mental defectives, and when it was asserted that imbeciles are much given to bestiality, one could be rather certain that soon someone else would be saying that most bestialists are imbeciles or near-imbeciles.

Additional note. *Time* magazine (February 3, 1961) reviewed *Story for Icarus*, by Ernst Schnabel, a work I have not read. According to *Time's* reviewer, the book is "a mythological novel about Queen Pasiphae's untidy love affair with the great white bull of Crete."

The reviewer remarks that "Although the ancient Greeks were seldom squeamish about aberrant sex, even they recoiled from this particular caper. . . ."—an insupportable observation.

We are further told that in the novel Daedalus denies "the

construction of a cunningly made wooden cow in which Pasiphae concealed herself to approach the bull." It is of course Mr. Schnabel's privilege as a fictionist to spare Daedalus his historic role as Pasiphae's confederate in iniquity. We are living, after all, in the time of the universal whitewash (national heroes—who are rather blackwashed—always excepted).

H O M O S E X U A L A C T S

Sodomy, fellatio, tribadism, cunnilingus, and
masturbation

Sappho! More lovely than Venus art thou! *I can't help it. When I think about what men and women do together*

CHARLES BAUDELAIRE *in bed—I want to puke!*

Male homosexual

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Heterosexuals, even if they are sufficiently intelligent and mature not to be made anxious or roused to militant hostility by the contemplation of homosexual practices, are likely to be more or less baffled, depending in part on the specific activity under consideration, as to how it is possible for the homosexual to respond erotically to the stimuli provided.

How is it that a man may be sexually aroused by a man? And how is it that a woman may be sexually aroused by a woman? Perhaps even more mysteriously; what basis is

there for the pleasure experienced by the individual taking the passive role in sodomy (anal intercourse)? What basis is there for the pleasure experienced by the individual *performing* fellatio (mouth-penis intercourse)? What basis is there for the pleasure experienced by the individual *performing* cunnilingus (mouth-female genital intercourse)? How is it that some of the persons taking those roles in the acts mentioned are even able to experience orgasm as a result of their activity? Could there perhaps be body areas which are sexually responsive in homosexuals but not in heterosexuals?

That there is at least some physiological basis for the sexual pleasures derived from all of the homosexual acts, and by persons in both active and passive or male and female roles, will be made clear. Some aspects of the psychological sources of gratification will also be dealt with. But first, some of the more general problems and questions should be discussed.

Referring back to the reactions homosexual acts engender in heterosexuals, a few of the reasons for the hostility, revulsion, anxiety, puzzlement, and other responses toward homosexual practices should be obvious. First and foremost, no doubt, is the element of conditioning. One is taught that there are natural and acceptable forms of sexual activity, and that there are perverted forms, which are unnatural and revolting, sinful and criminal. These teachings become deeply imbedded in the individual, and we react accordingly—sometimes with our bodies as well as with our minds.

There is also the fact that desires and practices that are alien to our own experience are likely to generate both anxiety and opposition. And the more alien the desires and practices, especially when they are sexual ones, the more intense will be the anxiety and hostility generated. (Though when we have repressed desires for the activities, it is their *appeal* and *familiarity*, and the conflict then generated, which may explain the anxiety and the hostility.)

One sees this principle—that the more alien the act, the greater the hostility—illustrated in the matter of the “roles” taken by male homosexuals. While both parties to a homosexual act are certainly equally homosexual in their behavior, the individual who takes the “male role”—who is fellated by, or who sodomizes, the other—is likely to be condemned far less harshly by other males, and to engender less revulsion in them, than the individual taking the “female role”—who is sodomized by, and who performs fellatio on the other. This is doubtless because the individual in the male role has only those contacts with the other which he might have with a female partner (and which are thus potentially at least within the experience of heterosexual males): He penetrates the anus of the other, as he might do with a female (and as rather compares to coitus); and he is fellated, as he might be by a female, and as perhaps most males have been. The feeling that the male role in homosexual relations is “more normal” is so strong that many individuals who take only the male role in homosexual intercourse are

able to deny vigorously that they are "homosexual" at all, or that the activity is for them a homosexual one, and firmly believe in the truth of what they are saying.

This perspective is found rather frequently among men who take the male role in homosexual intercourse while in prison, military service, or some other situation where heterosexual intercourse is not available. Whether their view of the matter is a rationalization or not, it is true that many such individuals use homosexual intercourse as a stopgap and return to heterosexual relations whenever females become available to them. Even the assumption of the distasteful female role in homosexual relations may sometimes be assumed by these "non-homosexual" males in the isolation from women of prison, lumber camp, or remote military outpost. Since "someone has to" take the female role, and since there are usually "no homosexuals around," the assumption of the female role may be justified as a barter, as the fee one must pay for then taking the male role with the same partner. Under such conditions, the female role activity is certainly "not homosexual" either. Or so says the participant.

Among males who do consider themselves to be homosexuals, and whose erotic activities are more or less exclusively homosexual—among, that is, "true" homosexuals—the view, often expressed by medical and other authorities, that there is a relatively hard-and-fast role-taking among homosexuals, is regarded as something of a joke. Most male homosexuals exchange roles freely in the sex acts—as is indeed necessary in most cases if both part-

ners are to be satisfied—though outside of the sex acts, in the homosexual social world, the roles may be clung to somewhat more rigidly. It is true that some homosexuals are able to experience climax as a result of being sodomized, or as a result of performing fellatio or cunnilingus on the sex partner, but these are in the minority. (And it should be pointed out that some heterosexuals may also arrive at the climax in these ways.) Most homosexuals (and most heterosexuals), however, require direct stimulation of the penis (or female genitals), and where roles are not reversed the individual being fellated, or who sodomizes the other, or who is the recipient of cunnilingus, at least masturbates the sex partner.

That an individual may experience the climax by being sodomized, or by performing fellatio or cunnilingus, is one of the aspects of homosexual intercourse least understandable and most grotesque to the heterosexual who often supposes such responses to be the rule rather than the exception. However, when one recalls that for a great many persons “petting,” even when it is confined largely just to kissing, may result in orgasm, then the mechanism is likely to seem less strange. (Not that this adequately explains the more complicated homosexual responses.)

The insistence upon preserving the roles is somewhat more marked in lesbian (female homosexual) relationships than in male homosexual ones. The “dominant” or “active” partner, the one in the “male role,” is known among lesbians as a *butch*, while the “passive” partner, the one in the “female role,” is a *femme* (or *fem*). Individuals who overtly and freely move from one role to the

other are known by the term *ki-ki* (kigh-kigh), which is one of disapprobation. Much of this is, however, a social veneer, psychologically important but perforce abandoned in actual sex relations, for the same reason that interchange of roles occurs among the male homosexuals.

Except in tribadism (apposition and friction of the female genitals), where there may be approximately equal stimulation, the individual in the male role may be left unsatisfied unless the role reversal takes place. Why the deception is so passionately insisted upon, when the facts of life are known to all lesbians, must perhaps be explained on the basis of the butch's need to maintain at least vestiges of the illusion that she is truly the masculine partner to the relationship (an illusion fostered also by the manner of dress, short haircut, absence of makeup, and so on; and sometimes by the assumption of the male's economic role in courtship, and by other behavior).

In a society whose laws are enforced almost exclusively by males, the lesbian enjoys a considerable advantage over the male homosexual. Lesbian sex acts are never prosecuted (there are extremely rare exceptions) and lesbians are likely to face special harassment by the law only when they frequent "gay bars" and other gathering places of male homosexuals where they may be incidental victims of the "crackdowns" periodically staged by the police of most cities against "the queers."

Most heterosexual males do not object strenuously to lesbianism (unless they are personally inconvenienced), and many males are sexually stimulated by the idea of lesbian sex acts. The U.S. lesbian organization, Daughters

of Bilitis, reports (rejected) male applications for membership. It is also true that exhibitions of lesbian intercourse are more popular with males than are exhibitions of homosexual intercourse with female spectators. However, sexual exhibitions generally are said to be more popular with males, and this is a response complicated by many factors and about which no conclusions should be lightly drawn.

Some of the objection to male homosexuality (and the lack of objection to lesbianism) is on esthetic grounds. The role of the anus in homosexuality accounts for some hostility and repugnance, the anus being regarded by many persons solely as an excremental orifice. There is also the fact that most persons have been forced to suppress or repress the erotic feelings associated with defecation which were once natural to them, so that it might be said that those who continue to preserve the connection between the anus and eroticism arouse in us a (unconscious, *of course*) resentment not altogether unmixed with envy.

It would seem to be the case that in this country there is no term popularly applied to homosexuals quite so intensely hostile as "cocksucker." But one supposes this hostility to derive even more from the ingestion of the semen than from the act of orally stimulating the penis. Many taboos surround the semen, and vestiges of these linger on and may sometimes evoke powerful emotional responses. On the other hand, both kissing and cunnilingus are commonly performed by males—so that the sexual use of the mouth by the male is a generally held

experience—while sexual utilization of the male anus is almost universally forbidden or at least frowned upon, and even anal intercourse with the female is a part of the experience of only a small proportion of heterosexual males. (It should be remembered here that societies permitting sodomy usually have a special and accepted class of sodomists who take the female role in the practice. Passive sodomy by males who are not members of this class is offensive.)

It is worth noting that the more abstract the level on which homosexuality is considered, the easier it is for the heterosexual to remain dispassionate. Homosexuals do well in pleading their cause to refrain from being specific. We see this point made when we compare a cause-pleading writer like Donald Webster Cory, who is always rather vague when it comes to details of homosexual physical attraction and intercourse, with a similarly cause-pleading writer like K. H. Ulrichs, who is considerably more specific about the attractions of the male body. Other things being equal, the writer who defends “homosexual practices” is likely to be more influential with, and in general better received by, the heterosexual reader than the writer who defends mouth-penis and anus-penis contacts, and elaborates upon their raptures. And this even though the reader is well aware that both writers are, after all, talking about and defending the very same things.

Something should be said about the limitations and frustrations of homosexual intercourse from the homosexual’s point of view. We perceive, for example, that the

passive or female role homosexual, the homosexual who is most likely to regard himself as a female soul or psyche in a male body, and who is most in competition with genuine females, is precisely the one who can offer his partner nothing in the way of physical contacts that the woman cannot offer—and who, indeed, can offer one most vital pleasure less. That is, he can offer only his mouth, his anus, and his hands (fellatio, sodomy, and masturbation)—all of which the woman can also offer—and he significantly lacks the *pièce de resistance* of the real woman: a vagina, and coitus. Here, the passive homosexual recognizes, is the absolute and unmistakable proof of his *ersatz* womanhood, and of his inferiority on the physical level to woman as a sexual partner. That the awareness of this deficiency is no myth is attested to by the hundreds of appeals received by Danish and other foreign physicians after the case of Christine Jorgensen became known (and when it was thought that she had been equipped with a “functional vagina”).

That the female role homosexual can offer his partner less than the woman can offer him is somewhat ironic, since the male role homosexual, who is in no sense in competition with women, affords pleasures that no woman possibly can offer. That is, he offers his penis—sodomizing the other, and permitting the other to felate him. Not competing, he is without a rival, while the competing passive homosexual is unfitted by nature for the contest. All this would, of course, be more significant were there a more rigid adherence to the matter of roles.

The male role lesbian is also seriously handicapped, by

her lack of a phallus. Masturbation and cunnilingus may be offered by the male lover, and tribadism is the only distinctively lesbian act. But tribadism, which is basically a stimulation of the external genitalia, not too different from the stimulation possible in cunnilingus and masturbation, is more dispensable so far as most not exclusively lesbian females are concerned than is coitus. The lack of a penis is keenly felt by the male role lesbian, and this lack has not infrequently been the decisive factor in love triangles where males and lesbians are in competition for a female love object. (A case of this kind, describing the suicide of a lesbian resulting from her inability to be a complete lover to her mistress—resulting, that is, from the lesbian's lack of a phallus and consequent incapacity to provide the vaginal penetration required by her mistress—is described by Medard Boss in his book *Meaning and Content of Sexual Perversions*. The case is a particularly tragic one, the lesbian an especially intelligent, sensitive, and generally admirable person, and it well points up the great importance of this anatomical deficiency for the male role lesbian.)

Some readers may be puzzled by the acceptance of the idea that there is competition between women and male homosexuals, and between men and lesbians—actual competition, and not just that competition which is generally recognized to be a part of the male role lesbian's and the passive homosexual's psychology, and which leads him (or her) to think of all members of the opposite sex as competitors. But as Kinsey and others have shown, the popular notion that most or all persons who have homo-

sexual relations are “true” homosexuals is quite erroneous. On the contrary, a large majority of those who engage in some homosexual behavior engage also in some, and usually more, heterosexual behavior. It would be a most conservative estimate to state that there are presently in the U.S. at least fifty million persons who are more or less susceptible to conscious sexual stimulation by members of either sex. And of course most of these fifty million and more persons are not exclusively or even largely homosexually oriented.

Another difficulty of some importance mars homosexual intercourse, and is usually not mentioned by writers on the subject. The preference for the man above, woman below position of coitus, with perhaps a secondary preference for the coital position in which the man and woman lie on their sides facing one another, must be explained in large part on the basis that these positions are not only comparatively devoid of muscular strain, but permit confrontation of the lovers, kissing, and the stimulation of the female breasts by the male (or the stimulation of the male by the female's breasts, as the case may be). There is reason to believe that these are not the coital positions “natural” to mankind, that early man copulated “dog fashion,” with the woman kneeling and the man approaching and penetrating her from behind. However, there can be no doubt that in most cases positions which permits the lovers to confront one another, and which additionally allow for the stimuli of kisses and breast-mouth contacts, represent a distinct advance in love-making—physiologically, by providing important secondary

stimuli, but especially psychologically, improving rapport, and helping to raise the act above the animalistic level.

The lack of confrontation in most homosexual intercourse is definitely regarded as an anti-pleasure factor by homosexuals who are seeking to express love or at least some affection, and who are neither so animalistic nor so guilt-ridden in their behavior that confrontation is either a matter of indifference or something positively to be avoided. Sodomy is performed from behind (usually), while in fellatio, too, the faces of the sex partners are necessarily at a distance. The pleasures of kissing, available in coitus, are denied the homosexual lovers. And these factors—lack of confrontation and restrictions upon secondary simultaneous stimulation—work to the detriment of the homosexual relations as an erotic experience on both physiological and psychological grounds.¹

A few more words before proceeding to a more precise examination of the homosexual acts. In many homosexual relationships, lack of penis or vagina, lack of confrontation, and other inherent obstacles to full gratification are factors not in any way comparable in importance to the masculinity or femininity of the partner. For the true homosexual, and sometimes in other cases as well, it is the maleness of the other which is decisive, or the fact that the other is *not female*. Similarly, for the lesbian it may be the femaleness of the other that is decisive, or the fact that the other is *not male*. Impotence and frigidity, narcissism, castration fears and incest desires, craving for tenderness and abhorrence of crudity and brutality, possibilities of greater spiritual or intellectual rapport: all these and a

host of other factors, physiological, psychological, or both, may offset or minimize difficulties and limitations inherent in the homosexual relationships—or may intensify and increase them.

It should be kept in mind that I am writing about homosexual *acts*, only incidentally about homosexuals.² In the cases of most who consider themselves to be homosexuals, or who are exclusively or mainly drawn to homosexual partners, the ipsosexual aspect of the partner will usually overshadow all else. But, and again, most persons who engage in homosexual acts are not homosexuals of this kind, or homosexuals at all, unless one regards participation in the acts as necessarily definitive (when most would still be “bisexuals”).

Engaging in homosexual acts are various kinds and degree of homosexuals, various kinds and degrees of bisexuals, and other persons who are perhaps best understood as sodomists and cunnilinguists and fellators (or as anally and orally sexual persons). With some of these classes of individuals matters of physiological response, technique, esthetics, etc., loom larger than is the case with the “true” homosexuals, who demand first of all that the other person be of the same sex for the reason that it is only the person of the same sex who in any way erotically attracts them.

The virile and skillful male lover may “cure” some women who are engaging in homosexual relationships. The warm, loving, and understanding woman may “cure” some men of their homosexual propensities. The fellatrice, and the woman who will permit anal intercourse,

may "cure" some males who have engaged in homosexual practices in order to receive oral stimulation or in order to engage in sodomy. The male cunnilinguist may "cure" some women who have turned to other women for that kind of stimulation. But no man, however virile and skillful in his love-making, and no matter what stimulation he is willing to provide, will have anything to offer the true lesbian; and no female, whatever her erotic talents and predilections, will convert the true homosexual to heterosexual practices. There is much misunderstanding on this point, though it has been often enough discussed, and many persons still believe that homosexuals have been and can be cured or converted by heterosexual intercourse. One can only answer those who cite personal knowledge of such cases by responding with the not very satisfying observation that anyone so cured was not a "real" homosexual.

Where both homosexuality and homosexual acts are concerned, motivations are almost infinitely varied and complex. No one can hope to say the last word on the subject, or even to discuss it in anything approaching its vast wealth of detail. To attempt to do so—as many have—is to court certain failure, and is both pretentious and foolish. One can only attempt to hit high spots of interest and importance, to cast a little more light where there are the most shadows. Elucidation of the phenomena of homosexual behavior is of necessity a joint undertaking, requiring the efforts of many, and perhaps it is a task never to be completed. It is with these points in mind that every reader and every writer on the subject should proceed.

THE PHYSIOLOGICAL BASIS

Homosexuality is thought of by many persons as an exclusively mental and emotional aberration; on that basis it is conjectured that the pleasure derived from homosexual acts, especially in the cases of those who take the passive or female roles, is largely or entirely the product of the aberration and dependent upon a pathological shifting of the capacity to respond erotically from one sexual act to another, and from one bodily organ to another. That is to say, it may be assumed that the passive pederast, for example, responds physically and psychologically to this act and to the person and penis of the partner, as the heterosexual female responds to the person and penis of the male, and to the act of coitus. The homosexual's physical response has been "misplaced," as a result of his aberration, and is centered, so far as the passive pederast is concerned, in his anus. His anus has become, for him, a kind of vagina, the recipient of eroticism somehow transferred to the anus from the penis, where it belongs. Both the physical and the psychological rewards experienced by the homosexual are thought to be approximately equivalent to those experienced by the heterosexual. The homosexual is, in other words, a pederast, or a fellator, *instead of* a copulator. That is what it is to be a pervert: to have your desires, and to "get your kicks," in a "queer"

way: to substitute (usually involuntarily) a perverted sex act and perverted desires and responses for normal ones.

It is customary to forget, or not to know, that in all of the acts commonly encountered among male and female homosexuals, the pleasures derived are quite understandable on a natural physiological basis alone. In other words, the body parts usually involved in homosexual contacts—mouth and anus (along with penis and female genitalia, as in heterosexual contacts)—are often or usually extremely sensitive erotically in both heterosexuals and homosexuals, and on a strictly physiological level there is no reason to regard sexual pleasure derived from the contacts involving these parts as unnatural, perverted, or in any way unexpected. If there is a mystery connected with the sexual use of mouth and anus, and the sensual pleasure derived from such use, then what is mysterious is that the uses and pleasures are not a commonplace aspect of all human sexual relationships.

This is true so long as we remain on the strictly physiological level. When psychological factors are introduced, however, the picture changes somewhat, as will be seen. But first it would be well to discuss some of the “erotogenic zones” of the body—the body areas naturally sensitive and responsive sexually—and to understand what is normal and natural where those erotic areas of the body are concerned.

Of the erotogenic body parts involved in the usual homosexual acts, the functions and responses of the penis are for practical purposes the best understood and least debatable. The male having homosexual contacts involv-

ing his penis does nothing with that organ that he may not also do in heterosexual contacts with the female. The penis is sucked (fellatio), it is inserted into the anus and rectum (sodomy or pederasty), or it is masturbated. Everyone understands sufficiently why the penis should respond to the sensations resulting from these forms of intercourse. There is friction with the flesh of the other person, and no physiological reason for supposing that contact with the mouth or anus of an individual of one's own sex is less stimulating than contact with the mouth or anus of an individual of the opposite sex. To be sure, it may be incomprehensible to some that the penis should become erect in the first place without the stimulus of the female. But that is a question one cannot consider without introducing psychological factors.

It might be supposed that the functions and responses of the female genitalia would be similarly, for practical purposes, well understood. Mankind has been copulating for some years now and, moreover, the average individual is likely to engage in coitus several thousand times in the course of a normal sexual lifespan.³ It cannot be said that either firsthand experience or opportunities to study the reactions of others have been wanting.

It is true of course that the female genitalia are more complicated so far as the male sex partner is concerned than is the penis so far as the female sex partner is concerned. (Generally speaking, we may ignore the scrotum and testes which, though parts of the male genital apparatus, seldom play any significant part in heterosexual or homosexual love-making.) But even so, one would not ex-

pect that the female genitalia are so complicated as to defy the understanding not only of husbands and wives, but also of medical authorities, in regard to what sensuously happens to them in the course of love-play and coition. That, however, is the case, though it should in fairness be added that there is far more variation between the genital responses of individual females than between the genital responses of individual males, and this within the limits of what must be considered natural and normal.

Kinsey *et al.* (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*) cite four distinct parts of the female genitalia which are of especial significance in sexual arousal and climax: the clitoris, the labia minora, the vestibule of the vagina, and the vagina itself. (The labia majora, or outer lips of the genitalia, are likened in relative insensitivity and erotic insignificance to the male scrotum. From a tactile standpoint, it is held that neither labia majora nor scrotum is important in the erotic arousal or responses of most females and males, respectively.)

All authorities are in agreement regarding the importance of the clitoris, which is considered to be the homologue or structural counterpart of the penis of the male. The clitoris is at least as sexually sensitive as any part of the female body, and in many females must receive stimulation if maximum arousal and climax are to occur. All marriage counselors and manuals exhort the husband to adequately stimulate the wife's clitoris,⁴ and if it is true that many men are unaware of the importance, and sometimes even of the existence, of this small but vital portion of the female anatomy, it is unlikely that many women

are—the clitoris figuring more prominently than any other part of the genitalia in the masturbatory acts of most females.

Stimulation of the labia minora, or “little” inner “lips” of the female genitalia, is less often counselled specifically, though the Kinsey team held that “As sources of erotic arousal, the labia minora seem to be fully as important as the clitoris.” The labia minora, too, frequently figure in female masturbation, which is sometimes accomplished by rhythmically pulling on these “lips,” though more often they are stimulated in connection or along with the stimulation of the clitoris, and by friction.

Neither is the vestibule of the vagina usually singled out as an especially responsive area by most writers and counsellors on the art of love. But Kinsey holds that for the great majority of women (“nearly all”) it is equally as important a source of sexual stimulation as clitoris and labia minora.

Beyond the vestibule of course lies the vagina itself, and it is around the functions and capacities of the vagina that the great dispute among the experts rages. The vagina is also the most misunderstood portion of the female genitalia so far as the average male is concerned.

Probably a large majority of all males conduct their love-making on the assumption that the vagina is extremely sensitive and responsive. This is attested to by the fact that so many, in manually “caressing” the female genitals in foreplay, endeavor to introduce their fingers as deeply as possible into the vagina, or to stimulate coitus with their fingers, moving them, often roughly, in and

out of the vagina (as if in emulation of the husband, described by Balzac, who is like "an orang-outang with a violin"). This, however, is probably the least satisfying kind of manual approach so far as most females are concerned, since the interior of the vagina is in most cases poorly equipped with end organs of touch. (In many females to such a degree that superficial operations may be performed on the vaginal walls without recourse to anesthesia.) Kinsey remarks that "all the evidence indicates that the vaginal walls are quite insensitive in the great majority of females." ⁵

In view of this insensitivity it might seem that coitus would be less than satisfying for the female, but Kinsey admits that (as countless others have remarked) there are unique satisfactions often forthcoming from the deep penetration of the vagina. He attributes this—as his physical findings oblige him to do—to psychological factors, to contact with the larger body area and external genitals resulting from the positions assumed in coitus, to stimulation of the levator ring of muscles and the pelvic sling, and to vaginal response in the relatively few females who seem to possess tactile sensitivity within the vagina (placed at some 14 per cent). He notes that it is comparatively uncommon for masturbating females to attempt to stimulate the vagina,⁶ and that it is also rather uncommon for this to be attempted in lesbian relations—an observation which is probably valid for the U.S., but which might have to be amended if other countries were taken into consideration. For some reason the

“verge,” or artificial phallus, has never been as popular in this country as it has traditionally been in a good many others.⁷

Now, Kinsey’s findings with regard to the vagina, and his denial that there is a typical “vaginal orgasm,” places him in conflict with probably most authorities on the matter, and especially with the psychoanalytic ones. Sigmund Freud had laid down the rule that the clitoris is the principal source of sexual satisfaction in the young girl, but that in the sexually mature female the principal source of erotic satisfaction is the vagina. The failure of this transference to occur is, indeed, a major source of frigidity in the female.

Some authorities subsequently maintained that satisfaction in the sexual act is not possible at all when the transference from clitoris to vagina does not occur, and various shadings and subtleties of opinion have been expressed on this point. A further debate, or an extension of the other one, has evolved around the question of whether the female normally has a “clitoral orgasm,” a “vaginal orgasm,” or both clitoral and vaginal orgasms.⁸

It would be interesting to discuss this controversy at some length, but to do so would be to stray too far from the subject of homosexual acts, with which we are here concerned. And it is sufficient to our purpose to recognize that the female *external* genitalia are in almost all cases highly responsive erotically, and that penetration of the vagina is not essential to the obtaining of at least a very considerable sexual gratification. The implications

of this for lesbian relationships are obvious, but the matter still requires elaboration and will be dealt with a little later on.

The third body part commonly involved in homosexual relations is the mouth, which also plays a prominent part in heterosexual relations. Lips, tongue, and the interior of the mouth are all extremely sensitive, and Kinsey observes that these "constitute or could constitute for most individuals an erogenous area of nearly as great significance as the genitalia." Even those who confine their oral activities to kissing and perhaps to mouth-breast contacts, should understand well enough the erotogenic character of the lips, tongue, and the interior of the mouth, and the excitations possible where these are brought into use in any sexual contact from petting to the more impassioned forms of love-play.⁹

Lastly,¹⁰ there is the anus, or anus-rectum, since while anal intercourse is a synonym for sodomy or pederasty, the term anus is properly applied only to the opening, penetration taking place through the anus and into the rectum which acts as a sheath for the penetrating penis.

The anal erotic responses are easily explained, and children are well aware of the anus as an erotogenic zone or source of sexual pleasure sensations.¹¹ The anus and the area around it are rich in end organs of touch, and the anal area shares some of its musculature with the genital area. Other factors also contribute to the erotogenic character of the anus.

The rectum, on the other hand, is comparable to the vagina in that it is poorly supplied with end organs of

touch on the one hand, although the deep penetration of the rectum affords considerable satisfaction to some persons. Why this is so represents a further analogy to the vagina, as will be seen.

The Kinsey estimate is that half or more of the total (male and female) population "may find some degree of erotic satisfaction in anal stimulation, but good incidence data are not available. There may be some females and males who may be as aroused erotically by anal stimulation as they are by stimulation of the genitalia, or who may be more intensely aroused."

The purpose of the foregoing has been to remind the reader that there is in every case a *physiological* basis for the erotic satisfactions derived from the typical homosexual acts—sodomy and fellatio, tribadism and cunnilingus. All of the body parts brought into play are parts which nature has endowed with the capacity to respond erotically, so that it would be difficult to argue that it is unnatural for these parts to be used for erotic purposes. (On the other hand, it is possible to dispute whether certain *combinations* are natural.) In any case, it is commonly agreed that mouth, penis, and vagina have their normal roles to play in heterosexual love-making. But present-day interpretations of what is normal and desirable in heterosexual love-making usually do not assign an erotic role of any sort to the erotogenic anus.

It is also true, very obviously, that one must take into account factors other than the physiological functions and possibilities of erotogenic body parts. However, again, it is important thoroughly to grasp that sexual pleasure in

certain body parts, and from many different kinds of stimulation of those parts, is altogether comprehensible on the physiological level. Without this understanding it is impossible even to approximate to an understanding of the meaning and content of homosexual acts.

LESBIAN ACTS

It is my purpose in this section to deal mainly with the homosexual acts of males, and only incidentally with lesbian sex acts. However, lesbian intercourse does have some relevance, and for that reason the female homosexual acts will be discussed briefly.

Masturbation as a love-making technique, and carried through to orgasm, is of more frequent occurrence and of greater significance in lesbian relationships than in male homosexual ones. Indeed, all of the techniques usually thought of as a part of coital foreplay are put to more and more important use with lesbian partners than with male homosexual ones. This is doubtless attributable to the lesbian's belief—generally accurate—that women are more slowly aroused and that they require more in the way of caresses and other preparatory stimulation in order to become fully aroused.

The lesbian knows that many males either do not know or disregard this predilection or requirement of the female. She tends to emphasize all of those facets of love-

making in which the male is so often deficient: caresses, endearments, tenderness, and so on.¹²

The lesbian also has a much better knowledge of the female body generally and of the female genitalia in particular than do most males. Her masturbatory caresses, and her caresses generally, tend therefore to be more subtle, more skillful, and more satisfying. She is able to bring her female partner to a high pitch of excitement by means of genital manipulations far more often than the typical male is able to do, and she is especially aware of the desirability of making the arousal continuous and uninterrupted, bringing the partner slowly and steadily to a pinnacle of erotic excitation.

The data compiled by Kinsey indicate that females who engage in homosexual intercourse are likely to achieve orgasm in a higher percentage of their contacts than do females who engage in heterosexual intercourse. This he attributes largely, no doubt rightly, to the superior knowledge of female anatomy on the part of the lesbian, and to the lesbian's ability to arouse a female in the manner in which she herself would wish to be aroused, whereas the male approaches the female as *he* would like to be approached, which is not usually the approach the female tends to desire or to best respond to.

Of necessity, the stimulation provided by most lesbian contacts—masturbation, cunnilingus, tribadism—is confined to the areas of the external genitalia (clitoris, labia, vestibule of the vagina). Only by the use of an artificial phallus—uncommon in this country, as we have

noted—can the lesbian give her sex partner vaginal stimulation and the feeling of deep penetration available in heterosexual coitus. That such deep penetration is not essential to the obtaining of much sexual gratification by a good many women has been made clear. On the other hand, the most complete kind of female sexual gratification doubtless does require in most cases—for reasons to be mentioned shortly—that there be penetration, and other things being equal it is doubtful that the lesbian can compete on equal sexual terms with the male where the satisfaction of a female who is not a true lesbian is concerned.¹⁸

Cunnilingus, stimulation of the female genitals with the tongue and lips, and sometimes with the teeth, is a common lesbian love-making technique and is of course confined to stimulation of the genitalia anterior to the vagina. It is more satisfying than masturbation for a number of reasons: one is “going farther,” there is a greater intimacy and mutuality of excitation, the tongue and lips are softer, moister surfaces than the fingers and doubtless provide somewhat more intense sensations (and also, with the aid of the teeth, more various ones). It is interesting to note that while cunnilingus is often taken to imply the assumption of a submissive, masochistic role when performed by the male, in lesbian relations it is the person in the dominant, aggressive, male role who provides the oral stimulation or takes the lead in providing it.

Tribadism is a term used to describe lesbian intercourse where the genitalia of the partners are rubbed

together, and also, perhaps inappropriately, where one female simply lies on top of another and performs the bodily movements common to coitus, but without benefit of the phallus. Again, only the external genitals can be stimulated, and the peculiar rewards of tribadism may be inseparable from the fact that it is in a sense an approximation to heterosexual coition, enabling the passive partner to feel more feminine and perhaps more normal in this relationship than in the cunnilingual and masturbatory ones (while the active partner may feel herself to be more male). There is also the possibility, seldom realized, of mutual simultaneous climax; and the advantage, if such it is, that both partners may at least experience climax as a consequence of the same sexual act.

It is authoritatively asserted (though many individuals report otherwise) that oral stimulation of the breasts contributes little to sexual arousal of the female though it may contribute much to the male's arousal. However that may be, oral stimulation of the breasts is common in lesbian love-making. If it is true that the female breasts are not very sensitive erotically—despite the strong prevailing notions and expressions of opinion (and experience) to the contrary—then perhaps this practice, too, serves to make the passive partner feel more feminine and the dominant partner more masculine. This in its turn may serve to lessen feelings of guilt or strangeness on the part of the individual in the passive role where that person has conscious or unconscious reservations about the homosexual indulgence.

MASTURBATION

Most males have had the experience, in the majority of cases as boys, of mutual masturbation, or of masturbating another person, or of being masturbated by another person. A good many have also had the experience of masturbating male animals, usually dogs. Still more have masturbated themselves, but in the company of one or more persons of the same sex; or have been a part of a group, one or more of whose members masturbated himself. These are all homosexual activities since they are sexual experiences involving persons (or animals) of the same sex, but they are seldom thought of as homosexual activities at the time, and in many cases they are never so regarded. They are not, in other words, conscious homosexual experiences, though whether participation in such activities is motivated by unconscious homosexual desires is another question. No doubt this is often or usually the case, as a number of clinical findings would indicate; but consciously the impression in most instances is one of sharing a mildly forbidden experience with a friend, and the act is usually quite devoid of any conscious sexual attraction for the person with whom it is performed under the boyish circumstances.

I recall fairly clearly my own initial experience of this sort, and it was probably a rather commonplace one in

terms both of physical behavior and conscious response. It consisted of a group of five or six boys, on the way home from school, sitting down together beside a railroad track, in a secluded spot, and masturbating (or, as all schoolboys then called it, "jacking off").¹⁴ According to some, this would have to be regarded as a bit of a homosexual orgy, but so far as I know there was an absence of any conscious sexual attraction between members of the group, no one had any idea that the experience was homosexual, and it was about the equivalent in our minds of turning over an outhouse, tossing snowballs at passing cars, or performing some similar act of minor mischief. Most of us had just found out about masturbation, and we knew that it was tabooed behavior—but not very, so long as we didn't let the adults know what we were up to, thus forcing them to take a stand. This seems to me a proper juvenile evaluation of what we were doing, and a proper response to the incident mentioned; and it is certainly easy to see how firm might be the conviction of an adult, looking back on such an experience, that there was nothing homosexual about it. On the other hand, there are too much clinical data to the contrary to insist that just because a sexual experience is lightly taken at the time, and gives rise to no conscious remorse afterwards, that it *cannot* be profoundly significant, and even traumatic, on the unconscious level, strongly influencing the future course of the individual's sexual and more general emotional adjustment. This, too, however should perhaps be qualified, and a predisposition to neurosis or some other disability insisted upon, since experi-

ences of the kind I have described are so extremely commonplace, with only a relative few to be counted as victims.

It is indeed the fact that group masturbation and even mutual masturbation and masturbation of or by another person are so lightly taken on the conscious level, that can make of these activities effective vehicles for homosexual seduction. Mutual masturbation (and I will hereafter include in this term, unless otherwise specified, masturbation of or by another person) is at once the least committing and the least anxiety- and guilt-provoking of homosexual acts, and may be called the consciously (and perhaps unconsciously) "least homosexual" of the three common homosexual contacts—the other two being, of course, fellatio and sodomy.

Homosexual seducers are well aware of the fact that many persons, especially youths, may be seduced to engage in mutual masturbation who would not engage at the time in fellatio or sodomy. Many a history of an individual's homosexual activities includes the information that he first engaged in mutual masturbation, only later in the other "more homosexual" acts.

The homosexual seducer—and in this he does not behave differently from the heterosexual seducer—if he has the patience to bide his time, knows that the mutual masturbation will eventually lead to other types of contacts (if his partner is sufficiently homosexually inclined). Mutual masturbation is, after all, the least satisfying of interpersonal sexual acts, serving merely to whet the appetites—an apertif. Masturbation is in fact something

that one can do almost as well, and sometimes better, alone, and on the tactile level is obviously inferior to the titillations which may be afforded by either fellatio or sodomy.

The mutual masturbation, generating little guilt and little anxiety, and which may be rationalized as not really a homosexual contact at all, may gradually break down the existing barriers against homosexual intercourse and create a desire for more extreme and more stimulating practices.

For this reason, that it does not ultimately satisfy as a form of sexual union, masturbation is rarely encountered as a homosexual practice save in relationships where one or both of the sex partners are quite young and/or inexperienced. Where adults engage in the practice of mutual masturbation as means of inducing climax, that is, not just as foreplay, or in order to bring about erection, the conclusion may usually be drawn that many conflicts and reservations are present consciously and/or unconsciously in one or both partners. When the mutual masturbation is engaged in by adults, it is almost always, of course, understood by them to be homosexual.

Masturbation is, as mentioned, a more common technique in lesbian relationships, for the reason, it would seem, that the female more often requires it, though, if this is the case, one wonders why it is not also a more important aspect of heterosexual love-making. Male ignorance of and misconceptions about the female genitalia provide a part of the answer; but the question then arises why the female does not simply instruct the

male as to her requirements and how best to go about arousing her. Females often seem reluctant to do this, and males seem reluctant to learn, masculine arrogance and vanity perhaps being affronted by any indication either that the female may be more knowledgeable in this respect, or that the male's mere physical presence is not stimulus enough. On the other hand, males do not often seem to be reluctant to instruct females in the art of manipulating the penis, and females do not seem to be at all reluctant to learn. It would, of course, be much better for everyone if this situation were the other way 'round, since masturbation of the male is considerably less complicated, and the acquisition of an adequate technique not much of a problem; while the male—experience advises us—does not usually happen spontaneously upon the knack of female genital manipulations, and would profit considerably—as would his female partner—from precise instruction.

The significance of this for homosexual relations is that while the female manipulates the penis about as satisfactorily as the homosexual male is able to do, the lesbian manipulates the female genitalia with an artistry and effect not matched by most males. At the same time, it is the female who most requires the genital manipulations, the male seldom needing to be masturbated in order to be completely prepared sexually. For these reasons and others, masturbation is a rather insignificant aspect of adult male homosexual intercourse, but an item of considerable significance in the intercourse of adult homosexual females.

FELLATIO

Fellatio, an intelligent and well-educated homosexual once told me, is probably the least natural of the more widely practiced sexual acts. With masturbation and copulation and sodomy, he said, one knows just what to do. Certainly, there are techniques to be learned if the best possible performance is to be given. But they are acts that any man is able to perform at least to his own satisfaction. The same is true of cunnilingus. But it is not true of fellatio.¹⁵

This statement echoed rather strikingly the comments of an articulate German prostitute I once spoke with, and who regarded herself as being an expert on sexual behavior. She, too, lamented the difficulties of fellatio. It was a problem with her at the time because she was having a lesbian relationship with another prostitute, a young and not very experienced girl from the country, who would be able to make more money if she would only master this much-in-demand technique.

"Any idiot can learn to make love (copulate) well enough to please most men," my prostitute friend remarked. "All you have to do is lie there, wiggle a little, sigh and moan, pant, and generally act as if it's about the greatest thing that ever happened to you. Maybe you cut loose with what's called 'a torrent of oaths' every now

and then, and you bite him and scratch him if you see he goes for that. And if it's not too implausible, you beg him not to hurt you with that *enormous* thing he's got. What imbecile can't learn to do those things?

"But when they want you to eat (fellate) them—now, that's a different matter. Nature didn't intend it, or she wouldn't have put teeth in our mouths. And she'd have made mouths longer or she'd have made them (penes) shorter. In the beginning, you know, you are always choking on it. And then there is always some idiot who will grab you by the ears or the back of your head and try to ram it down your throat.

"You have to learn not to choke on it, and you have to learn not to bite them—at least not accidentally. That is painful. I know of one girl who bit a man and he knocked her teeth out. Others get slapped around. Or the guy won't pay. They figure you're a professional and you ought to know how to do it right.

"Your lips get tired, and your mouth. There's a strain to it. It's a shape your mouth's not used to, and you use muscles not normally exercised. Then there's that stuff they spit at you. If it's good enough to come out of them, it's good enough to go into you—that's *their* idea. I never knew a girl who didn't choke on it in the beginning. Some never get so they don't choke on it. And the men, those sons of bitches, if you don't swallow down every last drop, like you're wild for it, they kick up a row.

"No, it's not a natural thing. It's a bloody art, and only a few are ever really good at it. It should be left to

those who've a taste for that sort of thing. Not too many have."

The remarks of the homosexual mentioned earlier were not, as regards the obstacles, dissimilar.

"Anal copulation," he said, "while it surely seems unnatural to many, is not really so. The anus is a natural receptacle for the penis, and has always been so regarded in some parts of the world, especially in the Near and Far East. If it weren't for the possibility of conception in coitus, you'd have a hard time arguing that the vagina is more so.

"And, after all, homosexuals must have 'some place to go.' But you can't say, I don't think, that mouth intercourse is natural. It doesn't come easily or spontaneously. It is something that one must learn to do, and sometimes the learning is rather difficult and takes a long time.

"Neither, I think, is it so natural (for the fellator) to experience pleasure from oral relations. With anal intercourse, while it may not be so pleasant just at first, one quickly learns to respond. There are definite pleasure sensations in the anus. Soon, when one is excited, one experiences a real longing there, a real excitement and desire for physical stimulation.

"It seems to me that the mouth develops its capacity for responding sexually much more slowly. In the end one does respond, but probably with most it is only after a considerable number of experiences. And even then I would suppose that the pleasure is largely psychological.

"In the beginning, you do it because it's expected of

you. You want the other person to do it to you, and then you feel that you must return the favor. Finally you do get to like it—or anyhow most do.

“Some men take a good deal of pride in their oral techniques, and you don’t find that so much with the passive anal eroticists. Some will develop control of the anal sphincters, but even so there is a limit to what one can do to make oneself a more desirable partner—just physically, I mean—for anal sex. In other words, where anal intercourse is concerned, you have it or you don’t. But fellatio is a quite different thing.

“A great deal of individuality is, or may be, expressed in fellatio. You could blindfold me and have several fellows I know do fellatio on me and I could probably name each one by his individual style. But I couldn’t, with rare exceptions, do that with anal relations. Or at least I don’t think I could.

“Fellatio is an acquired skill, even an erotic art, and those who are especially good at it, if they are attractive otherwise, can be very much in demand. Word gets around. It’s talked about and admired and desired. Those with whom one has anal intercourse may be praised for their physical beauty, if they have it, but not often for anything that could be called their anal sex technique.

“The ancient Hindus, you know, recognized fellatio as an art, and a highly intricate one, and both boys and girls were tutored at some length in how to perform it. But training of boys and girls in pederasty was rather largely limited to the acquisition of sphincter control.

“There are, one must admit, natural obstacles. The mouth is not really large enough unless the penis is rather small. The teeth are in the way. The facial muscles become tired and strained, and the lips also become unpleasantly tired if it lasts very long. The other person wants to move his body, but the fellator must usually insist on his lying still if the act is to be well performed. A spontaneous movement, and either the penis is bitten or the fellator may choke, both of these being events not designed to preserve the erotic mood of the intercourse.

“For these reasons, and some others, I think that fellatio is not a natural sex act in the sense that coitus, sodomy, and even cunnilingus are natural. What I mean is, fellatio does not ‘come naturally.’

“Of course, this is not to say that fellatio is abnormal or perverted. After all, millions of both the most primitive and the most civilized persons engage in it, and so far as we know always have.

“I would call fellatio, I think, a ‘refinement’ of sex intercourse. It would compare perhaps to some of the more unusual positions of coitus—positions which, like fellatio, do not ‘come naturally,’ but are the fruits of imagination and the desire to provide and to receive unusual titillations.

“All of the marriage counselors nowadays are coming out in favor of fellatio and cunnilingus when they are engaged in as a foreplay, as preparation for coitus, insuring that the husband and the wife will both be fully aroused for the act, so that both will achieve their cli-

maxes. On the other hand, they say that fellation and cunnilingus are 'perverted' or at least very bad practice when they are carried on to orgasm.¹⁶

"There is a good reason, possibly, for taking this position where heterosexual relations are concerned. No doubt it is best if male and female reach their orgasms in copulation. But where does all this leave the millions of homosexuals, many of whom would be unable to copulate even if they wished to do so?

"It seems to me more than a little strange that fellatio is not perverted when a woman performs it, but perverted if a man performs it. And that cunnilingus is all right if performed by a man, but perverted if performed by a woman. These are surely rationalizations, because fellatio and cunnilingus are two acts which can be performed equally well by either sex, and for which both sexes are equally equipped.

"There is no natural repugnance to homosexual acts, but only to the idea of homosexuality. Blindfold a man or a woman and he or she cannot tell the sex of the person who is performing cunnilingus or fellatio. Many homosexuals disguised as females have performed fellatio on men, and the man, enjoying the experience very much, never knew the difference. Later, in some cases, those men have found out how they were deceived and have been outraged and disgusted. This certainly shows that there was nothing disgusting or outrageous about the *act*, though it was performed by a male. The disgust was thoroughly artificial, deriving from the prejudices against homosexuals and homosexual intercourse held by those

modern authors. It is generally taken for granted that such gratifications as are forthcoming derive in the main from the physical assumption of the female role (where homosexual fellatio is concerned) and from the excitation induced in the other person. It is seldom noted that the physical pleasure could physiologically be expected to at least equal that resulting from "French kissing," or kissing where the mouth is titillated internally by the tongue of the other person, and where lips and tongue are also stimulated. It is widely recognized that the lips, the tongue, and the interior of the mouth are highly sensitive areas, but it is not usually mentioned that they may respond erotically in fellatio, and that tongue and lips may similarly respond in cunnilingus. Instead, the emphasis is all placed on the genital stimulation experienced by the sex partner of the fellator or cunnilinguist. To be sure, the stimulation of the genitals is likely to exceed in intensity the oral stimulation, but that is not to say that the oral stimulation is by any means negligible. The psychology here is peculiar: the pleasure of the individual fellated is readily acknowledged and discussed, while the pleasure of the fellator is glossed over or ignored. Once again, perhaps, we are confronted by the (here unadmitted) belief that all experiences involving the genitals are "more normal" or somehow healthier or less objectionable than pleasures involving the other erotogenic zones. And in acts where the genitals of one person come into contact with erotogenic but non-genital zones of another person, the activity of the partner whose genitals are stimulated is less reprehensible or more nor-

mal than the activity of the partner who stimulates the other's genitals with some non-genital part of his or her body. At bottom, the psychology is simply that of the convict or soldier in an isolated outpost who considers his behavior normal so long as he commits sodomy on another, but who could not endure to be sodomized because that would be queer.

Psychological gratifications of fellatio and cunnilingus, apart from such general observations as that these are rewards consequent upon the assumption of the female role, are also usually neglected or for one reason or another excluded from discussions of the subject. However, every detail concerning oral sexuality is, of course, of great import to the understanding of sexual behavior, and with important consequences for marital adjustment, and one should not neglect to discuss the matter on any hypocritical grounds of possible offensiveness or pretexts of superfluity.

In terms of physical erotic gratification, the pleasures of the fellator do not differ significantly from those of the cunnilinguist. It may be that the advantage is somewhat on the side of the fellator, since a larger erotically sensitive oral area is involved in fellatio than in cunnilingus; but the difference is at most one of degree, not of kind.

Psychologically, however, fellatio and cunnilingus may be altogether different acts, and may arouse quite different pleasures on the one hand and anxieties and other anti-pleasure responses on the other. There are no doubt

a good many cases where cunnilingus and fellatio are engaged in and enjoyed almost indifferently by the same individual; but these are the exceptions, and another matter yet. In the more common instances, it is doubtless quite important to the fellator—and this factor often completely severs his connection with the cunnilinguist—that the phallus is *taken into* the mouth, with the gratification accompanying this being somewhat akin to that experience by the female from penetration of the vagina, and by the passive sodomist from penetration of the rectum. There is almost always a strong desire on the part of both fellator and fellated that the penis be taken deeply into the mouth, and this desire cannot be completely explained on solely physiological grounds where the fellator is concerned. (And perhaps not even where the fellated is concerned. The shaft of the penis below the glans is, after all, relatively insensitive, and many males masturbate, at least a part of the time, employing only the thumb and the forefinger, in a manner which does not provide contact with the entire length of the penis. The incentive to deep penetration, while it is not unintelligible physiologically, is not fully to be understood without recourse to questions of psychological motivation; and this desire for deep penetration will be discussed more thoroughly a little later.)

There is one important aspect of fellatio which makes it in some ways unique among sexual acts, and which is at once the most interesting, possibly the most complex, and the most fraught with ancient magical taboos and

mystical overtones of any connected with this subject. The reference is to problems arising in connection with the ejaculated semen.

More precisely, the main question is that of the ingestion of the semen by the fellator, which seems always to be desired by the fellated or male role partner, and is usually desired also by the fellator (or fellatrice).

One may well inquire as to why it should be of great importance to the individual being fellated that the other person, male or female, ingest or swallow the semen. Obviously, whether the semen is or is not ingested is of no importance to the strictly physical pleasure. By the time the semen has been ejaculated the act is over, or practically so, and it would seem that the only requirement should be that the fellator retain the semen in his mouth long enough for the ejaculation to be completed. What happens to it after that contributes nothing to the sensations experienced by the fellated. Therefore, the importance attached to the ingestion—the pleasure when it occurs, the displeasure when it does not—must be explained psychologically, and is difficult to understand, save on the basis that it is a sign of rejection or acceptance of the fellated person and of the act which led to the ejaculation, with refusal to ingest the semen also laying bare unpleasant anxiety- and guilt-provoking reactions and reservations the fellator and perhaps the fellated as well may have with regard to the experience.

From the point of view of the fellated, the fellator's *refusal* to ingest the semen—when he spits it out—is apparently conceived of as a conscious and willful act of re-

jection, and possibly as a token of disgust, and is therefore an affront. So, too, is it a rejection when, as more often happens, the fellator gags on the ejaculate, though this is less disturbing in some cases (and doubtless more disturbing in others) for the reason that it seems to be intuitively grasped that the rejection is *unconscious*. In almost every case, other things being equal, the fellator or fellatrice who will ingest the semen is preferred to the oral sex partner who will not.¹⁷

As for the fellator, for him, too, the question is of great importance. He understands that to swallow the semen without hesitation, and with apparent pleasure, is expected and is regarded as an indication of acceptance. When he gags, or especially if he should vomit, this will be both frustrating and embarrassing, and particularly so where both partners understand the unconscious significance of these reactions.

Such gagging (sometimes with vomiting) is not uncommon in fellatio, especially when the fellator or fellatrice is inexperienced in the practice. Unless the ejaculation is an unusually powerful one, this gagging probably does not admit of a physiological explanation. That this is a rejection, of the act, of the other person, of the semen, or of all or any combination of these, and that the rejection is unconscious (conscious rejection manifesting itself by the individual spitting out the ejaculate), is in many cases clear. It often happens that the individual fully intends and strongly desires to ingest the semen, and has no conscious reluctance of any kind to do so and yet there is gagging and perhaps vomiting. This rejection

by gagging or vomiting usually testifies, among other things, to unconscious feelings of guilt. However, it often happens, and probably this is usually the case, that the fellator, after a time, becomes able to ingest the semen without gagging. Just why this should occur, since presumably the unconscious guilt and other unconscious sources of rejection are not diminished by further indulgence, is probably explained by the learned ability of the fellator to detect when the ejaculation is coming and thus prepare himself for it so that the mechanical preparations more than compensate for the unconscious rejection as it is manifested physiologically. Of course, when the rejection is very extreme the gagging and vomiting will probably not be overcome, with the result that the individual is likely to have to abandon this phase of his chosen erotic career.¹⁸

The conscious or unconscious reluctance of the fellator to ingest the semen, a reluctance almost certainly encountered more often than not, at least among novices, is perhaps to be accounted for partly in terms of the reaction of distaste for and withdrawal from the other person which frequently, and especially with males, *follows* all kinds of sexual relations, and is probably most common of all in homosexual and some other tabooed practices. That is, the ardor of the fellator is likely to be in approximate relation to that of the sex partner, and once climax is achieved, and the excitement abruptly and sharply diminishes, a certain amount of disgust, or at least a definite cooling toward the other, may occur

very swiftly—leaving the semen to be ingested after this reaction has already set in.

Yet another possibility to be mentioned in accounting for the rejection of the semen is that the semen may be equated with bodily excretions—urine and feces—and may be disgusting or distasteful on that ground. Probably a good many who violently condemn the practice of fellatio, even when it is performed by a female, hold to this view, a factor reinforcing their hostility to a practice also disapproved of on other grounds.

That the semen may be invested with symbolic values enabling the individual to overcome any obstacles to its ingestion is also true, as is the reverse, the obstacles, on account of the symbolism, being insurmountable. In a few persons, the ingestion of the semen is so meaningful as to bring about a climax in the fellator directly linked to the ejaculation of the individual he is fellating and to the subsequent ingestion. Such cases are, however, in the minority. And it is to be supposed that commonly such pleasure as the fellator derives from the ingestion of the semen is based mainly on the pleasure which this ingestion gives to the sex partner, and to the acceptance of the sex partner which it implies.

Before leaving the subject of fellatio, I would like to touch further upon a matter mentioned briefly at the beginning of this discussion. It seems quite likely that there are some cases of male and female homosexuality, and some others of male and female bisexuality, or rather, cases that are so regarded, that would be much more

profitably explained in terms of anal and oral sexuality, or of desire for anal or oral sex intercourse.

In other words, there are individuals who are almost equally attracted to both fellatio and cunnilingus, and little or not at all attracted to other sexual intercourse, and it would seem that these persons are best understood in terms of their oral cravings, rather than as bisexuals. The same is true of active or male role sodomists, who may crave sodomy almost exclusively and care little whether it is a male or a female anus they penetrate, and who are thus better understood in terms of their anal predilections.

The case of the individual who is largely or exclusively a passive pederast is perhaps an even better example. The male passive pederast, of necessity, has homosexual relations (though it used to be fairly commonplace for such individuals to also have themselves sodomized by females equipped with artificial penes, and a few such persons do achieve gratification regularly by means of heterosexual anilingus and anal masturbation). It is always assumed that these passive pederasts are homosexuals in the sense that their desires are primarily for (anal intercourse with) members of their own sex, but this may raise a difficulty when one considers the matter of females who similarly desire the passive role in sodomy and whose intercourse is of necessity heterosexual. It seems that in many of such cases it would definitely be more illuminating to regard these passive sodomists simply as passive sodomists, or as anally erotic, than to insist

that the male ones are homosexuals and the female ones heterosexuals, distinct from their male counterparts, and that therefore the phenomena are altogether separate. That both males and females may be, say, kleptomaniacs, or pyromaniacs, or compulsive masturbators, and that the mechanisms of these deviations may be understood as similar in both sexes, is acknowledged. It may be that this should apply also to the types of individuals mentioned above, and that it is misleading to place too much emphasis upon the sex of the individuals who are of perhaps merely structural necessity their sex partners.

Moreover, wherever a given relationship is a homosexual one, or is at any rate between members of the same sex, an insufficient amount of attention is paid to the *acts*. Clinicians and theoreticians alike appear to be entranced and ensnared by the fact that the relationship is homosexual, and to preoccupy themselves with seeking the basis of the ipsosexual attraction. This is an important question, to be sure, but it is only a part of the problem; and the preoccupation works to thwart the fuller understanding which might result were the acts given greater consideration.

One needs to inquire: What does sodomy mean generally, and what does it mean in this relationship in particular? What does fellatio mean generally, and what does it mean here? What are the values of these acts for the participants? This is an aspect of sexual relationships which, given the obvious importance of it, has been underemphasized by investigators. It may be that existential

analysis will probe more deeply and more widely into these matters than has hitherto been done. There are indications that this will be the case.

SODOMY

“No one likes to penetrate excrement,” says the primitive (Trobriander), and he speaks for heterosexual man in the civilized societies as well. The homosexual (and most other sodomists) agrees that “no one likes to penetrate excrement,” and moreover the typical homosexual male is likely to be somewhat more fastidious than his heterosexual brother. Nonetheless, the anus is used in homosexual contacts, sodomy not fellatio is the definitive homosexual act, and the homosexual is even able to find beauty in anal intercourse. This is possible because the anus is transformed, in the mind of the homosexual, from an excretory organ into a primarily sexual one.¹⁹

Obviously, some rather remarkable accommodations are made here. For most of us, holding to the perspective generally regarded as acceptable, the anus is that orifice through which we void our waste products—our “filth.” Even for those of us who regard defecation quite matter-of-factly as a natural process, the anus is still a rather unpleasant part of the anatomy. The “dirt” that comes out of it is, for some reason, more offensive than other dirt—

so much so that many rather normal people can scarcely bear the sight of it.

The anus, unless precautions are taken, will stink—as every child in our culture is more than once advised. The orifice occupies our consciousness for the most part only when we are excreting and wiping away the excreta, or when, as is not too infrequent among Americans, we are the victims of some anal disorder. With few exceptions, which are “psychopathological” ones, the anus goes unpraised in literature (though it renders meritorious and most essential service). No (heterosexual) poet includes it in his enumeration of the physical charms of his beloved, and with some poets it is perhaps the only part of the external body omitted from mention.

Even homosexuals, having accomplished the metamorphosis of this much maligned aperture into one of copulation, tend to be less well disposed to it than is the heterosexual to the vagina.²⁰ A few writers insist upon its functional superiority to the vagina as a vehicle for sexual pleasure, but even these do not often profess to find it esthetically appealing.²¹ Esthetic tributes to sodomy are limited to the buttocks, to the contact of the male bodies, and to the act as an expression of “manly love” or something of the sort.

In a way this is curious. The penis, which appears in countless art works, and is ugly and shameful only to the prudish and/or the mentally disturbed, evokes no such universal hostility and distaste. Some would explain this on the basis of the penis' function as an “organ of genera-

tion," but that is only a part of the story; and it has been often enough celebrated in its capacity as a sexual (copulatory) organ as well.

Yet the penis is also an excretory organ. One urinates far more frequently than one copulates, so that the phallus appears not seldom in its less romantic role, but the sexual function of the penis remains primary in almost every mind. This indicates, obviously, that the sexual function of the penis is regarded as being more important than its eliminative function (though such a view might be difficult to maintain on a strictly physiologic basis, urination being, after all, a bit more essential to survival than sexual intercourse). Perhaps it is not that the sexual function is held to be more important, but merely that it is more interesting.

The penis is a "sex organ" because it is used to have sex relations with and because it is the source of erotic sensations and gratifications. (It is assumed, I think reasonably, that few persons think of procreation when they think of "sex organs.") We can better understand the sodomist's awareness of the anus as primarily a sex organ when we recognize the fact that for him the anus possesses those same qualifications which make the penis a sex organ for the copulator.

The anal aperture, as was noted earlier, is highly sensitive, abundantly supplied with end organs of touch, and the physiological basis for pleasure in sodomy is further explained by the reactions of the anal sphincter to penetration and by the fact that the buttocks, too, in both

male and female, may be highly responsive to tactile stimulation.²²

There is also, and perhaps most importantly, the pleasure which may be derived, and not only by homosexuals, from deep penetration of the rectum. Females who have experienced both vaginal and rectal penetration find the two experiences in many ways comparable.

Just as, when excitation is present, the female may become conscious of the vagina as a hole or an emptiness, and desire that this hole or emptiness be filled, so, too, does the passive role sodomist in some cases become conscious of the anus as a hole which he intensely desires be filled. (The expectation of fellatio may arouse somewhat analogous feelings in the fellator, but they are usually less marked.)²³

When this awareness of an emptiness within, which is a consciousness of a desire and a lack, is present, it may only be satisfied by the "filling up" which results from penetration by the penis (or penis substitute). This penetration gives the individual—gives both individuals—that feeling of one-ness and union which has always been held to be one of the greatest rewards of sexual intercourse.

It is likely that in the great majority of instances of persons who engage in passive role sodomy, the pleasure sensations experienced in the rectum and at the anus during the act are absent or only slightly felt the first few times the act is performed. Later, however, these pleasure sensations may become quite intense, with the result

that not only does repetition of the experience come increasingly to be desired, but the anus becomes more and more a "sex organ" in the consciousness of the passive pederast.

It has been mentioned that the rectum, like the vagina, appears to be lacking a physiological basis for the physical pleasure which so many individuals report experiencing in both vaginal and rectal copulation. If there is indeed no physiological basis for these responses experienced as tactile, and it is doubtful that the last word has yet been said on this subject, then the pleasures are of course psychogenic. But anal and rectal sexual responses have been somewhat less than exhaustively studied and it is not inconceivable that the interior lining of the rectum is erotically responsive in a minority of persons of both sexes, as Kinsey holds the interior lining of the vagina to be responsive in a minority of females.

Even though the possibility of physiologically based erotic responses in the rectum was ruled out altogether, there would be nothing particularly unexpected or unexplainable about the seemingly physical pleasure experienced. Persons in hypnotic trance, and under the influence of the drug mescaline—as I have observed repeatedly—are able to experience erotic sensations in parts of the body where there is no known physical basis for such responses. That possibly no physiological basis for physical pleasure responses in vagina and rectum can be established does not at all entitle us to insist that responses experienced as physical are non-existent. And it will matter little to the individual performing the act

whether the considerable apparent physical pleasure he experiences has a physiological or a psychological basis.²⁴

That the passive sodomist experiences the more intense pleasure responses only, as a rule, after he has engaged in the act several of more times, it is not surprising either, and merely constitutes a further analogy to vaginal intercourse. Pain of defloration aside, a girl may experience little pleasure sensation in the vagina (or elsewhere) during her first and early acts of intercourse, with the vagina seemingly "learning" to respond pleasurable to coitus. The rectum, it would seem, "learns" to respond pleasurable with somewhat less rapidity, but for almost anyone—as is evidenced by the testimony of convicts and others forced into passive role sodomy, but who remain primarily or exclusively heterosexual in their desires—the rectum does eventually yield pleasure sensations when the act is engaged in repeatedly.

The normal person is aware of the anus primarily as an excretory organ, while the passive sodomist is aware of it primarily as a sex organ.²⁵ It is also the case that the normal person thinks of the anus primarily as an orifice through which matter passes *out*, while the sodomist, on the other hand, regards the anus as primarily an orifice through which matter passes *in*. It is worth noting that this particular distinction between normal and abnormal awareness of body cavities cannot apply to the mouth. The mouth, for the normal individual, is doubtless first and foremost (where the passage of matter is concerned) associated with eating, which is as much an intaking as fellatio. But there is rarely any consciousness of erotic

gratification or significance in connection with eating (though sexual elements may be present), while the fellator may consider the mouth to be at least as much a sex organ as a vehicle for taking in food. (The vagina, of course, is almost exclusively an organ of intaking, differing considerably in this respect from the anus, which can never be altogether separated from its function as an outlet for the feces.)

From all of the foregoing, it must be seen that there is much that is anomalous in the psychical climate of the homosexual acts and, to a lesser degree, in the physical climate as well. Both psychological and, to some extent, physiological aspects of the sex organs are distorted, the anus-rectum, for example, being invested with attributes and perhaps erotic capacities which, even though it is partly an erotogenic zone, it would not normally possess. The emptiness of the rectum, the sensation of the anus-rectum as an intaking hole which is desired to be filled—these normally belong to the vagina, not to the anus. It is significant that such feelings with regard to the anus come only after pederasty has been practiced for some time, many more repetitions of the act often or customarily being required in the case of the anus-rectum than in that of the vagina. Even, however, if the pleasure responses and localized desire consciousness are as much the fruit of sexual relations in the vagina's case as in that of the anus, if both learn to respond to the same stimulus and in somewhat the same way, it cannot so well be argued that this is natural or normal in the anus' case. The hole feeling being characteristic, almost definitive, of the female,

when it becomes characteristic of the male there usually also occur anomalous psychological changes which over-emphasize the female components of the male makeup and represent to the world a psychical organization obviously no longer that of the normal male.

In the early part of this century, and in the latter part of the nineteenth, a good deal of attention was being paid to transformations occurring in and around the anal orifices of passive pederasts. This was no new discovery. The distinctive appearance of the anus of the habitual female role sodomist had been noted by the Romans, and probably earlier.

Professor Tarnowsky (*Pederasty in Europe*) described the phenomena at some length, and also summarized the findings of others. He confirmed the oft-noted feature that the anus of the habitual passive sodomist, when he assumes a position kneeling on elbows and knees, tends to gape open, and sometimes to have a slit-like (as distinguished from the characteristically round) appearance. But he found in his practice, which was extensive in this regard, no confirmation for Tardieu's assertion that in catamites (here meaning youthful passive pederasts) "the long mucosa of the lowest part of the rectum in the vicinity of the anal orifice forms folds and takes on the appearance of a slightly thickened coil or ring. In other cases, the folds of the mucous membrane resemble excrescences which at times attain such development that they constitute ridges somewhat similar in appearance to the labia minor of a woman's genitalia. These ridges separate when the anal orifice is stretched." Tarnowsky observed

of this that he had “never noted such an aspect in catamites. It does sometimes accompany rectal prolapse in cases having no etiologic relation whatever with pederasty.”

Professor Tarnowsky noted that the catamites would often attempt, when being examined, to conceal the characteristic anal changes by clenching the sphincter, but he invented ingenious, one might say diabolic, or at least sadistic, methods for thwarting this attempted concealment (or resistance to invasion of privacy).

I cannot unfortunately vouch for the authenticity of Tarnowsky's observations, or of those of Tardieu and others, but if it is the case that the anus of the passive pederast comes to resemble somewhat, as many have claimed, the external genitalia and opening of the vagina of the female, then the phenomenon is certainly of great interest since it would seem likely that the changes which take place are not entirely the result of the physical intercourse. The anus must, that is, in some cases, function for the passive sodomist as a “vagina,” and indeed it is rather frequently so identified in his mind—the female role homosexual, for example, speaking of “my cunt,” or “my pussy,” and so on. And it is not impossible that should the anus come somewhat to resemble the vaginal opening, the alterations which occur are the result of an unconscious effort to simulate a vagina (possibly by developing sphincter relaxation which causes the anus to gape open, and perhaps by effecting even more radical and dramatic changes).

This is a matter which would certainly bear further investigation, and it is to be hoped that those in clinical practice will avail themselves of their opportunities and make their findings known.

NOTES

1. [page 174]

One recalls a passage from Jean Genet (*The Thief's Journal*): "Though we are bound together by my prick, all our friendly relations are cut off. Our mouths, which might be able to re-establish them, can not meet. He seeks only to be further impaled."

2. [page 175]

Were I writing about homosexuals, and thus confining the discussion of homosexual acts within the limits prescribed by homosexual psychology, then I should be obliged to more strictly heed the warning voiced by the author Ann Aldrich (*We Walk Alone*):

“ ‘If you agree with me that the lesbian is mainly a clitorid-ean type of woman,’ a friend of mine argued, ‘then you have to agree also that the lesbian has the advantage over the male in making love to a woman. She’s touching a familiar body. Her technique’s bound to be better!’

“This argument, like many with respect to the nature of the lesbian’s sexual experience, concentrates solely on the physical, and ignores the more important psychological factors involved in homosexuality. Those who worship at the altar of technique perhaps overlook the fact that if the psyche is unwilling, no amount of technique can persuade it; and if the psyche is willing, no lack of technique can dissuade it. While a heterosexual may experience homosexual intercourse, and vice versa, the technique employed is probably the least consideration in determining the extent to which the experiment will continue. A much more important consideration is the psychological receptivity.”

It is doubtless true for the homosexual in a heterosexual contact no less than for the heterosexual in a homosexual one that “if the psyche is unwilling, no amount of technique can persuade it,” though it may be somewhat less true that “if the psyche is willing, no lack of technique can dissuade it.”

With heterosexuals (or “bisexuals”) engaging in homosexual acts the emphasis may be different. While it is probably true that no one voluntarily engages in homosexual acts who is entirely lacking in homosexual inclinations—a male probably could not (save for the female role)—it is also true that the pleasure-received factor becomes increasingly important as the importance of the element of homosexual psychological attraction diminishes. Thus, as in the case of the lesbian mentioned by Boss, it was the superior pleasure (vaginal penetration) afforded by the male which caused the (“am-

Notes

bisexuals”) girl for whom the two were competing to choose the man and reject the woman. And innumerable cases have been reported where women who could “go either way” chose the lesbian relationship because of the lesbian lover’s greater tenderness and skill in love-making, because, that is, of her superior technique.

3. [page 179]

“Biologically speaking,” writes Wilhelm Reich (*The Function of the Orgasm*), “the healthy human organism calls for three to four thousand sexual acts in the course of a genital life of, say, 30 to 40 years.” He adds: “The wish for offspring is satisfied with two to four children. Moralistic and ascetic ideologies condone sexual pleasure even in marriage only for the purpose of procreation; carried to its logical conclusion, that would mean at the most *four* sexual acts in a life-time.”

4. [page 180]

The most famous piece of advice on this particular matter undoubtedly remains that given to Empress Maria Theresa by her physician, Van Swieten: “I am of the opinion that the clitoris of your Most Sacred Majesty should be titillated for some length of time before coitus.”

The Empress had consulted him specifically about her sterility, but it was his belief that this could be overcome if she managed to experience the sexual climax. However dubious some may take that view to be, the Empress subsequently produced sixteen children, and, one supposes, conceived them with a considerably greater pleasure than she might have done had her imperial clitoris remained untitillated.

5. [page 182]

Obviously, many females themselves lack knowledge of the manipulations which would best serve to stimulate their own

genitalia. And some must learn from lesbian educators how to experience sexual arousal as the result of a few rather simple manual techniques. Others, masturbators of long standing, are so shy or otherwise reluctant that they never get around to instructing their husbands in the manipulations that often would mean the difference between a satisfying and a frustrating sexual life, and between the harmony often accompanying the former and the disharmonies almost inevitably accompanying the latter. Not that this reluctance or ignorance should excuse the husbands who, even if they remain completely oblivious of printed and spoken counsels on marital relations, should at least be sufficiently interested observers to note that their wives are not responding to the techniques employed and possess sufficient initiative and self-interest to try something else.

6. [*page 182*]

Young girls, basing their activities on what they have been told or otherwise have learned of coitus, not infrequently begin masturbating by stimulating the interior of the vagina either with their fingers, or with a truly wondrous variety of phallus substitutes, which may range from hairpins and broom and soda straws to frankfurters, candles, carrots, and fishing pole handles. Usually, however, these amateurish insertions are fairly soon replaced by manipulations of the external genitals, either because enlightenment comes from some better informed friend, or because the more sensitive and more easily stimulated areas are accidentally discovered in the course of the vaginal explorations. Some adult females do, however, continue with the masturbatory vaginal penetrations, either because they are vaginally sensitive, because they find such penetrations are a more satisfying accompani-

Notes

ment for their coital phantasies, or for a variety of other reasons more peculiar to individual temperaments and inclinations.

7. [page 183]

Ann Aldrich (see Note 2), who is probably the best informed avowedly lesbian author writing in behalf of the lesbian in this country today, also leans to the belief that the artificial phallus is little used in lesbian relationships in the U.S. presently. She comments on this and offers her opinion as to what the lack of a penis may mean to the lesbian as follows:

“Dildos (artificial penes) come in a variety of forms. Some may be held in the hand; others are worn by one partner or used in single or double form. It is my belief that they are not frequently employed in most relationships between two lesbians. In the first place, they are not generally available to most lesbians, and secondly, to many there is relatively little desire for actual penetration, the clitoris being the main organ for their gratification.

“On the whole, I would say that most female homosexuals merely feel occasional melancholy awareness of their inability to possess a woman as a man. At such times, rather than attempt to find a penis substitute, I think they more often ‘lie there wishing perhaps to be a man for a moment,’ as Anais Nin describes it in ‘Winter of Artifice.’ ”

Elsewhere in *We Walk Alone*, Miss Aldrich takes note of the fact that some masculine lesbians may keenly feel the need to effect penetration, and that some women in lesbian relationships may feel a strong need to be vaginally penetrated. For the lesbian who feels she must penetrate her partner, Miss Aldrich writes, “the sexual act is a homosexual imitation of heterosexual congress.”

Perhaps the counterpart of this masculine lesbian is the passive pederast who thinks of his anus and rectum as his "vagina," and who also seeks to ape heterosexual coitus. By no means all passive pederasts, it should be added, think of the anus-rectum as a vagina-like sexual orifice, and not all would wish to have real vaginas even if they could. The anus, for many, is regarded as being a satisfactory sexual orifice in its own right, and the intercourse is desired specifically on the basis that it is between males, and without any reference to the sex organs or any other part or aspect of the female.

8. [*page 183*]

To some this whole affair is likely to sound a bit ridiculous, and of course it is not without its humorous aspects. However, the question is no simple one, and it will not suffice just to ask the ladies where they have their orgasms. On the contrary, some distinguished (and presumably non-virginal) female scientists have participated in the controversy—and on opposing sides. The obvious answer would seem to be that some women have vaginal orgasms, some have clitoral orgasms, and some have both. But that is not really much of an answer, even if true. One would still need to find out whether the clitoral orgasm, say, is an appropriate response, or whether it is symptomatic of arrested development or some other aberration. If one of the orgasmic responses is appropriate, and another aberrant, one would need to know why and how it happened and what can be done about it. And so on.

9. [*page 184*]

The teeth also, as is well known, are of considerable importance in oral stimulation. From the oft-remarked little "love bites" and affectionate nips and nibbles to wound-inflicting bites, the teeth have always had a significant role in love-making and in perversions of love-making such as

sadism. And the use of the teeth may evoke powerful erotic responses in one or both sex partners.

The teeth are not, however, erotically sensitive, or "erotogenic zones," and they have therefore been excluded from the main body of the text.

10. [*page 184*]

It may be that one should include the hand, especially the fingers, which do seem to be quite erotically sensitive in some persons, and which are involved in the homosexual practice of mutual masturbation, especially important in lesbian relationships, and where the hand functions, in a sense, as a sex organ.

Throughout the average person's life his (or her) hands play an immensely important erotic role, one which has not been accorded, in recent times, its due.

The child's first expressions of affection, perhaps his first expressions of sexual desire, are made with his hands, and by means of his hands the child gains his first tactile knowledge both of his own body and of the bodies of others. For most persons, the first consciously sexual experience—masturbation—establishes a link between the hands and eroticism which persists throughout the individual's life, reinforced by almost every subsequent sexual experience of whatever kind.

For many, the caress is a most essential aspect of sexual arousal, serving to stimulate both the caressor and the caressed. A part of the sexual response to the caress is, of course, psychological, caressing having implications going far beyond the mere contact of epidermises.

Since erotogenic areas of the body of the other are usually chosen as the focal points for the erotic caresses, there is no difficulty in at once understanding the physiological responses of the person thus stimulated. But strong responses are also

aroused in the caresser, and these are more physiologically intelligible than most of us tend to suppose.

An article in the March, 1960, issue of *MD* magazine remarks that "Unequaled by any other part of the body is the hand's intimate partnership with the brain: cortical representation of the hand is in fact larger than all other somatic parts except the head. . . .

"In (its early) delicate function as a sense organ, the hand developed a high concentration of sensory endings (100 per two square millimeters); in the number of touch corpuscles the fingertips are second only to the tip of the tongue.

"The skin and pulp of fingers and palm contain several kinds of specialized touch corpuscles: of the 2000 or so Pacini corpuscles distributed throughout the skin, over 800 are in the fingers alone; the hands are rich in Meissner and Ruffini corpuscles."

Experiments with mescaline, cited elsewhere in this book, show that in the mescaline intoxication "erotic consciousness" may readily be localized in the fingers (and in palm, wrist, and forearm). Considerable erotic sensation may then be obtained by any friction of the fingers, against flesh, against fabrics, against hard surfaces, etc. Probably this is to be understood in part as an intensification of the considerable capacity for erotic response already physiologically present in the erotogenic fingers.

It is not the sense of sight but the sense of touch that causes the sex partner to come into being for us as flesh. Perhaps instinctively one wishes to caress every part of the other's body, to know it tactilely, and to bring it to life under the caressing hand and fingers. As sexual excitation increases, the fingers are likely to increase both the speed of their movements and the pressure of the contact.

Notes

During the sexual act, and especially as the climax approaches, these tendencies may be greatly intensified. Both partners may experience the desire to run their hands impassionedly over the body of the other, or the more tightly to clutch the other with the hands. Scratches, often drawing blood, are inflicted, which may be intended as scratches, or which may rather attest to the vigorous friction-craving activity of the long-nailed fingers.

The sexual significance and role of the hand and especially the fingers has long been recognized in popular lore and superstitions, and elsewhere. The placing of the wedding ring on the finger may in part constitute such recognition. Many erotic customs have involved the fingers. At one time, for a male to take in his hand the finger of a female was an act highly charged with eroticism. More recently—perhaps it is still practiced—the male's scratching of the palm of the female with his fingertip has constituted an invitation to coitus.

Much more could be said on this subject. No one denies the importance to eroticism of the hands, or that they are erotically sensitive to some degree, but the whys and how muchs remain inadequately understood and call for much additional exploration.

11. [page 184]

Sigmund Freud has well observed ("From the History of an Infantile Neurosis," in *Collected Papers, Vol. III*) that the male child witnessing heterosexual intercourse often arrives at the conclusion that the intercourse is *per anum*, thus interpreting the coitus he has observed for the reason that he has no knowledge of the existence of the vagina and must understand the act in terms of his own body's possibilities. He then creates a "cloaca theory," in which the anus is an

organ both of copulation and elimination. Under certain conditions he may unconsciously retain this belief in the anus as a cloaca, or combination sex-excretory organ, long after he is consciously aware that copulation is with the vagina.

In the same paper, Freud noted that the child may find confirmation for his view of the anus as a sexual aperture, or may come to so regard it in the first place to the extent of associating it with sexual pleasure, as a result of the experience of elimination:

"Since the column of feces stimulates the erotogenic mucous membrane of the intestine, it plays the part of an active organ in regard to it; it behaves just as the penis does to the vaginal mucous membrane, and acts as it were as its precursor during the cloacal epoch."

But the child who does not witness coitus and formulate a "cloaca theory" is aware of the anus only as an organ of out-passage, though as one with which pleasure sensations are associated. Freud's observations are particularly interesting in the light of some of the questions discussed in the section on sodomy.

12. [*page 187*]

One finds this emphasized in a great many lesbian novels, even including some written by lesbians. The emphasis on comparative tenderness, more skillful caresses, etc., on the part of the lesbian lover, is in fact a stereotype of the female homosexual love scene in fiction.

On the other hand, there are novels written by lesbians, and a few by non-lesbians, which describe sex acts that are swift, without preliminaries, and even savage.

The fact is probably that while most women profit from an extended foreplay, there are also a good many women

Notes

who do not require it, especially if they are not very inhibited sexually and are really attracted to the sex partner.

One would guess that women are “naturally” about as quick to respond, and about as “animalistic” in their love-making as men, and that the slower responses and desire for extended caresses and tenderness so often reported are largely or exclusively the results of conditioning imposed on the female for economic, ideologic, and other reasons.

13. [page 188]

If it is true that in the normal mature woman there has occurred a transference of the seat of primary response from clitoris to vagina, with perhaps even the source of the orgasm being thus shifted, then obviously lesbian intercourse must be less than fulfilling for such a woman, as must any sexual stimulation other than that obtained in coitus. To be fulfilled, the normal woman would have, in effect, to be filled full—the meaning, of course, of fulfillment. The fulfillment of climax could not occur without the full filling of the vagina, which occurs only in copulation. The female satisfied by lesbian intercourse would have to be one who has never made the transference to the vagina and who is thus abnormal and immature. This is indeed what many psychoanalytic observers hold to be true of the homosexual of both sexes, and what a good many lesbians also appear to believe with their designation of themselves as “clitoridean types” (as distinguished from the majority of females, who are “vaginal types”). One might perhaps extend with equal plausibility these assertions and declare that the “bisexual” female is likely to be one with whom the transition from clitoris to vagina is partial and unfinished. The entire matter is at least, as Kinsey has demonstrated, still subject to debate: i.e., inadequately understood.

14. [*page 191*]

This term ("jacking off"), used in the 'thirties and 'forties by all schoolboys, and perhaps still in vogue, is held by the authors of a recent work on slang to derive from the word "ejaculate." I have also heard, however, that it is a modification of the term "jerk off" which owes its origin to the jerky movements of the masturbator.

I well remember, in this regard, a boy who had the distinct misfortune to be named Jack Hoff, and whose life was made thoroughly miserable on that account. Schoolboys are usually quite without mercy where names lend themselves to sexual word plays, and one must wonder at the rare innocence, or cruelty, of parents who inflict upon their children names certain to make their bearers targets of such abuse.

Sometimes, the last name alone is an unfortunate one in this respect, and then it is a little more difficult to do anything about it. Two boys in one school I attended were about as badly abused as poor Jack Hoff. One was named Lipschitz, and the other Fuchs. At the same school were girls named Koch and Kuntz, and they too were subjected to many an ordeal on account of their names. Others singled out for especial attention were boys called Dick and Peter, but in these cases the jokes were perhaps a bit less tormenting.

It would be very interesting to learn what effect, if any, these word plays ultimately had on the victims. I remember so vividly the cries of "Hey, I hear Roger Fuchs!" and "Mary, let's see your Kuntz!" Certainly, Roger and Mary remember them better than I do. A study of the subsequent sexual lives and attitudes of children with such names might be most illuminating and might perhaps help to persuade some parents to give thought to what is likely to be done with the names they force upon their progeny.

Notes

15. [page 195]

Various writers insist upon reporting that animals “naturally” engage in cunnilingus and fellatio. What they mean by this is that the animals lick one another’s genitals. The bitch, for example, will sometimes lick the penis of the male dog. The tomcat will lick the sexual orifice of the female feline. And so on. Quite as often, animals will sniff and lick at the anal apertures of other animals, so that one could, with equal logic, argue that anilingus is natural to animals and, therefore, probably natural also to man.

But the actions referred to do not really, of course, correspond to cunnilingus and fellatio in humans; and even if one confines the comparison to the most crude physical level, there is no resemblance to fellatio. There is no animal, with perhaps the rarest exceptions found among individual monkeys, that even approximates fellatio as it is performed by humans.

16. [page 200]

The question of whether cunnilingus or fellatio is performed to climax seems to me to be an entirely false criterion for establishing whether the act is or is not “perverted,” and doubtless merely represents a concession to the view that sexual relations must be in the service of procreation. The correct criterion would be the *meaning* of the act—why it is performed, and what are the effects of the performance. And probably in most cases, especially with fellatio, the acts should be regarded as perverted or as evidential of sexual neurosis if they are engaged in exclusively, or if the orgasm cannot be experienced in coitus while there exists no physiological deterrent to the experiencing of orgasm in coitus.

I say fellatio especially, for the reason that the female is denied her climax in many cases by the clumsiness or pre-

mature ejaculations of the male. Then, cunnilingus may provide her with the necessary physical stimulation so that she may reach her climax, and the male who performs cunnilingus in order to bring about the female's orgasm, and the female who is so brought to orgasm, could scarcely be regarded as perverted in the context. Involved in situations of this kind, females in practice may reach climax regularly only as a result of cunnilingus. But that does not mean that the same females, if they received more adequate stimulation in coitus, could not experience orgasm in that way. Arriving at ejaculation, though maybe not orgasm, is usually no problem for the male who is able to copulate at all. When the male can reach climax by means of fellatio, though not by means of coitus, which he can perform normally or at least adequately in other respects, then one must of course look for a psychological disturbance.

The textbooks are abundantly supplied with cases of individuals who perform cunnilingus and fellatio compulsively, or for whom the acts are symbolic ones—cannibalistic, incestuous, related to castration anxieties, and so on. These are the cases of "perversion," or of behavior symptomatic of underlying maladjustment.

Whether the acts are or are not performed to climax is of negligible importance so long as the motivation is not neurotic, and so long as the acts provide adequate genital satisfaction. And certainly one cannot in every case infer neurotic motivation just because the cunnilingus or fellatio is performed to climax on some occasions.

Doubtless this is generally understood by scientific practitioners. That is, a diagnosis of neurosis would scarcely be made just on the basis that the oral sex acts are carried through to climax. But, on the other hand, one repeatedly

Notes

finds in marriage manuals and more technical sexological writings the flat declaration that fellatio and cunnilingus are “normal” when performed in the interest of precoital sex arousal, “abnormal” and “perverted,” or at least “unhealthy,” when carried through to climax. Such statements do not allow for exceptions, and at the very least must be quite disturbing to readers who are in fact “normal,” but who do sometimes, or often, give their sex partners climaxes in these ways.

17. [page 207]

I have heard the rather curious point of view expressed that there is “nothing wrong” with the female’s ingesting the semen—since the semen is “intended” for the female—but that the ingestion of the semen by the male is revolting and a travesty for the reason that it is natural for the semen to go, or come, out of the male and into the female. (It is interesting to note that from time to time women correspondents, writing to a popular sex education magazine, inquire whether they may become pregnant as a result of ingesting the semen; and occasionally men share the misconception that women can become pregnant in this way. To those who believe that oral copulation can result in fertilization, the female mouth cannot seem too unnatural a sexual orifice. These inquiries, by the way, are sometimes motivated by the wish to substitute mouth copulation for vagina copulation in order to avoid pregnancy and child-bearing.)

The homosexual, who wishes to heighten his own illusion of being female, may stand to profit from the acceptance of the notion that the semen is “intended for the woman.” By taking the semen into himself, orally or anally, he further increases the analogy between himself and the female he wishes to be. The male role partner in the homosexual fellatio may also in some cases find a value in this aspect of the

act: his ejaculation into the other feminizes the other—an other factor tending to make the act “more natural” (if the fellated requires such acrobatics). The male role “true” homosexual, on the other hand, probably desires the ingestion only as an indication of acceptance, and is little or not at all concerned with feminizing the partner. Nor would he be likely to consider this a possibility, since he will probably never have accepted the notion that the semen is intended for the female and will, on the contrary, regard his homosexual partner as the natural receptacle for this substance.

18. [page 208]

Both homosexual males and heterosexual females have reported to me that although they have difficulty ingesting the semen, or had difficulty in the beginning, this ingestion was accomplished without difficulty when they were drinking heavily. This could be interpreted to mean that the inhibitions which caused the physiological responses, gagging and vomiting, were reduced by the intoxication, so that the responses either did not occur at all or occurred so feebly as to pass unnoticed. It seems likely that this is the correct explanation, and that only rarely is there a true physiologically based rejection of the ejaculate.

(I am also, however, acquainted with a few cases—in matters of sex there are inevitably exceptions—where the gagging and vomiting occurs *only* when the individual is intoxicated.)

19. [page 212]

It is not altogether true of course that *no one* likes to penetrate excrement. There are perversions, and perhaps vices, where just this is desired. The brothels of Europe are familiar with the customer who will reward well the prostitute prepared to retain her feces for several days previous to the anal contact so that the excrement may be penetrated. And

moreover some sophisticated perfectionists will administer medications, in order that the feces should approximate to the desired hardness or softness. There are many versions and variations of the coprophilic perversion or vice, employing the excrement in the anus, in the vagina, even in the mouth of the sex partner. Sometimes it is only the contact with the excreta that is desired, so that there is no requirement that another person be involved saved as a source of the fecal matter. But it should be added that these tastes are rare, and that most sodomists do not wish to penetrate excrement, and may be repelled should such a contact be felt or discovered to have occurred. Here, too, one encounters perfectionists so that there are those who will insist that the individual to be sodomized must first submit to one or more enemas. In one case, a gentleman of this fastidious type paid his catamite three hundred dollars for "a night of love," but in preparation for that night the youth was required to undergo several days of fasting and to submit to a barrage of laxatives. The cynic might here suspect that the motives of the sodomist were not entirely esthetic and hygienic or without elements of sadism.

20. [page 213]

However, the ills to which the flesh is prey, and venereally especially, are a concern to homosexuals as they are to the rest of us. Thus, just as the interested housewife may read a work on gynecology, the invert may purchase one on proctology—as advertised in a homosexual publication, the July, 1961, *Dorian Book Quarterly*: "Proctology by S. D. Mannheim, M.D. . . . a medical and physiology book about the ano-rectal region, with discussion of the various pathological disorders of this part of the body."

21. [page 213]

See Notes 8 and 9, Chapter V.

22. [*page 215*]

There are such imaginative far-reachings for indications of what is natural in sex and what is not. For example, a physician who is usually described as "eminent" once told me that sodomy is clearly an unnatural act for the reason that the anus has no equipment for lubricating either the aperture or the sheath, such as, for instance, the Bartholin's glands in the female. Were the anal orifice intended for sexual intercourse, he said, it would be more readily penetrable. (Those inclined to suspect that he was pulling my leg do not know their man, and will have to take my word for it that he was not.)

That the anus is not "readily penetrable" is indeed a factor of some importance in homosexual love-making. It erects yet another barrier to spontaneity, and interposes yet another required artificiality between the desire and the fulfillment.

When the female is fully aroused for coitus there is usually no need for the male to employ artificial lubricants. In heterosexual intercourse as well as homosexual the use of the lubricant is undesirable, though it is certainly a lesser evil than proceeding without it in some cases. In general, any such artificial "aid" to sexual intercourse of whatever kind is undesirable. Whatever cripples spontaneity is undesirable. These objections apply also to the use of the condom or "rubber," however sensitive, and apart from any decrease in sensation and the inevitable diminishment of psychical stimulation resulting from the lack of fleshly contact. The act of putting this sheath over the penis after the love-making has already started and the erotic excitation has begun to ascend in what should be an uninterrupted progression, and the mere fact of its being there at all, remindful that calculation

and prudence have waylaid and somewhat castrated the erupting volcano of desire: both of these are deterrents to a successful sexual intercourse with complete gratification.

There is also another objectionable aspect to the necessity of depending upon artificial aids. Sometimes the lover's entire erotic psychology may be irrationally dominated and distracted by the effect exerted upon him by his "equipment." The writer Jean Genet has admirably described, in *The Thief's Journal*, his feelings about a partially used tube of vaseline the police found in his pockets when he was arrested and searched. He writes (in part):

"Amidst the elegant objects taken from the pockets of the men who had been picked up in the raid, it was the very sign of abjection, of that which is concealed with the greatest of care, but yet the sign of a secret grace . . . by its mere presence it would be able to exasperate all the police in the world; it would draw upon itself contempt, hatred, white and dumb rages. . . . I would rather have shed my blood than deny that silly object."

Yet the police, generally, would not react so strongly as Genet suggests to this tube of vaseline put to a use the police well know. Neither has the vaseline acquired instantaneously, with its exposure to alien eyes, all of the significance with which Genet invests it. On the contrary, at least a portion of this significance resided in the object already, as a result of the use to which it had been put. It is over-valued, and it was over-valued before it came to rest upon a table in a police station. And since it is over-valued it can only, like the condom, distract the erotic consciousness and remind the sodomist of the calculation that has preceded and clings to his passion. Even as the lubricated penis penetrates the anus and rectum he cannot but be aware that the slimy facility of his

entry is attributable to this substance which is a part neither of himself nor of his sex partner, so that the vaseline is a "third party" to an act where "three is a crowd."

There is the aforementioned matter of spontaneity. The homosexual, like the heterosexual, must feel that the necessity of "preparations" is distracting and regrettable. The application of vaseline to the penis, or at the anus, places the sodomist necessarily at a distance from the natural and the spontaneous, which he, as much as the copulator, desires. It is not the absence of an anal Bartholin's gland, but what must be done to compensate for that deficiency that is most significant.

23. [page 215]

Jean-Paul Sartre (*Being and Nothingness*) has observed that "sex is a hole," and that "the hole is an appeal to the flesh." These are interesting observations, though perhaps more suggestive than instructive; and, of course, there are reservations, and qualifications to be made. I would like to consider a few of these in the following brief note on *The Desire and Pursuit of the Hole*—remarks I hope to expand upon at considerable length in another work.

"Sex is a hole," and "the hole is an appeal to the flesh." But one must—and consciously, in Sartre's view—perceive the hole to be a hole. And moreover, there are different kinds of holes. Some holes, it is true, are limited nothingnesses, or circumscribed voids, appealing to being, and seem to require filling, holes that seek to be made wholes, and that appeal, as holes, precisely to that which can make them wholes. But there are other holes which do not present themselves to consciousness as appeals, which one thinks not of filling, or of going into, but which are holes that are sources of being—holes out of which matter emerges.

The hole through or out of which the geyser erupts; and the urethra, out of which comes urine and semen, are examples of this last mentioned kind of hole. It is, of course, a fact that an occasional individual inserts objects into the urethra, for purposes of masturbation; and no doubt there have been attempts to fill up, or at least put something into, the holes from which geysers erupt. But such cases are rarities and aberrations, and in general these are holes which *open out* rather than in, and holes from which there is an emergence of being “into the world.” Such a hole is quite different from a simple hole in the earth, or in the side of a rock cliff; or from the vagina, all of these being holes that *open into*, and which moreover are perceived as emptinesses: “barren” holes that “take,” as distinguished from “fruitful” holes that “give” and “ask nothing.”

As we have noted, a difficulty in understanding the desire of the passive sodomist, and, to a lesser degree, the male role sodomist, results from his or her apprehending the anus-rectum in a way just opposite to the way in which it is apprehended by most persons. The anus is generally recognized as being a hole—in popular terminology, “asshole”—but it is a hole that opens out, and from which matter emerges. The sodomist, however, apprehends the anus mainly as a hole that opens in, as a sexual emptiness, like the vagina, which is an appeal to the flesh.

There are significant differences between the way the passive sodomist apprehends the hole and the way it is apprehended by the male role sodomist. This is a difference which corresponds to the female’s consciousness of her vagina as compared to the heterosexual male’s consciousness of it. It is a difference of degree; but it is also a difference of kind.

The hole-like character of the vagina (or anus) is of course

felt far more intensely by the female role person—whose hole it is. Vagina and anus (and sometimes mouth) may be felt keenly to be emptinesses, with insistent desire that they be filled. But the male role person will be much less aware of this aspect, because it is not his hole, and because it is with his own body and its demands and urges that he is above all concerned. In his case, the hole is much more of an appeal *for* the flesh than *to* the flesh.

(One should keep in mind here that in all cases these holes, which are holes at all times and as much holes at one time as at any time, are still experienced as holes only when desire or sexual excitation is present. The explanation is doubtless that this is scarcely a matter of creation and nihilation by desire and fulfillment, but a matter of degree of intensity of awareness, that some very faint and only peripherally conscious awareness of the hole as a hole is always present; but only when sexual excitation arises as the result of some stimulus, and the void becomes an “aching” one, does the awareness of the hole-as-hole “ascend” to the level of conscious preoccupation to be experienced as a troublesome frustration of an appetite demanding appeasement.)

Desire “opens up” the hole—vagina, anus, or mouth, depending on whether the desire is for coitus, sodomy, or fellatio—and at the same time the individual is made aware of a lack that is an appeal to something external to the individual, or to that part of the individual that is the hole. This appeal, also, seems more an appeal for the flesh than to the flesh. However that may be, it is still the urgent desire of the female role person that the hole be filled.

The individual in the male role, however, probably desires to be *contained*, or else to *penetrate*, or both; and he is little or not at all aware of the hole of the other as an appeal—

Notes

imposing an obligation—to be filled. The erect phallus extends outward. It yearns not to fill a hole, but to, in a sense, make one; or to be snugly surrounded by the flesh of the other. Sartre notes that the ideal hole is one that fits (which is true sexually only for the male. For the female, there is an ideal sexual object—one that fits the hole). And there are two ways of looking at this ideal hole that fits: one may desire to fill the hole completely, or one may wish to be completely contained by the hole. Henry Miller's "stiff prick" that "has no conscience" is self-centered. It may wish to be contained, but it is not likely to be moved either by appeals or obligations to fill the hole of the other. The extended phallus, no less than the hole, is an appeal, and remindful of a lack. It is solitary and lonely and absurd, and so long as it merely extends into the air around it is a token of frustration. The man with an erect penis is as ridiculous as the man who must urinate and is unable to find a latrine. The erect phallus is dependent, and urgently requires the other. Like the hole, it is an appeal to matter external to itself—and that matter is not the larger part of the hole, which is a nothingness, but that part which defines the hole: its material boundaries.

The hole is not just an emptiness, though it may be so apprehended by the desiring individual in the female role. But the hole also has a wall around it, which makes it a hole rather than just "space," which limits what it can contain, and which makes it a suitable container for certain forms and quantities of matter. It is, of course, this wall or boundary that makes the particular hole meaningful to the phallus, and the phallus meaningful to the hole. If the hole is too large or too small it is of no use. It must, as Sartre asserts, fit perfectly to be perfectly satisfying.

The term "to screw," meaning to copulate, is rather apt. It recognizes both the need to penetrate and the need to be contained—as well as the female role need to be filled completely, and perhaps to be penetrated in the sense that not only is the existing hole filled but it is slightly over-filled, so that the hole becomes, should the phallus be withdrawn, somewhat more of a hole than it was before the penetration. The penis, it is desired, should "screw" the hole and create the illusion that it is making its own place in the flesh somewhat as the screw makes its own place in the board, where it is then so completely contained by the board that it is, as it were, one with the board. Better yet might be the analogy with nut and bolt, especially since both are formed of the same substance. Doubtless the most completely satisfying copulation, from the standpoint of the hole-filling and containment desires, would be one in which the penis was "screwed" into the vagina just as the bolt is screwed into the nut. The "sloppy" vagina is thus unsatisfactory on more than just the physical basis that it affords inadequate friction; and the only partially erect penis is similarly unsatisfactory. Both are inadequate psychologically. The vagina is not filled full, and the penis is not fully contained. Thus the fullness of being that is sought after is denied, as is the feeling of oneness which results when the penis seems completely to fill up the hole, so that the bodies become "as one flesh."

As one flesh. Doubtless this is the real psychological goal. When the hole in the earth is filled with earth, the earth of the hole merges with the earth that fills the hole. The two merge, the boundary is lost or blurred, the hole ceases to be a hole. In sexual intercourse, the movement of the penis in the hole prevents this loss of identity, as do the subjectivities of the sex partners; but it is perhaps the maximum possible

Notes

approximation to the “one flesh” ideal that is sought, and which yields as by psycho-physical parallelism the illusion also of psychical oneness.

There is vastly more to be said about all of this, but it will have to suffice here merely to have suggested certain aspects of the problem.

24. [page 217]

The reader's attention is called to the section on drugs, where the French surgeon reports the alterations of sensation occurring in the rectum (and vagina) when the individual is under the influence of opium. With mescaline, too, this occurs. The same “rubbery” and voluptuous sensations are experienced in the rectum that are experienced in the male and female genitalia. Both males and females report that the rectum seems more erotically sensitive (when stimulated) under the influence of mescaline than under normal conditions. The increased voluptuousness compares to that experienced in the genitalia, but is slightly more intense, or seems so; in fact, it is probably a matter of the contrast between the normal and mescaline-induced sensations, the anus being usually more subject to inhibitions, so that when these are lifted the contrast is striking.

25. [page 217]

One recalls the remarks of the sodomist De Bressac in De Sade's *Justine*:

“Do not suppose, Therese, that we are made like other men; 'tis an entirely different structure we have; and, in creating us, Heaven has ornamented the altars at which our Celadons sacrifice with that very same sensitive membrane which lines your temple of Venus; we are, in that sector, as certainly women as you are in your generative sanctuary; not

one of your pleasures is unknown to us, there is no one we do not know how to enjoy, but we have, as well, our own, and it is this delicious combination which makes us of all men on earth the most sensitive to pleasure, the best created to experience it. . . .”

M I S C E G E N A T I O N

BLACK SUPREMACY:

**Norman Mailer and the myth of Negro
sexuality**

"It is impossible to generalize concerning the behavior of a whole race."

A. C. KINSEY

What is the Myth of Negro Sexuality?

We may say first of all that it consists of the beliefs that: (1) The penis of the Negro male is larger than that of the white male. (2) The virility or potency of the Negro male is greater than that of the white male. (3) The ardor of the Negro, either male or female, is greater than that of the white male or female. (However, it is usually with the Negro *male* that the myth is concerned, and when the Negro female is included it is usually for the [hostile] purpose of indicating that the Negro is more "animalistic" than the white.)

There are a variety of other beliefs which often or sometimes figure in the myth. One of these is that the white female is greatly attracted to the Negro male, and that sexual relations between the two would be a commonplace were it not for the social taboos and legal penalties involved.

"The white woman who's gone to bed with a nigger will never want another white man" is the usual and succinct way of expressing this notion with which we are all familiar; it implies both that there is initial attraction based on racial differences and that the attraction will continue and develop to the exclusion of other sexual interests as a result of the Negro's natural erotic supremacy.¹

The white female is said to desire the Negro male mainly because of: (1) His superior ardor and virility and the greater dimensions of his penis. (2) Because he is invested with the allure of the forbidden. A third motive, and one which has received support from the findings of psychoanalysis (see, for example, Greenwald, *The Call Girl*), is masochistic self-punishment and self-degradation. Here, the white woman has relations with the Negro man in order to court punishment by her own superego, or by society, or by both.

The idea that the Negro male is powerfully desirous of sexual intercourse with white females is based upon both factual evidence and the desire of the white community, or segments of it, to provide a device whereby public sentiment is kept aroused and vigilant against such transgressions. (It is also, of course, a phantasy of obsessive

proportions with some fanatical and/or psychotic persons, South and North, segregationist and integrationist.)

The Negro female plays an almost negligible role in the myth. Usually represented, when at all, as a victim of sexual exploitation by the white male in the South (another idea that is part fact, part phantasy, part device—this time of integrationists), and despite the fact that she shares in the supposedly greater sexual ardor of Negroes of both sexes, she emerges as a somewhat sexless creature when contrasted with the myth's erotically almost omnipotent Negro male on the one hand, and with the sex phantasy-ridden white female on the other.

As for the white male, his, too, is a relatively minor role, though a more important one than that of the Negro female: Sexually inferior and inadequate as compared to the Negro male, he is pictured as being at once envious and fearful of the Negro male and as convinced that large-scale miscegenation is prevented only by his own firm grasp upon the reins of economic power, which enables him to make the social and legal rules which hold back the miscegenous tides.

So much, just now, for the assertions of the myth. What are the demonstrable facts?

Considering the aspects of the myth in the order given above, we begin with the notion that the penis of the Negro is larger than that of the white. Where are the substantiating data?

The answer, medicine and anthropology having let us down rather miserably in this respect, is that there are none. There have been no studies meeting even minimal

scientific standards to compare the dimensions of the sexual organs of white and Negro males, respectively. There have been studies, though not very satisfactory ones, which have produced information about what may be considered the normal range of dimensions for the sexual organs of human males (Caucasians and Negroes, not Orientals) generally. However, these data concern largely the flaccid penis, while it is with the erect penis that we would be concerned.² And it is well known that variations between male sex organs in the flaccid state are of little significance in determining what the longitudinal and circumferential proportions of the respective penes will be in a state of tumescence. Indeed, it is not uncommon that a phallus which is smaller than another when detumescent may be larger than the other when erect. Hence, observations of discrepancies in male sexual organs which occur under the usual conditions of medical examinations are worthless as a means of deducing what the dimensions of those organs will be under erotically more favorable circumstances.

And furthermore, even if it could be shown that the *phallus erectus* of the Negro is larger on the average than that of the white, it is the often-voiced opinion of the majority of sexological authorities that within a rather considerable range the dimensions of the penis are of only quite secondary importance in determining the extent of the gratification obtained by the female in the coital connexion—both “staying power” and excellence of technique being regarded as much more significant factors. (In this regard we should not, however, ignore the psy-

chological implications of the popular belief that the size of the penis is not merely an important but perhaps the decisive factor in copulatory gratification. And, if it should happen to be established that the Negro is in fact "superior" in this respect, then the finding should further enhance his desirability for those who accept the belief that the size of the phallus is of prime importance.)

Next, we come to the belief in the Negro's superior virility or potency, which, if established as factual, *would* reasonably tend to make him from a biological point of view a more desirable sex partner for the female than the less well endowed white.³ But here again we find ourselves in the presence of an absence of substantiating data. And there are some sound psychological reasons, as we shall see, for supposing that in our contemporary American (United States) culture the Negro may well be *less* potent than the white.

Third, there is the notion of the Negro's greater ardor, which manifests itself in a greater interest in and readiness for sexual relations, and which is supposed to be accompanied by fewer inhibitions of a sexual nature. As concerns a larger fullness of passion on the part of the Negro, once again we are without the data which would be required to prove the assertion and bring about our acceptance. As regards the Negro's allegedly greater concern with sexuality and his relatively greater freedom from inhibitions, this is a very old idea, one we find expressed for example by Thomas Jefferson,⁴ and it should probably be taken to refer to Negroes living under primitive conditions, and in a primitive intellectual state, as for

example was the case during the period of Negro slavery. About this, too, I will have something more to say a little later on.

We come now to the belief that white women, especially in the South, are sexually much attracted to Negro men, and would like to have sexual relations with Negro men but are thwarted in this by the overwhelming barriers erected (by fearful white males) against such relationships. In his book, *The American Woman*, E. J. Dingwall, anthropologist and "Honourable Assistant Keeper of Printed Books" at the British Museum, says that ". . . the belief regarding the partiality of Negro men for white women is accompanied by the belief that, were white women allowed to know Negro men better, they would find them attractive. I have no doubt whatever that this is true, and that one of the main reasons for the violent colour prejudice in the South is due to the fact that the white women are sexually unsatisfied and jealous of the attention that coloured women get from white men, since the former labor under the common delusion that people of dark skin are more virile, sexually competent and capable of sustained activity than persons of lighter pigmentation."

That the white women of the South are sexually unsatisfied (presumably relative to other American women), and that the white men of the South have unusual potency problems (as a result, it is often suggested, of placing their women on pedestals of impossible purity), is yet another aspect of the Myth of Negro Sexuality, and such beliefs are mainly regional, found mostly in the large

cities of the North (where one supposes their function is at least partly to permit white Northern males to feel sexually superior to someone). But that the white males of the South are sexually less competent than other American males, and that white Southern women are more frustrated sexually than other American females, are once again notions for which we find no confirmation outside of folklore.

Certainly we must consider the question here of whether there is any *general* desire on the part of white women, and especially on the part of Southern white women, for sexual relations with Negro men. It would of course be ridiculous to say that there is no desire at all for such relations, and that there would not be a considerably greater incidence of such relations if the bars to them were dropped. But the question is, in terms of the myth, how general or widespread are such desires? We will see that there are many forces at work to prevent, inhibit and suppress them.

For example, the American ideal of the desirable husband and/or lover is to a massive degree determined by advertising and the films and television and other such opinion-moulding agencies and media. The Negro male, as a symbol of sexual desirability, or as a desirable sexual type, gets small support from those quarters. And it should be noted that when Negro athletes or entertainers do emerge as something faintly resembling sex symbols, the aura of erotic desirability enveloping them is predicated far more upon their roles as athletes and film stars—upon their roles as celebrities and upon their con-

sequent economic status—than upon their physical attractiveness in itself. (While this is also the case with white celebrities, there is a vast difference in degree, with the desirability of the Negro usually almost wholly dependent on his status; with the white celebrity, the attraction he exerts is much more likely to be simply the result of his being brought to the attention of those who could not otherwise be aware of his existence.) And it is also apparent that the Negroes who appear to exert the greatest normal sexual attraction upon white women are usually precisely those Negroes who are the least “negroid”—Negroes of light skin, Caucasian physiognomy, etc. In the case of athletes, especially fighters, muscularity or physique may also be a factor, as may be the extreme “maleness” seemingly implicit in some kinds of sports, but in this case, too, the white woman who is sexually aroused might very well (exceptions admitted) be moved even more if white skin were added to the roster of the desired object’s assets.⁵

I hope I am justified in thinking it doubtful that any realistic, unbiased person, white or Negro, could find anything smacking of racial prejudice in the (to many) unpleasant observations just stated. But it would surely be less than realistic to ignore or minimize the potency of those forces which mold the American woman’s (and the American man’s) image of the esthetically and sexually desirable mate. And those forces are likely to continue to operate even well beyond the time when the Negro male comes to enjoy a political and economic status far superior to that which he has today. In the

meantime, with both social and economic forces powerfully opposing and diminishing his sexual attractiveness, he is almost beyond consideration as a potential husband and can hope at best to be, for the white woman, a sexually desirable object which she (clandestinely) exploits in the interest of her own erotic gratification.

That the Negro male, in his erotic relationships with white females, tends to be a sexual *object*, and frequently a *means* to something quite other than normal heterosexual pleasure, brings us to the second and third points concerning the sources of his attractiveness: He is invested with the allure of the tabooed or the forbidden, and he may be the vehicle for the realization of conscious or unconscious desires for self-punishment or self-degradation. That the forbidden is always more or less desirable is a truism little requiring to be expanded upon. However, in this case it may be more closely related to a need for self-punishment, or punishment at the hands of society, than is at first apparent.

In his psychoanalytic study of *The Call Girl*, Greenwald speaks of the association between call girls and Negro pimps or Negro lovers:

“ . . . the girls were influenced by the attitude of those sections of our society which hold that relations between a Negro man and a white woman are an act of degradation of the woman.⁶ Their need for degradation and wish to break the taboos caused the girls themselves to over-emphasize the Negro-white aspect.”

Evelyn, one of the call girls studied, told Greenwald that “Being a masochist, I would imagine myself going

up to Harlem and being attacked or something and actually this is as low as I can go. I know it's not low, but in society's eyes it's low, so I want to degrade myself. I think that's why the average girl does, the average whore. So many whores end up with Negroes because they hate themselves so. They feel so degraded. They feel as though they deserve the worst. They want what they deserve so they feel that this is what society thinks is the worst. This is what they deserve. . . ."

Such a psychology, as we all know, is not limited to whores and call girls (the distinction between whore and call girl being an important one, especially to call girls). It explains many white-Negro relationships, especially when the white female is of middle-class or higher socio-economic background, and it is not vastly different in motivation from the historic copulations of the witches with the devil (who frequently appeared as "a black man," the significance of this being that in the language of the unconscious black men are likely to be associated with degradation and evil). The witches, too, sought degradation (through sin generally and bestial and coprophilic practices in particular), and finally the punishment they "deserved."

We may add that the fact the Negro is being sexually and otherwise exploited in these relationships is often or usually, consciously or unconsciously, understood by him, which accounts in part for the brutal or sadistic role he is so often described as playing. Further, at the same time he is being exploited, he may be in his turn using the white woman as a means of venting his hatred against the white

society he regards as oppressive by violating one of its most powerful and powerfully enforced prohibitions.⁷

Although it is not altogether relevant to the subject of this discussion, the sexual psychology of the Negro male in his relations with white women could scarcely be more absorbingly interesting and complex. He, too, we should keep in mind, is subjected to all of those forces of opinion-molding which represent the white woman as the most desirable sexual partner, and which ignore or minimize—though there has been a very slight “breakthrough” lately—the Negro woman’s sexual attractions. (Of course, the Negro is exposed to countercurrents largely unknown to the white, especially now that there are a good many Negro publications. But still the weight is on the other side.)

Simultaneously, in his sexual attitudes towards white women, the Negro man is desirous and fearful, proud and ashamed, sadistic and masochistic, dominant and dominated, aware of both his capacity for exploiting and his vulnerability as a target for exploitation; and aware, above all, that here is the vehicle *par excellence* for striking back at the white society responsible for his anxiety and his bewilderment. Further, so enfeebled is his self-esteem and so undermined is his self-confidence, as a result of all the powerful forces which insist upon his inferiority (even while, sometimes, proclaiming his equality), that he, too, must contend with the possibility that the relationship is degrading to the woman and therefore remindful of his own degraded status. Should we wonder that, in the face of all this, the Negro’s behavior is so

often ambivalent, anxious or even pathological to a dangerous degree in such relationships? More significantly, for our purposes here, should we expect him under such conditions to display that powerful potency with which the Myth of Negro Sexuality has invested him?

Lastly, and briefly since the phenomenon is of no great numerical significance, we may note the incentives to white-Negro sex relations which exist in certain subcultures and societies-within-society. For example, in left-wing, liberal, and Marxist groups, and in "Beat," *avant garde*, and other Bohemian circles today and in the past, white women have traditionally felt obliged to demonstrate their lack of racial prejudice by copulating with Negro members of the group. It is doubtful that many Negro males have found their egos bolstered, or found much testimony to a genuine belief in the equality of the races, as the result of such relationships. (Though it may be that in certain jazz circles, before the Beatniks and other "Bohemians" moved in, there was less hypocrisy, affectation, and pretentiousness about it all; this suggests, in its turn, a microcosmic society which was *really* permissive, and even largely indifferent to racial considerations, sexual or other.)

And now, in the light of, or at least consequent upon, what has just been said, I would like to take a look at certain writings of Norman Mailer, who has had a good deal to say (and imply) about Negro sexuality, especially in *The White Negro*, a well-known essay, and in other portions of his book, *Advertisements for Myself*. Mailer, as we shall see, accepts the Myth of Negro Sexuality al-

most in its *psychological* entirety (though he has his own ideas about the origins of some of the phenomena), and is also guilty of the familiar error of supposing that certain practices which once prevailed in the South, but which are now non-existent or rare, are still prevalent today.⁸

In *Advertisements for Myself* (a work containing some admirable fiction and autobiographical fragments), Mailer reproduces a piece he did for the monthly newspaper *The Independent*, and since the notions he bluntly stated there underlie much that is expressed in *The White Negro*, and since furthermore those notions summarize one point of view on certain aspects of the Myth of Negro Sexuality, I would like to quote Mailer's entire statement:

"Can't we," he wrote, "have some honesty about what's going on now in the South? Everybody who knows the South knows that the white man fears the sexual potency of the Negro. And in turn the Negro has been storing his hatred and yet growing stronger, carrying with him the painful wound that he was usually powerless to keep from being cuckolded.

"For the white, symbolically and materially, has possessed Negro womanhood for two centuries. Which is what all the literary critics mean when they talk about the blood guilt of the South.

"The comedy is that the white loathes the idea of the Negro attaining equality in the classroom because the white feels that the Negro already enjoys sensual superiority. So the white unconsciously feels that the balance has been kept, that the old arrangement was fair. The Negro

had his sexual supremacy and the white had his white supremacy.

“By this logic, the unconscious logic of the Southern white, it is fatal to give the Negro equality because that is the same as to give him victory. And like all poor winners and small losers the Southern whites are unwilling to accept the reversals of history, even though the flowering of the Negro and the temporary but nonetheless certain spiritual enslavement of the Southern white ought to be nourishing for both races—not to mention the moral justice of it.”

A number of persons, including William Faulkner and Eleanor Roosevelt, were asked to make comments on the Mailer remarks. Neither Mr. Faulkner nor Mrs. Roosevelt, as quoted in *Advertisements for Myself*, seemed prepared to deny outright in so many words the truth of what Mailer had said, though both deplored the fact—if I understand them correctly—that the statement was made. Mrs. FDR called it “horrible and unnecessary,” this being, according to Mailer, possibly the first time the ex-First Lady had ever used the word “horrible” in print. Faulkner responded that he had heard the same ideas expressed before by middle-aged ladies of non-Southern background, though never by a man—a probably hastily scribbled reply not altogether up to the standards one might expect from a Nobel Prize winner and our greatest living novelist.

Perhaps the only noteworthy response came from an anonymous—name withheld by request—“prominent Negro leader,” who said that “Of course Mailer is one-

hundred per cent correct." And what is noteworthy about that opinion, or at least about the public expression of it, is that such an expression flies directly in the face of the official posture of Negro leaders, which has been to play down all aspects of the sexual question as much as possible. In this regard, and while the notion that the Negro is sexually superior to the white has been regarded by almost all "prominent Negro leaders" as far too inflammatory even to have heard about, there *have* been public Negro statements on the idea that Negroes want intermarriage. Here, the almost invariable position has been that Negroes have no interest in intermarriage and much prefer to retain their own ethnological identity—"racial purity," the segregationists call it.

A typical statement on this is that of a former Negro college president, who is quoted by Gunnar Myrdal as saying that "As for amalgamation, very few expect it; still fewer want it; no one advocates it; and only a constantly diminishing minority practice it, and that surreptitiously. It is generally accepted on both sides of the color line that it is best for the two races to remain ethnologically separate."

To this official line the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in particular has consistently and vigorously, almost desperately, held. The statement of Mailer's anonymous "prominent Negro leader" must have sent some shivers up NAACP spines since it both raises the tabooed question of interracial sex relations and expresses a kind of erotic arrogance certain to confirm the darkest suspicions and forebodings of

segments of the white population and to infuriate even some of those not previously much concerned.

Two questions are raised here: To what extent does the Negro believe in his own sexual supremacy, and to what extent does he want freedom of sexual intercourse and marriage between the races? As regards the first, intelligent and informed Negroes, like their white counterparts, probably know that the Myth of Negro Sexuality is precisely that—a myth. And it is dubious that the rest of the Negro population accepts the myth, either, since not many of us are able to hold privately to a view of ourselves as sexual supermen.

Freedom of interracial sex relations and intermarriage is, however, another matter, and we can scarcely accept the politically expedient Negro disclaimers here, because it should be quite obvious to anyone who gives the matter even a moment's thought that the fundamental and ultimate test of equality of citizenship has got to be sexual equality—the elimination of all legal and, as far as is possible, social barriers against sexual relations between the white and Negro races.

This is true because laws against such relationships can only be based upon the view that the Negro is significantly inferior to the white, and that intermarriage or interbreeding would produce inferior offspring—offspring inferior, that is, to those the white mothers would bear if the fathers were also white. Some of the tolerance manifested toward sex relations between white males and Negro females is to be accounted for by the fact that, according to the same theory, the children pro-

duced would be superior to those resulting from all-Negro unions.

The Negro might be persuaded, if successful enough otherwise, to accept that the individual white businessman or proprietor has a right to pick and choose his own customers, or serve them according to his individual prejudices, but the Negro can never finally accept legal prohibitions against sexual intercourse and intermarriage which are transparently predicated upon the theory of Negro racial inferiority. It should be obvious, too, that none of the segregation laws is on shakier constitutional grounds than the miscegenation prohibition, which will almost certainly be overturned whenever the Negro leaders decide the time is ripe to challenge it.⁹

"Can't we," Mailer inquired "have some honesty about what's going on now in the South?" By all means let us try, but do we achieve that laudable objective by next declaring that "Everybody who knows the South knows that the white man fears the sexual potency of the Negro"? I think not (which I suppose makes it more than ever incumbent upon the reader to decide for himself what "everybody who knows the South knows").

The theory that the Southern white man fears the sexual potency of the Negro is one of those neat little theories which people like to bandy about with an air of being initiates of the mysteries, or with a sense of living dangerously, and into which almost no one ever bothers to look very closely. But here again I must call upon Mailer to produce the factual evidence upon which his opinion is based.¹⁰ I do not think he will produce any

evidence that is authentic, or more than conjectural for the reason that such evidence does not exist, and it is difficult to imagine why the Southern white man (a few editors and/or fanatics and/or psychotics apart) should be plagued by such unreasonable fears.

After all, "everybody who knows the South knows" that the majority of Southern whites (and especially those who might be expected by Mailer to be most fearful), even now, possess something approaching a blind faith that somehow numerically significant integration of the public schools will be thwarted, while genuine integration on the social level seems a possibility so remote as to be almost unthinkable this side of the nightmare. And white Southern males neither believe that large numbers of Southern white women are eager to hop into bed with Negro men at the first opportunity, nor that they themselves are impotent to prevent such an occurrence—through the social, political and economical machinery they control—should the inclination somehow arise. And so what, after all, is there for them to be fearful about?¹¹

Not even where the Myth of Negro Sexuality is swallowed whole—and *general* Southern acceptance tends to stop short of the notion that white women in large numbers are powerfully attracted to Negro men—is there so often *fear*. Acceptance of the idea of the Negro's greater potency and larger penis (and bigger "balls," more semen, more staying power, etc., etc.) may lead to envy, but that is another matter. And it is more often the subject of humor, with not hysterical anxiety but a patronizing view of the Negro as "animalistic" underlying the "joke."

Finally, in this regard, the acceptance of the myth is largely on the wane, though a considerable number still accept at least some of its elements. It is yielding to the massive doses of sex education to which we are all being exposed, and which does filter down eventually to the grade school-educated and the illiterate (of whom there are vastly fewer in the South nowadays than even a couple of decades ago).

Another point raised by Mailer is that "the white . . . has possessed Negro womanhood for two centuries." Historically, of course, this has been true, though "possessed" could use a good deal of defining, but it is apparent to anyone living in the South today that there is now very little of such activity, especially in the cities. The reason for this, we may suppose, is that Negro girls, like white girls, are usually "possessed" nowadays only when they wish to be, and with white-Negro relations in their present state, not many are inclined to cross the color line for exclusively sexual reasons. And as for the past, it is more than a little surprising to find coming from Norman Mailer the notion that the sins of the fathers should be paid for by the sons (who, he rather gleefully forecasts, will "certainly" be spiritually enslaved).

In the novels of a good many Negro authors, and in the works of certain white novelists of similar persuasion as well, sex relations between whites and Negroes are likely to take two forms: Either the white woman seduces the Negro man (and cries rape when they are caught), or the white man (or men) rapes the Negro woman who—such pieces being frequently replete with the trappings

of melodrama—is often an innocent young girl trying desperately to “do right.” There is also in this field the occasional “haunting and tender” story of a young couple, almost always a white male and a Negro female, entangled in the angonizing web of an “impossible love.” And then there are the novels written about Negro male-white female sex relations in post-war Europe, a subject about which superb works of fiction might have been written, especially by Negro authors. Unfortunately none have been.¹²

One may scarcely doubt that in most Negro male-white female sex encounters in the South it is the woman who is the seducer. Conditions being what they are, the Negro would be foolhardy to make the advances. But again at the risk of being unpleasant in the interest of what I hope is objectivity, I must note that rapes, and I don’t mean just at gun or knife point, of Negro women by white men have always constituted a numerically negligible portion of cases of white male-Negro female sex relations (while rapes make up a quite significant percentage of Negro male-white female sex acts in the South).

We must remember that sexually, up until quite recently, this has been a man’s world, with a double standard of morality. (I repeat the obvious because people seem to forget, when dealing with Negro-white sex relations, that most of the same forces find application here as elsewhere. And instead of availing themselves of the knowledge readily at hand, they elaborate entire theoretical structures which are usually fantastic enough to seem profound to somebody.) At the same time that

this was true, the Negro woman was not expected to observe the same restrictive standards of sexual morality imposed upon her white sisters. Should we wonder then that the white male, always being represented as more desirable than the Negro male, and with economic and other advantages almost entirely in his favor, was attractive to Negro women? And that, the opportunity being present, (mutual) attraction found expression in sex relations? To the extent that there is guilt, that guilt lies not in the fact that the white males had sex relations with Negro females, but in the fact that white women were declared off limits for the Negro male while there was played out a sexual drama with a cast of three in which white and Negro male alike pursued the sexually unfettered Negro female.

In his letter to *The Independent*, just quoted and commented on, Norman Mailer gave voice to ideas which are by now hoarily familiar—if usually excluded from drawing-room conversation. In *The White Negro*, however, he is more original, though his originality lies not in his basic ideas (Reichian-Existentialist-Marxist-Pschoanalytic-Hip) but in his synthesis and, especially, in his application of them. What does he have to say?

To begin with, we are confronted by the difficulty of determining just which and how many Negroes he is talking about: Negro “Hipsters” only, or a significant portion of the (male, it would seem) Negro population. If we are to limit Mailer’s view of Negro sexuality as expressed in *The White Negro* to Hipsters, of whom there are, he estimates, one hundred thousand who so regard

themselves, we need go no further; the Negroes included in this group would not be sufficiently significant numerically or otherwise to bear much upon the theme of Negro sexuality. But perhaps we may include some of those near- or potential Hipsters, the ten million psychopaths, many supposedly Negroes, Mailer says we have in the U.S. presently; and the "new millions of psychopaths" who, he tells us, are being developed in this country each year. (To be a psychopath is not, incidentally, and as one might imagine, to be a psychological cripple; or at least it is not to be inferior to non-psychopaths—the orgasmically potent of course excepted. Indeed, in Mailer's view, the psychopath may well represent the highest present state of human evolution so that his statement that psychopathy is most prevalent with the Negro should be taken as a kind of tribute.)¹⁸

Or perhaps we may assume that Mailer is speaking of most Negroes, or at least of a great many, even some non-psychopathic ones, for it is also his belief that "the Negro" may well emerge as a dominating force in American life (which would seem to suggest some numerical strength) and that with this possible emergence of "the Negro," Hip may "erupt as a psychically armed rebellion whose sexual impetus may rebound against the antisexual foundation of every organized power in America. . . ." I think we may assume that he is talking about a great number of Negroes.

Mailer accepts most of the psychic paraphernalia of the Myth of Negro Sexuality, but he has his own explanation of how the Negro's sexual supremacy came about.

According to the Mailer aetiology, the Negro was forced, in order to survive amid the conditions of his oppression, to cultivate "the art of the primitive," to live in "the enormous present," to subsist for "kicks," to relinquish the pleasures of the mind "for the more obligatory pleasures of the body." Out of this background he created, or at least developed until it was his own, jazz—which is "the orgasm" musically expressed: "good orgasm and bad." And out of this background, which imposed a role on him, forced him to live in the moment as a sexual outlaw, the Negro also perfected his sexuality.

It is interesting to note here that Mailer gives full and even exaggerated attention to another and crucial aspect of the impact an oppressive society has had upon the Negro:

"Any Negro," he writes, "who wishes to live must live with danger from his first day, and no experience can ever be casual to him, no Negro can saunter down a street with any real certainty that violence will not visit him on his walk. The cameos of security for the average white: mother and the home, job and the family, are not even a mockery to millions of Negroes; they are impossible. The Negro has the simplest of alternatives: live a life of constant humility or ever-threatening danger. In such a pass where paranoia is as vital to survival as blood, the Negro had stayed alive and begun to grow by following the need of his body where he could. . . ."

It is not true, just romantic, of course, that at the present time physical violence is likely to await the Negro out for a stroll. It depends for him, as for the white, upon

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

what street he chooses; and in any case the occurrence is rare (though less rare, one notes, in Harlem and Washington, D.C. than anywhere in the South, or almost anywhere else for that matter).

Psychical violence, however, is another matter, and there can be no doubt that psychical violence is done the Negro proportionately more often than the white, and that the resulting trauma is of great import to Negro sexuality.

Insecurity, anxiety and paranoia, these are the commonplaces of everyday Negro existence, and Mr. Mailer is by no means the first to take note of the fact. There is also the (related) Negro masochism which has been so often noted and described (and which, where sexual relations with whites are concerned, not infrequently bares its backside, with sadistic behavior resulting).

But where Mailer differs from other writers and observers is in his assertion that the Negro's anxiety and paranoia may stand in a kind of causal relationship to his superior sexuality. What basis he has for such a conclusion (wishful thinking apart) it is difficult to imagine. It is axiomatic that anxiety and the kind of "paranoia" Mailer attributes to the Negro (and excepting rare psychotic responses) inhibit sexuality, affecting deleteriously potency in particular. Certainly, there is no evidence to back the strange conclusion that as an end result sexuality may come to be heightened or the capacity for sexual relations or "good orgasm" improved by the presence of such factors in the psychical life.¹⁴

In a single sentence, Mailer reveals at once the source

of his wishful view of Negro sexual supremacy and its capacity to distort his thinking:

“As a radical,” he writes, “I am of course facing in the opposite direction from the White Citizen’s Councils—obviously I believe it is the absolute human right of the Negro to mate with the white, and matings there will undoubtedly be, for there will be Negro high school boys *brave enough* to chance their lives.” (Italics mine.)

Well, I, too, believe that it is the absolute right of human beings to freely choose their own sex partners, and that includes persons of all races; but I should never have thought of using this conviction as a springboard for indulging in a lot of wishful thinking about a Negro sexual supremacy which will result in a messianic social role for the Negro, or even, in the foreseeable future, in wholesale interracial sex relations.

Neither would it have occurred to me, or to most persons, I think, to make a crusade of interracial sex relations wherein Negro high school boys who copulate with white girls are to be revered as exhibiting bravery in the face of possible death. (Let us look back to our own high school days, or just beyond them, when we imprudently courted possible death at the hands of outraged husbands and fathers. I think it was not precisely principle which motivated us—though we may have believed in sexual freedom—and “bravery” is perhaps not quite the term which deserves to be applied to our actions.

And, by the way, if medals are to be passed out, why should we discriminate against the white females involved in these hypothetical miscegenations? If Mailer

were less blinded by his Negrolatry and more interested in women as other than a means to the "good orgasm," he might take note of the fact that in terms of the end he regards as desirable these white girls would have displayed "bravery" too, bringing down on their heads retributions almost or equally as severe as those the boys might face. And lastly, is it altogether irrelevant to inquire as to how many Negro boys have been killed for seducing, or being seduced by, white girls lately? Or even for raping them? ¹⁵

It was the Greek philosopher Critias who said that beliefs in gods were the inventions of a "farseeing priestcraft" and have as their objectives the domination of the ignorant masses through superstitious fears. I should rather enjoy, being by inclination as much of a Sophist as Critias (or Norman Mailer), to be able to declare that the Myth of Negro Sexuality was the invention of "far-seeing Negroes," preferably slaves, who understood that white acceptance of the myth was both inevitable, once it had been launched upon the seas of the human mind, and bound eventually to overthrow the social, economic, and political supremacy of the white masters.

But I am sorry to say that there is an objective, non-Sophistic aspect of my mind which is forced to reject such romantic and entertaining notions, which finds no evidence that priestcraft was "farseeing" enough to invent the gods for the purpose of enslaving the masses through superstitious fears, or that there were slaves or other Negroes farseeing enough to invent the Myth of Negro

Sexuality for the purpose of bringing about eventual Negro liberation.

Nor do I believe, I might add while talking about hypothetical origins of sex superstitions grown up around the Negro, that the myth was invented by *guilty* whites who compensated the Negro for his economic and social inferiority (simultaneously mitigating their own culpability) with a fairy tale of sexual superiority which turned, Frankenstein-like, upon its creators. Where is the evidence to back up a theory such as that one?—though I don't doubt I could seriously advance it and persuade many that such was the case. The theory would, after all, be a wish-fulfillment for many persons—those, for example, who feel guilty, and would like to think they are getting what they deserve, and with a dash of poetic justice.

With regard to the myth itself—the origins¹⁶ of which are, so far as I know, lost—we may note that its acceptance tends to decline commensurate with the integration of the Negro into the white society, while, at the same time, it acts as a still-potent deterrent to such integration. Ironically, such greater sexuality as the Negro might possess—and which would probably be due, if it existed, to the lesser pressure of inhibiting *moralistic* concepts upon his behavior—would diminish in almost precise ratio to his social integration and consequent exposure to the inhibiting concepts. (It is well known that Negroes who have risen to middle-class economic status very swiftly take over the bourgeois inhibitions and tend to be bound

by them to an even greater extent than are their similarly situated white neighbors. The puritanism of educated and middle- and upper-class Negroes has been widely remarked, and bodes ill for the Mailer vision of an emerging Negro in the vanguard of a sexual revolution. More likely, economic parity for the Negro will result in his becoming, at least for a long while, the devotee *par excellence* of split-level houses, praying and staying together, and other such manifestations of solid citizenship.)¹⁷

As for Mailer's visionary view of the Negro generally, it has been considered here as an example and contemporary adaptation of the Myth of Negro Sexuality; and as an example, too, of the grotesqueries of speculation which occur, as they so often do in this area, when we confuse what has happened in the past with what is happening presently.

"The Negro," as he appears to us in *The White Negro*, is likely to seem especially alien and bizarre. The reason for this, I think, is obvious: Mailer is generalizing about "the Negro" on the basis of his experience with a few atypical Negroes—philosophers, artists, intellectuals, renegade scholars, Hipsters, jazz musicians, Beatniks, and so on. (Not that these people are themselves necessarily bizarre. It is the attempt to describe the average Negro on the basis of such atypical Negroes that results in an eccentric creation.) As a result, when he speaks of "the Negro," we could often substitute an "X" and it is doubtful that one Negro in ten thousand would recognize that he was being confronted by his own portrait.

So we have two views of the Negro as a sexual being: One which regards him as fundamentally similar in his sexuality to the white, though perhaps a bit battered by the bludgeonings of circumstance; and Norman Mailer's, in which the Negro, his perpetual erection extending like a militant banner on high, is leading us all to the promised land of the better orgasm.

You takes your choice.

POSTSCRIPT

It is extremely unfortunate, whatever one's views on interracial sex relations, that the sexual act between the white female and the Negro male has acquired a symbolic character which no probable amount of integration of the races is likely to do away with for many decades.

For the Negro male, this has to be *the* weapon for lashing out rebelliously at white supremacy. No act he can commit, not even murder, is so detestable to the whites, or so he believes, as his sexual relations with a white female. Many rapes of white women by Negroes are to be explained and understood solely as such acts of rebellion and hatred.¹⁸ Contrary to the (probably) majority view that they attest to Negro animality or the overwhelming lust of Negroes, and/or to low moral standards resulting from economic and educational factors, perhaps the greater number of such rapes nowadays are, in a

sense, *philosophically* motivated, and have as their basis a protest against social customs and individual and public attitudes oppressive to the Negro.¹⁹

For the white female, on the other hand, the importance of the ideas that her relations with a Negro male are degrading and merit punishment cannot be overemphasized. In a great many, and perhaps the majority, of instances of white-Negro sex relationships, it must be assumed that the white female enters into the liaison on the basis of a masochistic psychology, and that for her the affair is a vehicle for self-punishment and degradation.

Allowing for all exceptions, it remains an inescapable conclusion that these symbolic values so permeate the white female-Negro male sex relationship that a normal and healthy intimacy is almost impossible.

Harking back now to the alleged Negro sexual supremacy, I have collected some data which might be regarded by some as supportive, though there are obviously a great many factors to be considered in attempting to reach any conclusions. In any case, I have accumulated the following recent statistics and other data concerning Negro sex attitudes, behavior, and reproduction:

A study of the sexual activity of volunteer subjects over sixty years of age, conducted in a North Carolina community, found fifty-four per cent of all married persons in the group to be still active sexually. The average age of those studied was seventy. Among them, Negroes were found to be more active than whites, men more active than women, and persons of lower social and

economic status more active than those of higher status. A correlation was found between sexual activity in earlier life and sexual activity beyond sixty. Results of the study appeared in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, and were summarized in the *Newsletter* of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sex.

Another SSSS *Newsletter* reported that "illegitimacy now accounts for 19.6 per thousand total white births, but for 206.7 per thousand non-white." The *Newsletter* attributed this considerable disparity "to socio-economic status, education, and society's attitude toward sex in general," while not taking into account, or at least not mentioning, any possible factors of racial sexuality.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's *Statistical Bulletin* has reported the finding that multiple births occur more often to non-white than to white mothers.

Dr. Stanton Wheeler, writing in the Spring, 1960, *Law and Contemporary Problems*, stated that "Considerable variation in sex attitudes is revealed when characteristics other than social class are studied. Even a single question on a public opinion poll reveals important differences in attitude by race. Where roughly fifteen per cent of the white females said that premarital intercourse for males was 'all right,' twenty-nine per cent of the Negro females gave that response. The differences in tolerance for women who engaged in the same behavior ranged from roughly five per cent for white respondents to seventeen per cent for Negroes. Evidence on sex behavior leaves no doubt that the attitudinal differences are carried out in action. A study of army recruits located seven virgins

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

among 500 Negro draftees. Studies of illegitimate birth point to the same extremely high rates for Negro girls in urban areas."

The U. S. Census, 1950, Special Reports, *Fertility*, cites the census as revealing that though more Negro than white wives are childless, the Negro women who do bear children more than compensate for this, so that the Negro birth rate exceeds that for whites.

Kinsey *et al.* (*Pregnancy, Birth and Abortion*) found that 62 per cent of grade school-educated Negro females in the sample group had engaged in coitus by age fifteen, and well over three-quarters of the group by age twenty. This is considerably higher than the coital rate for white females, especially in the case of those under age fifteen.

And so on. Whether it is possible, at the present time, to distinguish among these data anything relating specifically to a basic and distinctive Negro sexuality seems extremely unlikely.

NOTES

1. [*page 252*]

That one kind of lover may cause a woman to lose her desire for another kind is an interesting idea we meet with in a variety of forms. For example, there is the reported case of a servant girl brought to trial in nineteenth century England for copulating with "a large black retriever." She is said to have confessed to the judge that "when a woman has tasted a dog, she will never want a man again." Readers may wish to know that despite this imprudently candid outburst she was eventually let off.

Of similar opinion was a prostitute, whose case is cited by Havelock Ellis. This woman performed at private exhibitions in San Francisco, during the course of which she had coitus with a Newfoundland dog, and she declared that once a woman had copulated with a dog, she would ever afterwards prefer dogs to human males.

2. [page 254]

Or, as one cigarette manufacturer has it, It's what's *up* front that counts. (Italics mine.)

3. [page 255]

Phyllis and Eberhard Kronhausen, in their book *Pornography and the Law*, present what is a typical pornographic representation of the Negro and a representation, too, of the Negro according to the Myth of Negro Sexuality, as concerns both size of the sex organ and erotic capacity. The quotation given is from the pornographic book *The Strange Cult*, and is, in part:

"Pete (the Negro) stared at Inez (white) . . . Like his young mistress *his sexual ability knew no limit. This giant Negro could satisfy the carnal desires of any woman . . .* Like the *giant* he was, he proved it then and there. *Without a pause between ejaculations he* (vernacular for sexual intercourse) *her like a mad stallion . . .*" (Italics mine.)

The Kronhausens also observe that "In keeping with the popular prejudice that the Negro and Asiatic races are extraordinarily virile, sensuous, and given to all kinds of perversions, 'obscene' books frequently feature one or more such persons to provide an added 'exotic' element . . ."

Compare Mailer (*The White Negro*): "But the Negro, not privileged to gratify his self-esteem with the heady satisfactions of categorical condemnation, chose to move instead in that other direction where all situations are equally valid,

and in the worst of perversion, promiscuity, pimpery, drug addiction, rape, razor-slash, bottle-break, what-have-you, the Negro discovered and elaborated a morality of the bottom, an ethical differentiation between the good and the bad in every human activity from the go-getter pimp (as opposed to the lazy one) to the relatively dependable pusher or prostitute."

4. [page 255]

"Jefferson," writes Wolfe in *The Image of Man in America*, "objects to the black man's . . . sexual ardor . . . (and) to the predominance of his sensations over his reflections. . . ."

5. [page 258]

There is, of course, from the clinical point of view, nothing necessarily abnormal or unhealthy about, say, a white female's desire for a Negro male *when he is desired as a person* who happens to be a Negro. And this is equally the case with the desire of a Negro female for a white male *desired as a person*. It is when the Negro is desired *as a Negro*, or the white *as a white*, when one or the other is desired as a *symbol* and as a *means* to some end other than that of simple heterosexual gratification, that the desire becomes a psychologically aberrant one. Of course, the desire for others as symbols and as means is not at all confined to Negro-white relationships. However, the powerful nature of the taboo against Negro-white relationships tends to make these particular symbols especially significant ones, and these particular means more than usually exploitative.

6. [page 259]

Still, things are not so bad as they once were. There used to be debates in this country about whether Negroes were human beings, and of those who held that they were not, some declared that sexual relations with Negroes were there-

Notes

fore acts of bestiality. However, Negroes should not feel that they alone have been denied membership in the human race. Theologians have in the past given weighty consideration to the question of whether women have souls (and are therefore fully human). I must confess that I do not recall reading that any of those theologians, those who took the negative on the proposition, went so far as to declare all human heterosexual relationships therefore bestial. But then that is probably only a deficiency in my education.

Another case involves the Jews. In 1222, a deacon was burned at Oxford for bestiality, having been found guilty of marrying and copulating with a Jewess. Also, in Paris, one Jean Alard, found guilty of cohabiting with a Jewess, was burned, as was she, "since coition with a Jewess is precisely the same as if a man should copulate with a dog." In burning the Jewess, the authorities were doubtless obeying, then, the biblical (Hebrew) injunction to "burn the beast also" in cases of bestiality. The crime for which Alard was convicted was described formally as "sodomy"—a category under which bestiality is included in the statutes of the U.S. states presently.

These examples could be multiplied at some length. Sexual relations with Turks and Saracens have also been held to constitute bestiality. *Und so weiter.*

7. [page 261]

The following interesting exchange takes place in sociologist Sara Harris' book, *They Sell Sex: The Call Girl and Big Business*, between a Negro pimp, "Blood Long," and "Rita Marlowe," a white prostitute or call girl he has met in a bar. "Blood" describes it:

"So, laying it on that white bitch, I know I taking her to bed tonight. One way I don't want to. Well, you play with

a ofay (white), you playing with fire, man. Better breeze, I think, better blow. Nigger, they'll get you if'n you don't look out. Eeny, meeny, miney, mo. Going to have myself a white chick. Going to have myself a ball. This here Rita Marlowe what am I waiting for all my life. Goddam, she what I been missing. They lynch you, nigger. They kill you. Not me. I kill her first. What she want, anyways? Why she choose me and not a ofay? I ask her. She frunk and she say, 'I low, Blood.'

"Well, I, Blood Long, I no simpy or no square. I know what she mean all right. I am sharp, man, and know she mean she so low that she got to take a *nigger* pimp.

"She think I low too. She think I lower'n her. So I got to get her in my stable. Now she say that thing, I got to get her in my power. I got to make her pay. And it don't no more matter what happen to me. It don't no more matter."

8. [page 263]

I don't know that Mailer accepts the myth in *all* its aspects, though he may. I don't know that he has declared himself, for example, on the Negro's supposedly greater *membrum virile*—that *monstrum, horrendum, informe, ingens* attributed to the Negro by certain newspaper editors, yokels and psychotics I have encountered. And I don't know how he stands on the related idea of the Negro's more capacious testicles—"balls," Mailer would say, and rightly—and the larger and indeed copious amounts of semen he is supposed to ejaculate (and which is supposed to contribute to much female pleasure, though most women deny they can tell when the semen has been ejaculated by means of any sensation it gives rise to). Perhaps Mailer will let us know what he holds to be self-evident where these vital matters are concerned.

9. [page 267]

What possible justification can there be for miscegenation

prohibitions if the Negro is not regarded as *naturally* inferior? The present statutes are quite simply on a level with laws forbidding bestiality, and unlike the bestiality bans do not even have the advantage of being specifically prohibited by the old Judaeo-Christian code. The only argument to be mustered—biological evidence being insufficient—is that the Negro is demonstrably, at present, inferior in his social and intellectual *development*. But the Supreme Court has already, in the schools decision, refused to agree that this is any basis for preserving the segregation of the two races.

10. [page 267]

I have mentioned on several occasions that no evidence has been advanced to sustain certain beliefs and ideas connected with the Myth of Negro Sexuality as stated or implied by Norman Mailer. Where is my own evidence that these beliefs are false?

The answer is, of course, that if I were making similarly dramatic claims, such as that there are unicorns pursuing naked Hottentot virgins around the rim of a moon made of Camembert cheese, in a realm as much explored by scientists as that of human sexuality, then it would be up to me to provide the substantiating data; and you, if you did not accept my statement on “blind faith” to satisfy some peculiar psychological need of your own, would not accept my statement as fact until I came up with the necessary valid supportive data. Those are the usual and essential rules by which the game is played and I suppose we must go along with them though I concede that breaking or ignoring the rules is usually more fun.

11. [page 268]

Is the fear all unconscious, irrational, mystical? Who, save for a wishful theoretician like Mailer, has good cause to say

so? May it be inferred on the basis of the resistance to integration and the talk in some Southern quarters about racial purity? No one denies—certainly I do not—that there are fanatics obsessed by this theme. But that is not at all to say that the obsession is general, a kind of regional neurosis or psychosis; and the Southern white has many very sound and logical reasons, economic and political and educational, for resisting integration. These may not, from some points of view, be morally praiseworthy grounds for resistance, but they are nothing if not rational.

12. [page 270]

So thoroughgoing is the stereotype in the fiction of Negro-white sex relations that I have not encountered a single work written in the last decade in which a white woman is raped by a Negro man, though a great many such rapes certainly occur as a consequence of the miscegenation taboo and other factors and must be taken into account in any attempt to explore the sexual relations of the races. By the same token, it was necessary to wait for the fiction of the Beat Generation, which makes something of a fetish of interracial sex, to find plausible instances of Negro girls “submitting” willingly to white males. Of course, there may be a few such instances of rapes and willing submissions in contemporary fiction—which critics of this essay will hasten to point out—but if so they are surely in a vast minority as compared to the reverse side of this particular fictional coin. The doctrine of racial tolerance demands, apparently, of both writers and publishers, that where Negro-white sex relations are concerned all Negro males must be seduced and all Negro females must be carnally assaulted. (For examples see the archetypical fiction of Richard Wright, whose approach to interracial sex seems to have influenced most or all later writers; a novel

Notes

like *If He Hollers Let Him Go*, by Chester Himes, if I recall correctly; and Erskine Caldwell's *Place Called Estherville*, which may or may not be a satire on these stereotypes.)

13. [page 272]

It would certainly be helpful if Mailer would clearly indicate what he means by "psychopath"—a term much abused and, for that reason, now being abandoned by many psychiatrists and psychoanalysts.

14. [page 274]

There may also be such physical factors working against Negro potency as comparatively low protein diet, fatigue, and greater incidence of diseases which could have an effect on potency.

15. [page 276]

Just to mention rape where sexual intercourse between Negro males and white females is concerned is to invite denunciation as a fanatical negrophobe. However, even at the expense of waving red flags before bulls, I must strive for objectivity; and to be objective here requires that rapes, along with other relevant phenomena, be considered. The veritable epidemic of Negro rapes of white females which has accompanied the increased racial tensions of recent years is understandable but not any the less distressing for being so. It is the "bared backside" of Negro masochism, a form of protest, a testimonial to the confusion of Negroes as to their appropriate status in the present-day American society, and involves, too, a good many other complexities. It is probably accurate to say that just as the evil of prostitution can be eliminated only by the creation of a sexually free society where gratification is available to everyone, so interracial rapes, particularly those of white females by Negro males, can be eliminated or minimized only in a society where there is

free and wholesale intercourse between the races. Negro rapes of white females are, in other words, a part of the purchase price of sexual segregation of the races, just as prostitution is a part of the purchase price of insistence upon extramarital chastity and the maintenance of an officially antisexual society generally. Everyone is free to decide for himself whether what is purchased is worth what is paid. The point is that everyone should understand that the price must and will be met.

16. [page 277]

"Needless to say," writes Allen Edwardes in *The Jewel in the Lotus*, "Moslem women preferred Negroes because of the unusual size of their parts. According to Arab slavers and eroticists, the average Negro organ in a quiescent state measured not less than six inches. This, though rare among Semites, was their ideal in a man."

It seems likely, though it would be difficult or impossible to prove, that the Myth of Negro Sexuality, at least as it concerns the Negro's phallic proportions and superabundance of ejaculate, originated with the Arabs who have always felt a bit uneasy about the relative size of their penes. However, the Arab, a past master of erotic techniques and the retardation of the climax, soon came to despise the Negro for his sexual clumsiness and his swift orgasm, though still envying him the magnitude of his instrument. But the American, accepting the myth of size, while having no technique to speak of to fall back on, was in bad case; and when he adhered to other components of the myth as well, then he was really in trouble.

17. [page 278]

But then again, maybe not. A study made in Philadelphia, and published in the September, 1960, issue of *Eugenics*

Notes

Quarterly, showed that in the City of Brotherly Love the incidence of premarital pregnancies is high among upper as well as lower Negro socioeconomic status groups.

The report adds that the figures are not, as some would hasten to suggest, swelled by unfortunate migrants from the Southern states. On the contrary, premarital pregnancies are more numerous proportionately among the Philadelphia-based Negroes than among the Negro migrants. The Negro rate generally was more than double that for whites.

18. [page 279]

The extrasexual character of Negro rapes was well demonstrated in the Congo, where native sentiments toward the Belgians in some ways paralleled those of many U.S. Negroes towards U.S. whites. The Congo rapes were not quite so indiscriminate as they may have seemed. Nuns were raped and otherwise sexually abused precisely because it was surmised that this would seem particularly horrifying and outrageous to the whites. And when it came to raping the wives of Belgian soldiers, the desirability of a woman was determined not by her youth and physical charms, but by the rank of her husband.

Thus, it was reported, Congolese paid her captors as much as 500 Belgian francs to rape the elderly and not very physically attractive wife of a colonel although they could have assaulted the sexually more desirable wives of lesser officers at a fraction of that price. Moreover, the rapes were accompanied by mutilations of the genitalia especially designed to express the grievances of the natives.

19. [page 280]

It is worth noting here that one study has shown that Negroes who commit sex offenses are less likely to be mentally disturbed than whites who commit sex offenses. That is to

say, the excuse of mental illness is not so often applicable to the Negro as to the white sex offender.

Naturally not, it should be added. The sex code, while in a sense "normal" for the whites who created it, is in scarcely any sense normal for the Negroes, who did not. For the average Negro to abide by the white sex morality, which was in no way derived from the Negroes' situation in the world, would be abnormal. Behaving normally, the Negro behaves abnormally in terms of some white prohibitions; and criminally, too—but without any indication of mental disturbance such as one might expect to find among Negroes who transgress their own sex codes.

S E X A N D F O R B I D D E N D R U G S

Mescaline and other “aphrodisiacs”

*Yet many a man is making friends
with death*

Even as I speak, for lack of love alone.

EDNA ST. VINCENT MILLAY

Despite all the titillations so lavishly provided by advertising, literature, the films and other sources, ours remains an antisexual society. Not only does it officially prohibit and deplore most sexual acts, and encircle with restrictions the few that are allowed, but it also vigorously opposes all “artificial” means of improving those few sexual acts which, under specified conditions, are permissible. One sees this illustrated clearly in the case of real or supposed aphrodisiacs—drugs which stimulate sexual desire, or which improve sexual performance.

While there may be some rational basis for hostility to drugs which stimulate sexual desires, and which might therefore be used to "seduce the innocent," there can be no rational basis whatever for condemning drugs which, without damage to the user, improve sexual performance in sexual intercourse that is going to take place anyhow. Of course, no one who has dispassionately studied the matter ever suggests that there is anything rational about sex taboos, or about some drug taboos either, for that matter.

A drug that affects sexual performance favorably is twice damned. It must contend not only with the opposition engendered by its sex effects, but also with hostility to (pleasure) "drugs." When the public hears of a drug that is rumored to be, usually falsely, aphrodisiacal, it reacts on the official opinion level with violence: Drug fiendery and sex are being combined for who knows what abominable ends! Soon there are a flood of inaccurate and alarmist articles in the mass magazines and absurd bills in the state legislatures that no one dares to oppose.

Those who are somewhat more accomplished sophists may argue with more or less subtlety, ingenuity, and authoritative manner that it is immoral and perhaps dangerous to upset the "balance" between sexual desire and sexual capacity that God or nature has "established." Or that one should not meddle with such a sacred relationship as that which unites the sexes. (!)

These, and a host of other arguments, may be convincing to some where drugs that arouse sexual desires are (believed to be) concerned. There are no arguments

carrying any conviction, however, when it comes to drugs which might improve sexual performance. Such drugs could only serve a socially useful purpose in improving marital relationships and easing the sufferings of some of the sexually handicapped.

It is rather generally agreed, of course, that doctors should be permitted to prescribe helpful drugs for the impotent and the near-impotent with the objective of raising their level of performance to normal (i.e., average). But they should not, most persons feel, prescribe for individuals whose sexual performances are already adequate, and who merely want to make them better yet. Of course, there is no way for the public to exercise any control over that.

In a sense, the whole question is academic. Physicians prescribe sex hormones and *nux vomica* and strychnine and a few other substances, and sometimes, either on the merits of the substances or as a result of suggestion or both, sexual potency is for a time increased. But there are no aphrodisiacs in use either medically or otherwise in this country of the sort the public has in mind: sinister little tablets or powders that one slips into the milkshakes of reluctant virgins, turning them almost immediately into raging nymphomaniacs.

It is just such an aphrodisiac, of course, that a good portion of humanity has always secretly sought and hoped for: a drug to inflame female passions with, and which would, at the same time, confer upon the male a near-limitless potency. But, like the philosopher's stone, eternal youth and many another such *summum bonum*, this

sexual ultimate weapon has always eluded our grasp.

Such a drug, if it could be found, and were it to come into general use, would almost assuredly have the most unfortunate effects. Females and males, frenetically rutting and with vigor inexhaustible, would probably stay away from church, PTA, and meetings of the Rotary Club and the Junior League. Nations would become little more than immense bawdy houses. After a time, sex would probably become so boring as to fall into general neglect. Humanity would have to find something to replace it—and God only knows what that might be! No, such an aphrodisiac is not what one should hope for.

What one wants is something less than this sort of perfection: Drugs which will help people to enjoy their sexual relations to the maximum possible extent, thus eliminating what is certainly one of the greatest obstacles to successful, enduring marital relationships. Probably everyone who thoroughly studies sexual problems, and who does not have other axes to grind, eventually concludes that the husband-wife relationship, or at least the long-term pairing of a single male with a single female, is potentially the most rewarding human relationship possible. *Potentially*—if there is good sexual adjustment, *if* there is good rapport, and so on. It is difficult if not impossible to have the “rapport, and so on” if there is not good sexual adjustment. Any drug, or anything else, that contributes to such adjustment is a positive good by almost anyone’s standards, and no matter how one stands on a variety of other sexual issues. The most rigid sexual moralist in particular should favor that

which tends to bind men and women together and keep them sexually, and otherwise, within their marriage vows.

But so much for preamble. It is my intention here to discuss some of the drugs which do affect sexuality. Most of the drugs I will discuss are primarily psychosexual ones. That is, they affect sex desires and capacities by way of their influence on the mind, as distinguished from drugs which directly affect the genitals, producing engorgement, sexual excitation deriving from irritation of bladder and urethra, and other aphrodisiacal effects attributable largely to physiological responses. However, a few drugs of this latter type are also discussed.

Some of these drugs, most of the better known ones in fact—the common “narcotics”—are not taken primarily for their sexual effects and are not usually regarded as being mainly or at all aphrodisiacs. However, it is relevant to examine them in order to see how sexuality may be affected by various types of drugs. Some of the drugs mentioned here affect consciousness far more profoundly than others. Some are powerfully addicting and others are physiologically and psychologically injurious in other ways as well.

Probably none will, even with modifications, turn out to be the kind of drug one would like to find, the kind of drug that will help men and women to achieve the fullest possible sexual satisfaction with their chosen mates. Some, however, do significantly improve sexual relations for some persons. One—*mescaline*—which I will discuss at a bit greater length than the rest, has had a very interesting and helpful effect on the sexual rela-

tions of some persons, and is worth a good deal more study along these lines than it has received.

Cantharides, the Spanish fly of popular sexlore, is included mainly because of the widespread misconception that it is a true aphrodisiac which is suppressed only because it is effective. That is not the case. Spanish fly is dangerous, has often been fatal, and countless persons have been subjected to great suffering as a result of the false notions held about its effects.

A few "exotic drugs," reputedly possessing aphrodisiacal properties, are mentioned mainly in order to give the reader an idea of the diversity and distribution of such drugs throughout the world and the vast store of superstition to be encountered almost universally where aphrodisiacs are concerned.

The drugs discussed at greater length are familiar ones, at least in name, to many persons. Most of them—*cocaine*, *heroin*, *morphine*, *opium*, *marijuana*—cannot be legally used or obtained except in the course of medical treatment, when they are used for purposes quite other than that of stimulating the sex impulse. *LSD-25*, and such related drugs as *psilocybin* and *harmine*, are experimental drugs not available to the general public for any purpose and used only by a few psychiatrists. *Mescaline*, already mentioned, available in its raw state in the peyote cactus of the Southwest, may be legally obtained *as cactus* and used in most states, and is also employed experimentally in psychiatry. *Datura stramonium*, like others of the *Solanaceae*, can probably be obtained by anyone, though few would care to make use of it.

The attempt is made here to separate fact from fiction, both as concerns real and alleged dangers of the drugs discussed, and where their real and alleged sexual effects are concerned. This is not so easy as one might suppose. Individual responses to drugs vary greatly, and the responses of the same individuals vary according to time, circumstances, and other factors. An investigator may obtain a large number of responses that no other investigator can duplicate, perhaps for the reason that the subjects are in part or largely responding to the investigator himself, to the conditions of his experiments, and so on. Moreover, in the matter of sex stimulants some scientists are likely either to suppress data or to distort it in the interests of the particular moral philosophies to which they happen to subscribe. Doubtless such suppression and distortion of data is often, as the psychoanalysts say, unconscious. But it is a fact, and for that reason research in this field is both difficult and unusually liable to error. There are other obstacles as well, some of which will be mentioned later.

CANTHARIDES

I would like to consider first, and get out of the way, Cantharides (Spanish fly), and Cantharis (Russian fly), aphrodisiacs which do not really belong in the company

of the drugs to be dealt with presently, but which will be discussed for reasons previously mentioned.

The so-called Spanish fly, source of the drug Cantharides (properly: Cantharidin), is not a fly but a beetle, and is not peculiar to Spain. Spanish fly or Cantharides has a long history of use as an aphrodisiac despite innumerable cases of severe poisoning, many fatal, resulting from such use.

The Roman poet Lucretius, probably best remembered for his didactic epic *De Rerum Natura*, is said to have died as the result of an overdose of this drug (though others say that it made him "insane" and that he subsequently committed suicide). Cantharidic *bonbons* are supposed to have been introduced into France from Italy by no less a personage than Catherine de Medici. Henry III and Charles IX are said to have made use of such *bonbons*, as did Richelieu in the eighteenth century. The Marquis de Sade also tried them out, at a now-famous party, and according to some historians several persons died as a result. Cantharides is believed to have been the key ingredient of the "Secret Tablets" of Madame du Barry. And so on.

Cantharides is usually taken orally, the whitish powder being mixed in with some beverage. When the substance is being voided by urination, there occurs an irritation of the bladder and of the urethra, and this in its turn produces the powerful erections usually associated with the drug.

According to the toxicologist Gustav Schenk (*The Book of Poisons*), two or three grams of the beetle sub-

stance or 0.04 to 0.08 grams of Cantharidin are considered the lethal doses. Less than lethal doses are still likely to result in horrible suffering and grave after-effects.

Anyone tempted to employ as an aphrodisiac either Spanish or Russian fly would do well first to consider these symptoms of Cantharis and Cantharides poisoning given by Dr. G. H. W. Lucas in his book, *The Symptoms and Treatment of Acute Poisoning*:

"Symptoms. Severe pains in the whole abdominal region; burning in the throat, mouth and stomach; difficulty in swallowing, with sometimes a dread of liquids; excessive salivation and swollen glands; fetid breath; obstinate and painful priapism (erection); rapid, shallow respiration; hard and rapid pulse; burning thirst; vomiting of mucus mixed with blood; shining particles of the powder (if poisoning is due to ingestion of the beetles) may be evident in the vomitus; diarrhea, the stools consisting of blood and shiny mucus; acute inflammation of the urinary tract, shown by frequent desire to micturate, with urine scant, bloody or albuminous; high temperature; delirium; convulsions; tetany; death."

ALCOHOL

Though not thought of by most persons either as a drug or, primarily, as an aphrodisiac, alcohol does have important effects on sexual behavior and deserves to be considered here.

In a great many persons, the consumption of alcohol seems to weaken the superstructure of inhibitions imposed by social conditioning on the individual's biological desires and instinctual life generally. Speaking plainly, the man or woman under the influence of alcohol is likely to do things that he or she would not ordinarily do. In most cases, when this happens, it can probably be understood to mean that the *desire* to engage in such behavior was present all along, but that it was necessary for alcohol to reduce inhibitions and "increase courage" before the person could surmount the obstacles and engage in the behavior. "In wine is truth," and "the drunkard is himself but more so," say a couple of old apothegms taking note of the relatively uninhibited behavior of some drinkers.

To a degree one may say that alcohol, like many drugs, puts the individual "in closer touch with his unconscious." Sometimes the desires which are present in the consciousness of the individual under the influence of alcohol were not consciously present previously. Since

they did not come out of the bottle, one must suppose that they came out of the drinker's unconscious—somehow liberated by the effects of the intoxicant upon the mind. More often, the desires were conscious but the individual did not give way to them because they were regarded as morally wrong, or because the price—social disapproval, possible trouble with the law, etc., seemed too high. But under the influence of alcohol one is likely to care less about social taboos, to worry less about consequences of one's actions, and to feel that the chances are good of "getting away with it."

Everyone knows that these facts are relevant to sexual behavior. Intoxication may indeed, among many persons, excuse behavior which would otherwise be inexcusable. An adulterous husband or wife may plead (in all conscious honesty) that the infidelity would never have occurred had it not been for the intoxication, and it is often easier for the "injured" party to forgive the adultery under these circumstances.

Undoubtedly millions of persons have had their first, and a good many subsequent, sexual experiences while under the influence of alcohol. This applies not only to coitus but to cunnilingus, fellatio, sodomy, and other kinds of heterosexual and homosexual acts. Many authorities find a special connection between drinking and homosexuality. While it is doubtless true that, for reasons already mentioned, homosexual intercourse is more likely to be engaged in (by persons not consciously homosexual) when drinking than when not drinking, it is doubtful that any other connection can be established.

In the case of the male, intoxication may prolong the erection, in which case ejaculation may or may not occur, or it may make erection impossible. Inhibited females may find that they are more easily aroused, but they may also find that intoxication prevents their experiencing orgasm (as may females generally.) The longer (in terms of years) one has been drinking, the more likely one is to be impotent rather than to have the erection prolonged when drinking heavily. In alcoholics potency may be, and often is, destroyed altogether, the individual being unable to obtain an erection whether drunk or sober. Alcoholism may also result, where females are concerned, in an inability to experience climax.

Alcoholic beverages as aphrodisiacs are generally unsatisfactory. Many teen-age girls have been seduced "as a result of drinking," or so one hears. But it is well to recall here a witticism often repeated at lectures on hypnosis, and which concerns the possibility of using hypnosis to effect a seduction. The point of the "joke," which may be variously told, is that hypnosis cannot be used to seduce anyone who is really unwilling; and if the subject is not really unwilling, than the hypnosis is superfluous. Barring occasions where girls and women drink themselves into total unconsciousness, and are raped, the same might be said of seductions "accomplished" by means of alcohol. Where sexual responses are concerned, results obtained from alcohol may vary from one occasion to the next, and are therefore unpredictable. If it can be said to be helpful to anyone in a sexual way, that tribute should be confined to assistance rendered neu-

rotics who are impotent without it because of anxiety feelings based on fear of women, latent homosexuality, and other disturbances much better dealt with by a psychiatrist. Moreover, those who employ alcohol as a "crutch" for a partial impotence, and those who customarily make alcoholic consumption a part of their sexual relations, may establish a conditioning so that eventually the sex act cannot be accomplished except under conditions of intoxication. This is psychologically hazardous, may lead to alcoholism, and in many cases reduces the pleasure available from acts much more rewardingly performed when the participants are not intoxicated.

Physicians who recommend the consumption of alcohol as a method of improving sex relations, without the background of a thorough psychological study of their patient, are doing the patient a considerable disservice and exposing him to the possibility of serious emotional and physical damage. This old-fashioned "prescription," by no means unknown today, attests to the physician's ignorance or—if he is aware of the risks—to his immoral and perhaps criminal disregard for the patient's long-term welfare.

OPIUM

Opium, as used by the opium or *chandu* smokers of the East, is not commonly employed by American drug users. In the United States, the opium alkaloid *morphine*, and

its derivative, *heroin*, are preferred. In the end, users of all three achieve the same effect, sexually speaking: they become impotent. But in the meanwhile, the user of opium especially experiences some interesting and pleasurable erotic phenomena.

Even among the experts, there are conflicting reports about the erotic experience of the opium smoker. The famous German authority Dr. Erich Hesse, author of *Narcotics and Drug Addiction*, has written of the well-known sexual phantasies and visions of the opium user:

“It is a fact of experience,” Hesse declares, “that in comparison with the brains of Europeans, the brains of the people of Eastern Asia are far more sensitive to the distillation products of opium, which produce a strongly pleasure toned stage of intoxication full of erotic wish-dreams. The Chinese completely succumbed to this sensation.”

The attribution to Orientals of drug-induced erotic dreams and other sexual effects which the Westerner does not generally share is not peculiar to Dr. Hesse, but it is certainly erroneous, especially if taken as other than the broadest kind of generalization. In Hesse’s case, a similar view is expressed where *hashish* is concerned—which is even more erroneous—and the reader should bear his remarks in mind when we come to our discussion of that drug:

“Orientals (under the influence of hashish) experience also erotically toned dreams, which white people do not,” Hesse writes. “White people unanimously report the absence of any aphrodisizing effect.”

We shall see, however, that it is not so unanimous as all that—not in the case of the hashish, and not in the case of opium. And the “wish-dreams” are perhaps on the part of Hesse, and those who share his reluctance to admit white people into the fraternity of erotic visionaries. This would seem to be part and parcel of the notion that Orientals are always more virile, more sensual, more depraved, and so on, than white people, a view which is sometimes extended to include Middle Easterners and Negroes, wherever they may be. We should not permit such prejudice—the reader must decide against whom the prejudice is directed—to prevail, but should seek out the facts.

Iwan Bloch, a famed sexologist whose works are still valuable today, described in his book, *Strange Sexual Practices*, the erotic effects of opium, not just on Orientals:

“Of opium,” he writes, “it is well known that at first it increases sexual activity. Voluptuous phantasies and visions are also characteristic of these stages. Continued indulgence in opium, however, produces impotence.”

This impotence, according to Bloch, is likely (as is any impotence) to result in experimentation with sexual perversions, a likelihood further increased by the sensual extravagance of the opium smoker’s drug-induced phantasies. And, finally, in the embracing of perversions, with accompanying incapacity for any normal sexual relations whatever.

In *Wanderings in Untrodden Fields of Anthropology*, the anonymous French surgeon-author, while acknowl-

edging that long-time use of opium results in impotence, had some very interesting and more than usually specific things to say about the aphrodisiac effects which *may* be obtained if the dose is not too strong and the individual not too habituated to the drug:

“According to my personal experience, and from avowals made to me by many women, both Europeans and Asiatics, the effects produced by opium in moderate amounts, say from 10 to 20 pipes, are as follows: under the influence of erotic excitement, either direct or merely mental, an erection is quickly produced, if you want to copulate. But—and this has never been remarked by any other author—although the penis is in a stiff erection, its nerves, and more particularly those of the glans, are anesthetized by the effects of opium, and though the erection is strong, the emission on the contrary is much retarded, and only takes place after a prolonged copulation. This anesthetic effect is also produced in the nerves of the vulva, the vagina, and rectum of the woman, and the ‘physiological moment’ arrives slowly. . . .”

(There is a good deal in *Wanderings* that needs to be taken *cum grano salis*, but the above has a ring of authenticity to it. It is particularly interesting because the effects described are so strikingly similar to those obtained by the user of the non-addicting alkaloid mescaline, which will be discussed presently.)

“The stimulating effects of opium cease,” the French surgeon continues, “if more than 15 or 20 pipes are taken. When a total of 25 or 30 pipes is reached, the erections are not complete; and at from 30 to 40 pipes they are

entirely wanting, in spite of the most energetic rubbing. Old opium smokers generally become impotent. In their case, the penis is lanky, the glans shrunken and seemingly hardened, the mucous surfaces pale; the scrotum is shrivelled and the testicles eventually become atrophied."

HEROIN AND MORPHINE

The sexual effects of the opium derivatives heroin and morphine are, as mentioned, radical. They might well be termed "castrating drugs," since they soon—much sooner than happens with the opium smoker—render the addict totally impotent.

However, some persons receive from these drugs ecstatic sensations which may be interpreted as sexual in character. Robert deRopp (*Drugs and the Mind*) tells of one individual who described the sensation (just following the injection) as "a thrill through the body lasting seven or eight minutes and resembling the sexual orgasm." Such a reaction is said not to occur in normal persons, but only in "psychopaths"—psychopath apparently being used here in a somewhat broader sense than that of a strict psychiatric category. DeRopp suggests that the term "joy popping," employed by users of heroin, refers to such an intense and possibly sexual sensation as that mentioned.¹

There are some cases where, early in the addiction,

erection may be prolonged. Orgasm, however, usually does not occur. The individual soon becomes sterile and, inevitably, impotent. (Occasionally, it would seem, one can have it both ways: Harold Greenwald, in an unpublished Ph.D. thesis to be found in the Columbia University Library, claims that prostitutes may use heroin to deaden their responses to their customers, but also to heighten their responses to their "boy friends," or lovers.)

Heroin and morphine are, of course, powerfully addicting, and there are few agonies known to man which can compare with the "withdrawal symptoms" experienced by persons addicted to these drugs, and who are then unable to obtain them. Withdrawal has relevance to this article only in as much as a peculiar sexual aspect of the total withdrawal syndrome has been noted by Kinsey. Kinsey and his team observed (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*) that "Among men who have suddenly been deprived of some drug to which they have been addicted, (nocturnal) emissions (so-called wet dreams) may occur several times in each twenty-four hours, for two or three weeks or more."

COCAINE

According to Hesse, ". . . The repeated sniffing of cocaine leads to the real cocaine intoxication, which assumes a euphoric nature. It takes a sexual direction, with an intensification of the emotional life and a breakdown

of all inhibitions. . . . A symptom which can be regularly observed in chronic alkaloid addicts is the homosexually toned perversion of their sex life. In the opinion of several specialists, this state represents merely the manifestation of a latent homosexual inclination, released by the drug. Other authors claim that this is merely a purely cerebral consequence of cocaine intoxication, since after its effect has faded away, the normal emotional trend reappears, and frequently asserts itself also in the narcosis-free periods."

Bernard Finch (*Passport to Paradise . . . ?*) also remarks the erotic effects of cocaine:

"With the excitement of the brain, sexual desires loom up to the fore. In men there is increased sexual desire with erotic ideas developing into perversions which are carried even to the extent of violence. With women the same sexual stimulation occurs, but erotic manifestations are more marked, with a tendency to produce complete loss of moral sense and nymphomania."

Finch also writes, still with regard to cocaine's aphrodisiacal effects: "There is removal of normal inhibitions with increased erotic tension in women, characterized by marked engorgement and congestion of the genital organs. It appears that these erotic reflexes occur chiefly in the woman. There is heightened sexual excitement which may lead to all manner of sexual perversions in unstable people.

"In the male, the physical component is not so active, but the stage of excitement is present and all moral restraint 'goes by the board.' "

(Kenneth Walker, a well known British writer on sexological subjects, declares that the drug affects mainly males, producing vascular engorgement of the genitals and "erotic ideas." One soon learns, in this field, not to expect any unanimity of opinion on "matters of fact" among the writers.)

A hazard of cocaine is that it is likely to result in the use of heroin as well. As the cocaine effects diminish, they are replaced by anxiety, which may assume the proportions of near-panic, and this agonizing state is often followed by one of profound depression. Both the anxiety state and the depression are so tormenting that the heroin is taken in an attempt to counteract them.

The cocaine user is the most violent and antisocial in his behavior of all addicts, and it has been suggested that it is to him the popular picture of the "dope fiend" refers. He is especially eager to "turn on" other persons to the use of his drug, and also to involve them in his anti-social behavior, sexual and other.

The individual under the influence of cocaine may be quite dangerous, developing paranoid delusions of persecution and especially plots against his life. In the long run, cocaine destroys physical health as well as mental. If anything good may be said of it, that good resides in the fact that it is not addicting as are the opiates and may be withdrawn with a minimum of danger and suffering as compared to heroin and morphine withdrawal. Fortunately, cocaine is now very difficult to obtain, and its use is not widespread in this country.

MARIJUANA

Quite a different picture is encountered when we consider the hemp plant derivative marijuana and its related hemp (*Cannabis sativa* or *Cannabis indica*) derived brethren: *hashish*, *beng*, *kif*, *charas*, *bhang*, *gangha*, etc. The drug also has numerous slang titles, being known to the Beat Generation and to jazz musicians as *pot* and *shit* and by a variety of other designations as well.

The use of hemp derivatives goes back a long way, and aspects of its history are quite colorful. The hemp narcotic was mentioned by the Chinese Emperor Shen Neng in 2737 B.C. Its use by the assassins (or hashish-ins) of Hasan-i-Sabbah, The Old Man of the Mountain, was related by Marco Polo. In more recent times hashish has been celebrated by Gautier and Baudelaire, and by many lesser writers. Sir Richard Burton wrote of its use, by Orientals, to prolong coition and to increase sensation during coitus. Dumas attributed to hashish the power to give rise to fantastic and beautiful erotic visions.

The early Chinese version of marijuana was known, under Shen Neng, as The Liberator of Sin. Later Chinese, however—but doubtless with the same aspects of the drug in mind—called it The Delight Giver.

The Hindu names for the drug are rather unanimously on the side of the later Chinese, so that it is variously

known as The Soother of Grief, The Heavenly Guide, The Conqueror, The Dispenser of Happiness, The Love-Dagger, Cementer of Friendship, Wife of the Dhatura (thorn apple), Rose-Pillow, and so on.

The Oriental evidently had good reason to bestow such fond and grateful titles on the drug. It was said to bless him with visions of a paradise complete with beautiful nymphs and alluring catamites, and to cure, by these visions, the psychically impotent in the bargain.

In the Western world, the pleasures provided by marijuana and hashish are in the telling more modest, though a far cry from Hesse's assertion that the user experiences no erotic stimulation whatever. Aphrodisiac effects of marijuana, as noted by various experimenters, are described by deRopp:

"Burr, who took 60 minims of Parke, Davis tincture, found (that) . . . Sex ideas were entirely absent and 'Venus herself could not have tempted' ² him. . . . And yet this drug has been regarded for centuries in the East as the aphrodisiac *par excellence*. Burton, translator of *The Arabian Nights*, declares that Orientals used it both to prolong coition and to increase the intensity of the sensations. His words are echoed by those of Hector France: 'Hashish is of course a positive aphrodisiac, the length of the venereal act being at once reinforced and repeated.' Wood, one of the first American students of the drug, found that 'at no time were there any aphrodisiac feelings produced' but a friend of his, after taking a preparation of the resin, not only became so ravenous that his Gargantuan appetite evoked comment but was also

aroused to a state of 'venereal excitement' accompanied by priapism which lasted for several days. Walton does not consider the drug itself an aphrodisiac but believes that it may produce such an effect by exerting a paralytic action on the higher structures of the brain, releasing the lower, more primitive structures which are normally restrained and controlled by the cerebral cortex. This view is in accord with that expressed by Allentuck and Bowman: '. . . Marihuana is no more aphrodisiac than is alcohol. Unlike damiana, yohimbin, testosterone propionate, etc., which produces genital engorgement directly, marihuana, like alcohol, acts only indirectly through the cerebral cortex in this respect.' " 8

Finch reports that "After several inhalations, a feeling of sexual excitement develops and the smoker is able to improve on his sexual performance, in that erection is stronger and more persistent, but orgasm is depressed and does not usually take place."

No other writer with whom I am familiar reports as occurring among Westerners this "feeling of sexual excitement after several inhalations" of marijuana. It is possible that some persons may under certain conditions respond in such a way, but the response is far from being a general one.

Other remarks by Finch incline one to believe that he is speaking of marijuana smoked just previous to sexual intercourse. In such a context his remarks are more plausible. (The failure of writers on the sexual effects of drugs to state the conditions of their experiments is a grievous fault. It is ludicrous from a scientific viewpoint

to be guilty of such a significant omission, and especially so here where the presence or absence of erotic *stimulus* may be all-decisive—as will be seen when we come to the discussion of mescaline.)

Finch notes that marijuana tends to diminish the inhibitions and increase suggestibility. If one smokes marijuana *as an aphrodisiac*, sexual excitement might well at once occur, as it might with any placebo. That marijuana has the *reputation* of being an aphrodisiac is in itself enough to make it one in some cases. For example, the drug has often been sold by prostitutes to their customers, who have had no cause for complaint about the results. But no doubt those results would have been equally impressive in many cases had the “marijuana” cigarette been made of tea leaves or whatever.

The prolongation of erection in some cases is not unlikely. Neither is the failure of orgasm to occur. These phenomena are characteristic of a number of drugs, but in the case of marijuana the effects seem to be even more than usually dependent upon the individual personality.

The report of the Mayor’s Committee on Marihuana (New York City, 1944) remains the best ever compiled in the U.S. on this drug. It deals with the sociological and psychological effects of the drug’s use as well as with its pharmacological aspects. It is an objective and unusually sane survey, placing marijuana in its proper perspective, and for that reason necessarily dispels most of the journalistically spawned folklore concerning the drug’s alleged hazards. Indeed, the report led Mayor La Guardia to consider amending existing laws banning the drug.

This, however, was not done, perhaps because of the public outcry which would certainly have resulted, with consequent formidable opposition to any attempted changes in the regulatory statutes.

The Committee, composed of representatives of the New York Academy of Medicine, confirmed what has long been known to the reliably informed—that marijuana is not addicting. The Committee found no direct relation between marijuana and crime and no evidence that the marijuana smoker is likely to progress to the use of more dangerous drugs—as is often asserted to be the case. Certain dangers were cited, but these were similar to and certainly no greater than those connected with the use of alcohol. The general impression conveyed by the report as a whole is that marijuana in no way deserves to be included in legislation prohibiting the use of such drugs as cocaine, morphine, and heroin, and which imposes drastic punishment on offenders. Such legislation where marijuana is concerned, and as an editorial in *The Military Surgeon* once stated, brands “as a menace and a crime a matter of trivial importance.” It is to be concluded from this and a mass of similar evidence that marijuana is a problem largely because misguided lawmakers have made it one.

The supposed relationship between marijuana and sex was well known to the Mayor’s Committee and the matter was exhaustively investigated. Committee members visited Harlam “tea pads”—“tea” is another of marijuana’s many names—and combination tea pad-brothels and parties where marijuana was consumed. Further, a great

many marijuana users were interviewed by physicians thoroughly trained in eliciting information. The end result of these and other investigations was the Committee's conclusion "that in the main marijuana was not used for direct sexual stimulation."

It should not be necessary to dwell upon the fact that if marijuana were an aphrodisiac of that sort that arouses sexual desires, and could therefore be used to seduce the unwilling, then the drug would certainly be employed primarily for that purpose.

EXOTIC DRUGS

I will at this point consider briefly a few of the allegedly aphrodisiac drugs which are found all over the world, many of them among primitive and near-primitive peoples. Fabulous, and often unverified, claims are repeatedly made in behalf of the sex-stimulating powers of such drugs, and sometimes people go to great lengths to obtain them, only to be disappointed or injured in more serious ways. A few of the plants and drugs held by legend, folklore and more or less informed observation to be aphrodisiac are:

Cubeb Pepper. The sexologist Mantegazza and other writers have assigned aphrodisiac properties to the Cubeb Pepper, which is said both to induce erection and to pro-

long copulation. There is little if any reliable evidence, however, to confirm this assertion.

Betel. Betel is to the East what tobacco is to the West, and untold millions, for centuries, have been addicted to its use. A great many writers have attributed to betel chewing aphrodisiac effects, but most moderns who have investigated betel deny that it could have aphrodisiac properties of any importance. It does induce a certain amount of euphoria and mental tranquility, and if there are any sexual benefits they must somehow reside in those effects.

Kola. Seneghalese and Sudanese natives are said to be sexually stimulated by the *gourou*, or Kola Nut. However that may be, Kola is not a noteworthy sex stimulant where Americans and Europeans are concerned.

Mexican Red Bean. The Mexican "Red Bean" is the seed of the various *Sophora* plants of the family *Papilionaceae*. The red bean is known to have long been the principal ingredient of love potions. According to Schenk, red beans, taken in small quantities, have a powerful aphrodisiac effect. This may be so. Schenk is usually authoritative. However, he does not describe the red beans' aphrodisiac effects or mention how he arrived at his conclusion. Neither does he say whether there are any unpleasant or disastrous side-effects, as is not infrequently the case with drugs producing genital engorgement.

Nanacatl. Mexican black mushrooms, called nanacatl, are said to "provoke lasciviousness" and to induce visions which are sometimes erotic.

Yohimbin. Used by natives in South America and West

Africa, and to some extent in recent years in medical practice, Yohimbin is reputed to be a true aphrodisiac, producing engorgement of the genitals. It also affects the brain, and apparently produces an increased sensitivity to erotic stimuli.

Bufotenin. An hallucinogenic alkaloid, Bufotenin is obtained from the skin of a poisonous toad. It is said to produce erotic hallucinations, sexual excitement, and sometimes engorgement of the genitals and prolonged erection. Bufotenin is another substance of importance in the history of witchcraft, where it may have been used both as a poison and as an aphrodisiac—possibly as an ingredient in some versions of the witches' salve. From the skin of the poisonous toad South American natives make an allegedly aphrodisiacal snuff called *cohoba*.

Ololuigui. Obtained from the tropical plant *rivea corymbosa*, Ololuigui is another erotic hallucinogen and is believed to increase sexual excitement and potency.

Harmine. Harmine is an hallucinogenic alkaloid found in South America and obtained from the plant *banisteria caapi*. It is chemically related to mescaline. A brain stimulant, Harmine may produce erotic hallucinations and in some persons is said to have a favorable effect on sex performance.

Kat. Kat, made from the leaves or buds of *Catha edulis*, is found in Yemen. It is reputed to be an anaphrodisiac and to destroy all sexual desire in those who use it habitually. The drug also overstimulates the heart and thus gives rise to cardiac disorders. Insomnia is another unpleasant result of Kat's use. To compensate him for these

disadvantages, the Kat user is made excited and happy, his need for food and sleep is reduced, and he receives an extra quota of energy. Kat is said to be highly esteemed by holy men and ascetics, who employ it to liberate themselves from the torments and temptations of the flesh.

There are many, many other drugs of aphrodisiac and anaphrodisiac (sex depressant) reputation which could be mentioned, and some of these undoubtedly do possess, as do some of those mentioned above, the powers attributed to them. In most cases there is probably at least some basis in fact for the claims made, though it may be that only a few of the drug users are so affected, or that the effects have been greatly exaggerated.

The resistance to scientific exploration and development of aphrodisiacs where there is a chance of success is considerable. Many of these plants and their derivatives have never been adequately investigated as, one surmises, they would have been, had such dramatic claims been made for them in some other equally important area of health and need.

THORN APPLE

The drug derived from Thorn Apple (*Datura stramonium*) belongs to the class of *Solanaceae* drugs, other sources of which are the plants *Belladonna*, *Mandragora*, and the *Henbanes*. They contain the alkaloids *atropine*,

hyoscyamine, and *scopolamine*, among others. Thorn apple is found in all but the more extreme northern and western portions of the U.S., and may be known to a larger number of readers as *Jimson Weed*. It is also called, among other names, *The Devil's Apple*.

The solanaceae have all been used for hundreds of years by many of the world's peoples, and in some form or other are found almost everywhere. But it is as "witch drugs," or the drugs used in the preparations of the witches of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, that they are best known.

Under the influence of *Datura*, *Henbane*, or *Belladonna*, or some mixture of these, the witches experienced dreams of flying to the "Sabbats," where they participated with the Devil and his demons, and with other witches, wizards and sorcerers, in wild dances and sexual orgies.⁴ By the same means, they imagined themselves to be visited at night by demons (*incubi* and *succubi*) with whom they copulated and engaged in various perversions. Often these experiences were so vivid that the individuals involved believed the experiences actually to have occurred. Asthma patients, who used to be treated with some of these drugs, have confirmed the fact that they give rise to hallucinations, delusions, and sexual imagery; and sometimes to considerable erotic stimulation.

As used by the witches, a concoction or brew of these drugs was administered orally, or the drugs were used in the preparation of an unguent or salve. Sometimes the whole body was annointed with this salve, and some-

times the female genitalia only. Finch remarks that "when applied between the legs in women they (the unguents) were readily absorbed from the vaginal mucous membrane into the blood stream." Some of the solanaceae will also yield an intoxicating and/or erotic effect if burned in a closed room, and occultists have often so used them, burning the leaves in urns, or the seeds along with incense.

I have chosen to limit this discussion largely to the thorn apple, or *datura*, since its use for sexual purposes has probably been the most widespread, and since erotic experiences resulting from the use of the various plants do not differ significantly so far as the layman is concerned from those experienced with thorn apple.

The sexual effect of *datura* is mentioned by Edwardes, who quotes a Mussulman observer:

"... Opium, arrack, hasheesh: they are of little use save for the imagination. And the imagination works like evil *jinn* (demons) that come in the night and steal the precious seed of virile men, being jealous of their power. Even *datura* (thorn apple), which makes a man ragingly lustful and exuberant for an entire night, is of little avail. It deceives one, robs him of true courage in lieu of false; and when he possesses reality of manly vigor, he is hopelessly lost in an abyss of bewilderment."

Others, too, have made this complaint about the thorn apple, citing the bewilderment inevitably accompanying the aphrodisiac benefits. But there is worse: The user of *datura* can recall little, and sometimes nothing, of his

experience. And what good is an erotic escapade, however "ragingly lustful," that cannot be recollected in tranquility?

The combination of bewilderment and sex stimulation resulting from the use of datura and allied drugs can sometimes result in antisocial actions creating subsequent woes for the drug taker. Hesse paraphrases Riebling, who had encountered such a case resulting from an accidental atropine-scopolamine intoxication:

"... a fifty-four-year-old woman . . . inadvertently took too many atropine-scopolamine drops. During her narcotic psychosis, she attempted to have a Lesbian intercourse with her landlady, and unashamedly she invited also the fiancé of the landlady to have sexual intercourse with her. After her recovery from the intoxication, she had no memory of all these happenings."

I can add to what has been said about thorn apple a mild but to me interesting personal experience. Being engaged in research dealing with demonology and the witchcraft epidemic, I determined to experiment with thorn apple, which I found growing wild, less than thirty yards from my house, on our farm. Since, however, in addition to its other perils datura is likely to make one very ill, I took only a quite mild dose—the effect being achieved by smoking a mixture of the leaves and the seeds, both of which are sources of the drug.

Before retiring, I experienced only mild illness and an extremely fleeting sense of unusual clarity of perception, effects which might have been attributable to the drug, but which might also have been only the results of sug-

gestion. Assuming that was an end of it, and censuring myself for my cowardice in not taking more, I went to bed. However, I was victimized by vivid nightmares (including flying dreams!) all night, waking repeatedly; and on the following night I was also awakened a number of times, but that time by dreams of a distinctly erotic character. What role anticipation or suggestion may have played in my experiences it is, of course, impossible for me to say, but I am strongly inclined to believe that my sleepless nights, and the trend my dreams took, were at least partially attributable directly to the drug. This belief is strengthened somewhat by the fact that I had supposed the experience over with—after the brief illness and flash of clarity—and had gone to bed consciously expecting nothing more.

In concluding these remarks on *datura* and the *solanaceae*, it is interesting to note that it is upon atropine that we will have to rely for first aid in the event of a chemical attack, especially in the case of nerve gases. Thus, one of the old "witch drugs" may play a role in horrors even worse than those of the witchcraft epidemic, but this time a healing role, not a malicious or destructive one.

MESCALINE

In almost every way, the sexual phenomena associated with the alkaloid mescaline, a derivative of the peyote cactus plant of our Southwest, are the most interesting and important of any discussed here. Since extremely little has been written about the sexual effects of mescaline, which is more than passingly strange in the light of what will follow in a moment, the data presented here are almost entirely my own, based either upon personal experience or extended interviews with others of both sexes who have experienced the mescaline intoxication. I should like to add, lest the reader be misled, that in the case of mescaline, as with most of the other drugs discussed, the sexual aspect is not necessarily the most absorbing and not even the most significant for many persons when the total experience is considered. I dwell upon the sexual aspect almost exclusively, but only because that is what this work is about, and not because there are lacking a great many other aspects which might with equal profit and interest be considered.⁵

Any suggestion that mescaline is an aphrodisiac in the sense that it either gives rise to urgent erotic desires or produces sexual sensations or engorgement of the genitals should be regarded as erroneous. But if the reference is to the production of sexual effects such as I will de-

scribe, and which occur *when sex desire is already normally present*, then the term aphrodisiac would not be altogether misapplied.

Such is the paucity of information about mescaline's effect on sexual relations that one must turn to Jack Green, editor of the *Beatnick Newspaper*, for a few bits of data and insight suggesting that my own observations are not quite unique. Green's essay appears in an anthology, *The Beats*, and the relevant remarks are brief enough to be quoted in full:

"there was the same increase of pleasure & spontaneity, & decrease of drive, necessity in sex—a subject somehow not written about by my fellow peyote scholars in sexual intercourse i was happier, less awkward, more at ease & more spontaneous the change was even more marked in masturbation stereotyped habits and 'after this, do that' fell away & i was free to do as i pleased

"amount of energy released in orgasm was probably less "

There is no question but that mescaline may under the right conditions contribute to the increased sexual potency of both male and female, probably by reducing anxieties as the quotation from Green would suggest. One surmises that the drug is also a mild anesthetic which affects the genitals and so serves to facilitate the prolongation of the sex act. (One recalls here the observations of the French surgeon on the effects of opium.) However, there is with mescaline a very considerable disturbance of the time sense, five minutes for example often seeming like an hour, so that unless the sex act were

timed by the clock it would be impossible to know whether the increased "staying power" was real (by the clock) or illusory. Not that this would greatly matter, since the extended time experienced while under the influence of the drug is just as real to the individuals concerned as any time measured by the clock or otherwise apprehended.

The anesthetic effect of the drug, if it is that, upon the sexual apparatus may be such that ejaculation and orgasm do not occur. However, for both male and female the experience is likely to be so unusually psychologically satisfying that the absence of the physical climax seems of negligible importance, both at the time and subsequently.

Despite the anesthesia, or perhaps because of it, voluptuous sensations and sensuality generally may be heightened once desire is aroused. Some report that all bodily contact, even the slightest touch, sometimes assumes the proportions of an exquisite erotic caress. The face of even an ugly sex partner may seem quite beautiful. Often, one perceives the face of the other person in such a way that from each new perspective it seems to be a different face—or, as some experience it, a succession of faces. Usually "concealed" aspects of beauty in the face of the sex partner may be perceived and, happily, one may sometimes still appreciate these hitherto unrecognized charms after the effects of the drug have worn off. There is, after all, something of beauty in every face. It is rather a pity that one should have to take a drug to find the "hidden beauty" of one's wife or mistress, but it is surely better that it occur that way than not at all.

The sex organs, and indeed all of the erotogenic or sexually susceptible zones of the body may seem to be unusually and very pleurably engorged, turgid or tumescent, and may also be strangely "rubbery"—a description which, while less than adequate, is as close as I am able to come to it. The feeling of control over one's sexuality, especially the absence of any worry on the part of the male about being able to sustain his erection indefinitely, is uniquely satisfying to a good many persons.

What the effects of such intercourse would be over a long period of time, especially if ejaculation and orgasm regularly failed to occur, remains to be investigated, though more general studies of Indians who have used the drug for many years have shown no harmful effects resulting from the use. In any case, I do not think we may legitimately infer, especially in view of the profound gratification obtained, that the results would necessarily be the same as those from, say, coitus in which the male intentionally stops short of climax—coitus which is likely to leave one feeling frustrated, and which many though not all authorities believe to be physically injurious. It is relevant to add that other aspects of the drug, the long duration of the intoxication, for example, make it unlikely that all or most of the sex acts engaged in by a couple would take place when mescaline was being used.

Apart from its effects upon actual coitus, the drug gives rise to, or makes possible, a wealth of sexual phenomena which derive from mescaline's capacity for bringing about altered states of consciousness.

Probably the most discussed aspect of the mescaline

experience is that of visual hallucinations—"pictures" seen usually with the eyes closed, and which are intensely and richly colorful, seemingly drenched in a kind of "preternatural light." These images may be, though they are not customarily or even very often, sexual in content (orgiastic scenes, nude bodies in whole or in fragmentary detail, and so on).

More important is the frequently noted ability of the individual under the influence of mescaline to focus or localize consciousness in the sexual organs, or in other parts of the body. There may be a division or splitting of consciousnesses, so that there occur acts of coition in which consciousness seems to be present in the respective sexual organs, which seem then to possess a volition and awareness quite distinct from the "other" consciousnesses of the persons copulating, who are able to "sit back and observe," as it were, the conscious genitalia in their act of coition.⁶

There is also an ability seemingly to transfer erotic sensation from the genitalia to other parts of the body. Sexual feeling may, for example, be concentrated in a finger, so that the simple act of rubbing the fingertip against a fabric may yield sensations only slightly less pleasurable than those which would occur were the actual sex organs, rather than the fingers, involved in the friction.

There may be a considerably greater awareness of, and capacity for sensation in, the other erotogenic zones of the body so that kissing may seem to be almost as erotic an experience as coitus. In the female, the vagina may be

felt very clearly to pulsate, expand and contract, throb, or convulse—as it has been variously described.

It is interesting that Charles Savage (in *Lysergic Acid Diethylamide and Mescaline in Experimental Psychiatry*, a symposium or “round table”), reports the case of an LSD subject who hallucinated a woman “having intercourse with an isolated penis.” The hallucination may well, as Savage states, illustrate “the considerable conflict which he (the subject) had about this woman”—a view more comprehensible when one knows that the woman was also hallucinated as a corpse and as giving birth to a child. But it may also be relevant to the feeling, experienced by the subjects who have provided my own information, of the genitals as being at times separate or isolated from the rest of the body. These experiences occur, in actual sex stimulation and intercourse, in both mescaline and LSD intoxication, though I cannot say how general or commonplace they may be in the case of LSD.

Of extreme interest is the phenomenon that the female may possess a much greater awareness of her own male components; and the male of his female ones. There may occur acts of coitus in which it is as if four persons are involved: the male and female components of the woman, and the male and female components of the man. It is not only in neurotics, psychotics, and latent or repressed homosexuals that this awareness of other-sex components is present (though these conditions might of course determine the degree of intensity of the experience).

For example, two homosexuals (and one apparently

normal heterosexual) reported experiencing a sensation of physical metamorphosis—of a vagina opening up, of the breasts swelling and taking on feminine contours, and of other body sensations appropriate to the female. One reported lying on his back and making pelvic movements such as the female makes in coitus, and of experiencing as a result a very clear sensation of the vagina as an aroused emptiness craving sexual fulfillment.

A heterosexual male was able to experience himself as two bodies, one male, one female, in copulation. At the same time, a “third aspect” of his consciousness “stood apart” from the experience, observing it with detachment and maintaining a rational awareness that all this was “not real.”

There are almost as many apocryphal tales of dangers connected with the use of mescaline as with the use of hypnosis, and even fewer instances which could be considered in any way adequately documented or authenticated. So far as the sexual aspects are concerned, and apart from the blatantly ridiculous stories of peyote-inspired seductions and orgies, there is a lore cloaked in pseudo-scientific trappings.

For example, we are told that, by permitting access to deeper levels of consciousness, or to the unconscious, mescaline enables the individual to become aware of elements of his own sexual makeup of which he was previously ignorant, or which had successfully though tenuously been repressed. This, in its turn, it is said, may precipitate psychosis or other mental disturbance by giv-

ing rise to overwhelming guilt feelings or unbearable anxiety.

Such might be the case, it is said, when there emerges into the male consciousness the awareness of female components—accompanied by the conviction that such awareness attests to a latent homosexuality.⁷ Such a thing has never, to my knowledge, occurred, but it does not sound altogether impossible—if one agrees with the assumption, which remains to be proved, that mescaline does in fact open up and permit access to the unconscious; or if it can be shown that anyone might draw such a conclusion and accept it with sufficient conviction as to be traumatic. It is, of course, possible that any unusual psychical event may precipitate a mental disturbance where a sufficient predisposition exists.

Where, however, there is not a psychotic predisposition, or a very feeble grasp upon “sanity,” there would appear to be no such dangers. And the best testimonial to mescaline’s harmlessness would seem to be the vast number of persons who have used it without harm. One may be certain that if the drug were precipitating psychoses, there would be no end of publicity to that effect.

One important “safety factor” for the mescaline user—a safety factor which the alcohol user, for example, does not share—is the important fact that the individual under the influence of mescaline is almost always, and perhaps even more than usually, rational. He understands very well that the phenomena which occur are fully attributable to the drug in the sense that once the intoxication has

ended they will end with it, and he makes a thorough distinction between the mescaline-caused phenomena and "reality." If he is sufficiently knowledgeable psychologically, he may regard some of the phenomena as evidential of what is going on in his unconscious, though quite likely the evidence is being presented in symbolic form and does not at all mean what one might take it to mean if one made the literal and obvious interpretations. More likely, and as probably happens with a majority of persons experiencing the mescaline intoxication, such an occurrence as a male awareness of female components is simply dismissed as drug-produced and unrelated to the person's usual psychical reality.

So far as the emergence into consciousness of repressed traumatic events is concerned, and as some would have it, may occur spontaneously and accidentally in the case of hypnotic regression, I have never heard of this occurring with mescaline, though I have heard it suggested by alarmists that it might. To my knowledge, there is no case on record where it has even been suggested that a mental disorder could be attributed to mescaline on this basis.

As I mentioned in the beginning—and this is, of course, the *raison d'être* for these extended remarks on mescaline's effects—the possibility of using mescaline to improve human sexual relations has never been adequately explored. Yet so striking are the phenomena here encountered, with their implications of possible great benefits to the sexually disturbed, especially to those

crippled by sexual anxieties, that a great deal of exploration seems to be called for.

Unfortunately, the present status of mescaline research seems to be one of decline as a result of disappointments stemming from the fact that neither mescaline nor LSD-25 has provided the insights into schizophrenic processes initially and over-optimistically expected. Parapsychologists, in the realm of "psychedelics," are making some use of both drugs, but as a means of exploring extra-sensory perception, and it is doubtful that their researches will prove very illuminating in the area of human sexuality. So far as research specifically aimed at increasing knowledge of the sexual effects of mescaline, it may be that there is none. This is doubtless because mescaline experiments in the laboratory have provided no impetus for such research.

In a rather typical medical view of the sexual effects of mescaline, Malitz, Esecover, Wilkens, and Hoch write in *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, Vol. 1, No. 1, that "The lack of sexual desire seen in our present (*psilocybin*) subjects has also been observed by us with LSD-25 and mescaline. Stoll reports a similar experience with LSD-25, and Guttman commented on the anaphrodisiac qualities of mescaline in the Indians of the southwestern United States."

While there is some diversity of opinion concerning the sexual effects of mescaline and other hallucinogens, probably most medical observers have reported either that the erotic effects are limited to imagery, that there

is no sex stimulation, or even that the effects are positively anaphrodisiacal. A few—Finch, for example—report that mescaline induces “sexual excitement,” but the majority of the expressed opinion is probably in the other direction. How, in view of what I have just reported, is this possible?

That physicians and psychiatrists using mescaline and related drugs experimentally in hospitals and laboratories, mainly for the purpose of studying schizophrenic-like mental processes, have encountered relatively little in the way of sexual phenomena is not at all surprising or necessarily inconsistent with what I have reported. Mescaline is not an aphrodisiac in the sense of creating sexual desires—its erotic effects are, in the main, on *sexual relations*. Naturally, patients and experimental subjects in hospitals and laboratories, unless they were stimulated sexually and/or permitted to engage in sexual intercourse, would have little to report where sex is concerned. It is true that the mind can, with mescaline, and even when one is alone, intentionally focus upon sex and experience some unusual effects. But the effects on *sexual intercourse* are the really dramatic and important ones; and are, moreover, the effects experienced by the greatest number of persons.

There are other difficulties involved in penetrating into, sharing, and recording the experience of persons under the influence of drugs like mescaline and LSD. The mescaline subject will communicate freely and well with another person who is also under the influence of the drug—within the limitations imposed by the usual

non-drug-related factors. But he is likely to have considerable difficulty communicating with someone who is not experiencing the intoxication. Similarly, one who is not "turned on" has a good deal of difficulty communicating with the person who is. Sometimes one or both individuals may think that they are communicating when they are not. They are, in a sense, inhabiting different worlds where words and things have different meanings, and while this is always true of two persons to some extent, the gap is much wider in this case where one person is experiencing the world of mescaline intoxication and the other the "real" world. Rapport is simply an impossibility.

No experimenter, however well versed in psychology, who has not at least experienced mescaline intoxication in the past can begin to understand much that is said by a person under the influence of the drug, or even by one subsequently describing his drug experience. The best results are obtained when the experimenter experiences the intoxication in the company of his subject at least once, and then observes his subject's intoxication on other occasions when he is not himself under the influence of the drug.

Since the drug is harmless, and has slight or no after-effects, the only demand made upon the experimenter by these requirements is temporal. However, many writers—even psychiatrists—seem simply to have plopped their subjects down in rooms, given them the drug, and then looked in on them from time to time to inquire: "What's happening?" Where this stupid method has been fol-

lowed, the “initiate” reader discerns the fact at once, both by the poverty of the written account, and by the unavoidable distortions.

If anyone has set out to study exhaustively and specifically the sexual effects of mescaline, I do not know about it. If they have, they have probably been reluctant—not without reason—to publish their findings; or they have been unable to find journals prepared to print what they have discovered. The opposition to sex research in the laboratory is enormous, and about the best the scientist can hope to do is to observe the copulations of sub-human primates.

The experiments performed by the Nazis have some pertinence here. Men were dunked into icy water and then revived by nude body contact, and sometimes copulation, with—as it happened—prostitutes. The aim was to find a way to save fliers forced to bail out over cold bodies of water. When these experiments became public knowledge, many persons were more horrified by the method of revival than by the torture inflicted on the prisoner subjects, some of whom froze to death. Without doubt, there are mothers who would prefer that their boys die rather than that they should be revived by nude body contacts and copulation. Laboratory study of the human sex act—on the very few occasions when it has come to light—has aroused storms of protest.

Medical observers could perhaps acquire invaluable information which might be helpful to millions if they could study sexual behavior of persons under the influence of various drugs and sex behavior in other cir-

cumstances. For centuries, men have been witnessing erotic exhibitions, and the businessman's "smoker" is far more obscene than the human sex act could possibly be when observed for scientific purposes. But who dares to conduct laboratory sex research with human subjects? Especially, who would dare to publish the findings of such research?

By means of hypnotically induced hallucinations, cases of impotence and frigidity can be cured. Patients can engage in hallucinatory sexual intercourse, which can then be studied. Patients can be re-educated or trained to proper sexual responses by means of hallucinatory sex experiences induced and controlled by the hypnotist. But what doctor can afford to be accused of "giving his patients wet dreams"?

Some will recall the excellent results that were being obtained by Reichian vegetotherapy. Then the physicians and psychiatrists practicing it were accused, ridiculously, of "masturbating their patients"; and except for the more enthusiastic and courageous, or foolhardy, practitioners, that was an end of that.

There are other examples available, but perhaps the point has been made. As everyone knows, valuable information awaits the scientist with the knowledge and laboratory equipment to study sexual responses and behavior in the mescaline and LSD intoxications and under a variety of other conditions. But the hostility to "sex in the laboratory," "sex in therapy," etc., blocks progress and maintains suffering. And one wonders how much longer it will be before prudery stands aside for humani-

tarianism and the equally admirable unquenchable human thirst for knowledge.

LSD 25

Data on the erotic effects of LSD-25 (Lysergic acid diethylamide) are even more difficult to come by than are data on the erotic aspects of mescaline. This is true mainly for the reason that the drug is difficult to obtain and there are few persons who have had experience with it under conditions where they could also have sexual experiences, and who are available for interviews concerning those experiences. Thus we must rely largely on the published observations of psychiatrists, who cite occasional erotic hallucinations and little else.

Since LSD seems generally to provide experiences similar to those provided by mescaline "only more so," one might expect its erotic aspects to be striking. But if so, and hints and rumors apart, the secret has been well kept.

We should not, of course, depart our discussion of LSD without mentioning the finding of R. H. Ward (*A Drug-Taker's Notes*), that with rare exceptions it is an anaphrodisiac.

Ward, a British author, does confess that erotic imagery may be present in the hallucinations of some persons—he himself saw "sailors with red cheeks and fat bums"

and some "bisexual" erotic images—but in general, he concluded, the LSD experience is not a sexual one.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Some of the drugs which have been discussed here—heroin and morphine, for example—are seldom if ever employed for purposes of sexual arousal or improved sexual performance, though there may be some popular confusion about how people who use these drugs behave, the notion prevailing that "dope fiends" enthusiastically and inexhaustibly give themselves over to every kind of sensuality and licentiousness. The sexual effects of heroin and morphine, and some other drugs not notable as sex stimulants, have been mentioned in order to clear up such misconceptions and for whatever interest the information provided may have for the reader.

The burden of my opinions as expressed here, and as distinguished from the factual information offered, is not that what this country needs is a good five-cent aphrodisiac. I might say again that probably no responsible person favors finding and putting on the open market drugs which will inflame sexual passions, keep the genitalia in a state of perpetual arousal, or otherwise transform the nation into one great and grotesque bawdy house.

However, the centuries-long pursuit of drugs to im-

prove human sexual relations indicates—as one already knows—that problems connected with sex relations have plagued humanity for a long while, as they certainly do today. And I do not see how there could be any legitimate objection to the development and marketing of drugs aimed at helping people generally to enrich their sexual relations when they do have them, and which would assist in relieving the anguish and misery of persons whose sexual problems are so severe that they are either driven into very bizarre perversions or forced to get along without any sex lives at all.

Since most of humanity's present day sexual problems, including impotence and frigidity, are psychological in origin, drugs which merely work upon the genitals, producing engorgement, are often of little value; and it is likely that the drugs capable of solving or helping with these problems will have to be drugs powerfully affecting the mind. That is why mescaline is so interesting and promising and why it should be thoroughly explored in this connection.

It may be added that a drug which could accomplish the result hoped for would have the not negligible side-effect of reducing the use of other drugs of more dangerous and harmful kinds.

NOTES

1. [page 313]

Some quite interesting observations are found in an article by Dr. Charles Winick, "Narcotics Addiction and Its Treatment" (*Law and Contemporary Problems*, Vol. XXII, No. 1):

"The drug often takes the place of sexual activity, although addicts may engage in homosexual or heterosexual activity. The hypodermic needle often provides a kind of sexual play, with the addict inserting the needle into his vein, waiting for the blood to come up, injecting a small amount of heroin as he then forces the blood back by letting up his pressure

Notes

on the hypodermic. He may do this several times, before finally injecting the rest of the contents of the hypodermic into the vein.

"The heroin injection is described by addicts as causing a sexual glow. Just before taking the "shot," the addict often gets a feeling of prepleasure, localized in the bowel area. Rado has called taking drugs a kind of alimentary orgasm, which has strong oral orgastic components. Simmel has pointed out the strong autoerotic and masturbatory components in the addict's preoccupation with his body. Brill has studied the extent to which the language of addicts is eroticized."

2. [page 318]

Hopefully it is not inconsistent with the spirit of charity here to recall Gautier's observation that "a hashish addict would not lift a finger for the most beautiful maiden in Verona."

3. [page 319]

It is apparent from this and other examples that one should state clearly what it is that one understands by "aphrodisiac." From deRopp's quotation, one gathers that Allentuck and Bowman evidently understand by this term only drugs producing physiological erotic effects.

4. [page 326]

Many have since searched for the recipe used by the witches, and which enabled them to have such experiences. Some have been motivated to find out whether the experiences reported by the witches could really be explained on the basis of a combination of drugs alone. Others have simply been seekers after novel pleasures. Researchers into witchcraft, demonology, and occultism have of course been particularly interested.

From time to time, someone claims to have discovered the secret of the witches' salve, or of the witches' potion. Usually they have found it in the mouldering pages of some rare and ancient and forgotten manuscript; or they have proceeded to unravel the mystery on the basis of hints contained in forbidden *grimoires*, or secret books of black magic. Discoverers of the contents of the witches' unguent of course keep the precise details of their formula to themselves. The secret is much too dangerous, in one way or another, to be revealed to the public.

The latest scholarly gentleman to rend asunder the veil and go flying off to the Sabbat, there to see diabolic dances and infernal copulations, is Erich-Will Peuckert, a professor at Goettingen. According to an article in the December, 1960, issue of the popular occult magazine *Fate*, Peuckert is "one of probably only two living persons ever to have attended a real Witches' Sabbath."

Peuckert is reported to be a veteran experimenter with formulae gleaned from ancient books and manuscripts. The formula for the witches' salve, he claims to have discovered in Johannes Baptista Porta's *Magia Naturalis*, a sixteenth century work written in now archaic Latin. Ingredients of the recipe include Thorn Apple, Belladonna, Black Henbane, wild celery, and parsley. Also called for was the fat of an unbaptized infant, but Peuckert was able to substitute lard from a supermarket without rendering his potion inefficacious. The precise formula he is "careful not to reveal"—naturally, since there are very grave dangers involved.

Together with his "control," an attorney friend who "knew nothing whatever about witchcraft . . . or about the effects the salve might produce," Peuckert began his experiment. The salve was applied to foreheads and armpits, as directed.

Notes

Thereupon (within a few minutes) both men fell into deep trances which lasted for about twenty hours.

Horrible faces confronted Peuckert. Soon he was flying, his voyage terrifyingly interrupted from time to time by dizzying swoops and plunges. At length, he made a safe landing on a mountaintop. It was the site of the Sabbat!

There were "wild orgies and grotesque debauchery," with "voluptuous young ladies playing a prominent part. Beings with the appearance of monsters and demons joined in the erotic activities. There were perverted sex practices and they paid homage to the Devil." (I should note that I am quoting the author of the *Fate* article, Jack Dunning, and not Peuckert.)

When the two experimenters emerged from their trances, and before engaging in any conversation about their experiences, Peuckert instructed his "control" to write down what had happened to him while the Doctor did the same. When these accounts were completed and compared, Peuckert was "momentarily speechless." The experience of the attorney, ignorant of witchcraft's history and of what to expect, had been almost identical with Peuckert's own. Moreover, "both reports written by these professional men in the year 1960 tallied in every detail with recorded statements of accused witches who had died at the stake during the witchcraft trials. . . ."

It could be that my account, irreverent and sometimes sarcastic, does Peuckert an injustice. First of all, the article is by Dunning, who may or may not have related the incident as Peuckert described it to him. And then, there is always the possibility of someone's discovering the "witches' salve," and that it might produce visions of the sort described, though almost certainly only if one nourished certain ex-

pectations. That both of the subjects should experience the same dreams or visions, with one of them having no inkling of what was supposed to happen, would indeed be remarkable. So remarkable, in fact, as to be revolutionary. And one doubts that Peuckert, who is described as being a scientist, would suppress a formula producing results with such enormous import for psychology.

Who claims sensational results without giving others a chance to duplicate them must of course expect to be regarded as most likely a charlatan. Moreover, the story is too neat, and fits too well into the groove of the usual occult stereotypes. As everyone knows who has investigated the field, occultism, fabrication, and delusion go together like hands and gloves.

But it was not bad magazine entertainment.

5. [*page 330*]

Readers interested in other aspects of the mescaline experience will probably do best to look up Aldous Huxley's two books on the subject, both of which are intensely interesting and, as it's said, fecundating. Perhaps, indeed, it was because his books were already so fecundating that Huxley, solicitous of the well-being of his readers, ignored the sexual aspects. On the other hand, somewhat less fecundating accounts of the mescaline experience also ignore the sex aspects.

6. [*page 334*]

It may be that the variety of experience will be better conveyed—certainly it will be conveyed with greater immediacy—if I permit a few of my subjects to speak for themselves. The following excerpts are from my interviews with two male and two female subjects. As I have observed elsewhere, any complete account of their experiences would fill this volume. But I have attempted to select portions of their con-

Notes

versations which, though brief, will indicate both some of the major happenings and their reactions to the experience overall.

S——. White Female. Age 28. Married.:

When it was over we agreed that it was the best experience for both of us. There was a lot of mutual admiration stuff. Then we got into a half-humorous argument that still seemed pretty important to both of us.

He took the position that his penis was *in* me, while I took the position that my vagina was *around*, or *surrounded*, him. His penis, I said, was simply out there, waiting, until I enclosed it, took it into myself. He said that it was my vagina that waited, that was only passively *there*, waiting for him to fill it.

We were interested in the idea that a woman *gives* herself. It seemed to me that it is the man who gives—the penis—which the woman *takes*—into herself. Yet everyone speaks of the man *taking* the woman.

It all came down, I suppose, to an argument about who is most *active* and who is most *passive*, and I had always before just accepted the idea that the woman is passive and the man active. But now it seemed to me as if I had received a meaningful insight about this, and that I had learned that it is actually, in a way, just the other way around. That is, it's the man who *offers* himself—his penis—and it's the woman who *accepts*, or *takes*, draws unto herself and into herself this extended offering that the man makes to her.

I'd like to go on about this. It's very complicated, you know, and there are so many ways of looking at it. But what seemed to more or less solve the problem for us was when we remembered that the word *coitus* means *coming together*. This seemed to describe best what we had done—we had come together, and joined together, and the more we thought

about this, the more it seemed to us that we had hit upon something rather profound.

We had discovered that there is in this coitus a giving and a taking on both sides, an activeness and a passiveness on both sides, and that sex is a mutual undertaking where any assumption of any kind of supremacy on one side or the other, or any dominance or balance of initiative on one side or the other, is a one-sided interpretation not justified by the facts. At least not in sex relationships where both lovers respond and come together as they should. We thought about Plato's myth, and about the idea that there is something masculine and something feminine in everybody—that biological and psychological sex are decided by whether the person is *more* male, or more female, and not by one person's being *all* male, or *all* female. We wondered if coitus as we now understood it wasn't evidential of a near balance of male-female in everyone—a balance that isn't so unbalanced on one side or the other as people seem to think.

This isn't quite so clear to me now as it was at the time. Or it's clear, but I can't explain it the way I understand it.

Anyway, this coming together left us both very happy, and very satisfied sexually, too—which isn't always the way we feel about our sex relations. But we felt that what we had done was to accomplish a sex act that was technically perfect, beautiful, and—maybe even beyond that—illuminating because it had cast light on the real nature and meaning of love as you express it in coitus.

Do you know what I mean?

R——. White Male. Age 30. Married.:

D. H. Lawrence, I think it was, said that nobody ever thinks of themselves as copulating. That's true. People *fuck*. It's one of those words, don't you know, that sounds like the thing itself. Maybe there are a few people who copulate, but

Notes

I doubt it's much good. Screwing's a little better, but fuck is the word for it. I thought about that while I was—well, I can't very well call it anything else now, can I?—fucking my wife.

Some people think of it as an ugly word. You're taught to think of it that way, and maybe it does people a lot of harm. Because that's what they've got to think of themselves as doing. And then *what* they're doing is likely to seem kind of ugly too.

I haven't gotten over this completely. I didn't want to use the word to you, and I had to force myself to do it. I especially didn't want to use it because I was talking about my wife. See what I mean?

It's a *magic* word, so much more powerful, and in an evil way, than it ought to be. The mescaline somehow lifted the curse, for me, and I could think of myself and my wife as fucking, and there wasn't anything at all wrong with that. It was just the very best word for what we were doing, and we talked about it, and she agreed about that.

You see how I am—like a kid with a new toy. I want to keep saying the word over and over again, because I feel like now I'm free of it. It isn't ugly and bad for me any more. And I think that maybe this is true of the whole thing. The act itself. It must have been a little bit bad and ugly for me before, too. Now it isn't any more. I just hope this lasts.

And I keep thinking what if everybody could shake off the spell—how that would change the world. What a wonderful thing it would be if people could just think about fucking like they think about everything else—without all the emotions that don't really belong to sex coming in to spoil things. I bet you'd find a lot of men and women who don't really get any bang out of sex would be able to if they could just shake off the badness of that word, and the bad feeling it gives them about sex.

Naturally, feeling so free, it was damned good. You know how the old writers used to talk about being *fat*—meaning they had a hard-on. Well, I had this fat feeling, more than I ever had it before, and my wife had a fat feeling too, though I'm not sure I understand that. But I was just exceptionally fat, and it lasted a long, long time. And the longer it lasted, the more sure I was that it was going to last as long as I wanted it to, and so I could stop worrying about maybe being too fast for my wife.

It makes one hell of a difference, not having to think about holding back. You can concentrate on your technique, on giving yourself and your wife more pleasure. You think, like this is maybe how guys like Porfirio Rubirosa—these great lovers—like that's how they are naturally.

I'll tell you, a guy who could do it all the time like I did, well things would have to be pretty bad with his marriage otherwise if it didn't work out.

The way my wife looked at me afterwards—you'd have thought *I* was Porfirio Rubirosa.

C——. White Male. Age 33. Married.:

The intercourse lasted a long time. I don't know just how long. You know how it is. You light a cigarette and *hours* later you notice you're still smoking the same cigarette. But I think it really did last an extra long time.

Usually I wouldn't want to stop in the middle of it. You might get out of the notion, or you might not get started again, or something. Usually you wouldn't want to stop anyhow. But we'd stop, and I'd leave it in, and we'd lie there. We'd close our eyes and tell each other what we were seeing. After a while, we'd start up again. I'd stay hard the whole time, and my wife would stay excited, too.

While we were doing it, I'd close my eyes and see sexy pictures some of the time, when I was making love, though they

Notes

weren't when I wasn't. Once I saw naked South Sea, Balinese, maybe, dancing girls, and once I saw this beautiful girl and she smiled and opened her legs so that I could look up between them.

But once—this is funny—I was grinding away with my wife, and I closed my eyes and I saw a long line of refrigerators—the old kind, you know, with the coils sitting on top. It was so funny, under the circumstances, and I got a little bit hysterical. And when I was laughing my prick would kind of laugh, bob up and down like, and my wife started laughing, too, at me, and I could feel like it was her vagina laughing.

We must have tried about fifteen different positions. You can't usually switch around that way, you know, without spoiling things. But with the mescaline you could do it. Finally I came, but I didn't think for a while I was going to. My wife did, several times, and that's fairly unusual for her. But then it lasted such a long time, or seemed to.

I'll say this. In a way it was the best we ever had. I don't know how it would be for a steady diet. Maybe you'd get tired of it. I don't know. And anyway the kick lasts for so long. We were up all night. You'd have to do it just on week ends. But we feel, though, like there's so much more to it than we've found out so far.

I said to my wife—while we were still at it—"Honey, we've got to get to the bottom of this." Double meaning. Crude. Not really very funny when you tell it. But it seemed like the funniest damned thing in the world at the time, and yet there was more to it than that. Nuances of meaning, that you have to get at the time. In a way, it was a whole philosophy.

My wife got that. We had togetherness. Rapport. Understanding. It's not often you understand each other that way, so completely, or that you can be philosophical while you're making love. Or be funny. You know, they say there's noth-

ing so fatal to passion as humor. But it isn't that way with mescaline. And the experience is more enjoyable because of that. There's more to it when it's like that. Tender, loving, funny, philosophical—many faceted, you might say. We didn't know that sex could be so good and so much fun at the same time. Nobody ever writes about *that!*

L——. White Female, Age 25. Unmarried.*:

"I'm not sure that I'd have thought about sex at all, or wanted sex so much, but you told me I should watch how I was feeling sexually. And whether I wanted sex, and how my vagina and clitoris felt, and all that jazz. Well, I naturally thought about sex a lot while I was looking for those things, and it was crazy.

What I noticed first, I think, well I put my fingers down there to see how it felt, and my clitoris seemed to be bigger than usual, swollen, and kind of tough, but good feeling, and so were my lips (labia). And I started to have these contractions, like you're supposed to have when a boy sucks your nipples, but I never do. Then I tried sucking my own nipples like I've heard of girls doing, but it was just about the same. Of course, it felt pretty goddam good.

Then I closed my eyes again, rubbing myself just a little,

* The above is the only case included here where the individual was instructed to report on erotic sensations, phantasies, etc. That is, where any suggestion that there would be sexual experiences was given. In the cases of those who report sexual intercourse, it was only suggested that husband and wife—or lovers—take the drug together. It was hoped that they would have sexual relations, and that they would then describe those relations with special reference to the drug and its effects; but the only suggestion given in this connection was that the couples take the drug together—"because it is not so frightening, and more interesting usually, if the first time you take mescaline you are not all by yourself. And you will find that the experience will be more rewarding, and that you will remember it better, if you have someone to compare notes with.")

and kind of squeezing in and out, and I was seeing some more of these pictures of temples and statues and armies marching across the desert—better than any paintings—and once I saw a big, big supermarket full of crap, like supermarkets are. It made me ashamed, something as crappy as that! Like my mind was sordid, sort of. Like it was my own fault—and I guess it was. But I did see some good things too.

There was this beautiful white-haired girl, and a kid with a super build, but kind of an idiot, and they were both lying together naked on black silk sheets. Then it started breaking up, like a jigsaw puzzle, or like an old cracked painting. And then it was a kind of tile mosaic. Really something!

I keep on thinking about sex and I see this big one (penis) and it's all red and shiny at the top, and I start thinking "red on the head like a woodpecker," and I remember that they do call them peckers, and I wonder if that's where they got it. It's funny as all hell and I start laughing, but inside of me, 'cause I don't know if I laugh out loud how loud it might come out, and like the squares next door might think I've flipped and get me busted.

I'm feeling so christamighty sexy, and I get this candle, and then I get a bigger one. Then I get me an olive jar. It all feels damn good, but I keep wanting something bigger, and I think about trying a milk bottle and I remember about some kid who shoved a milk bottle up her and she worked up a suction and it wouldn't come out. And she pulled until finally all her guts were sucked down into the bottle. Could that happen?

I figure I'm going to hurt myself if I don't watch out, but then I get so hot and bothered I just do myself (masturbate) like crazy, and I wish some big stud of a nigger, or a wrestler, or somebody'd just bust in and rape me. I think of calling some guy I know—but then, really, like if he was turned on too it'd be all right, but I don't want it with him while I'm

turned on and he's not. And anyway, by the time he got there I might not want him. So I just keep on with my fingers and it's goddam good. Sexy? Christ yes!

Then I'm sad. Melancholy. The bad, bad blues. Like you feel sometimes, right after you been layed. Only more so. I think: The blues is so bad because the sex was so good. It makes sense. That's the way I am. I got to pay for everything. Always have. Nothin' free, like it is for some.

I don't think I'd want to mess with that stuff again. It was sexy as hell, but afterwards it was like I was looking over the edge of a hole, down into myself. It was dark, but I felt like any minute I might be able to see to the bottom of the hole, and then I'd know who I was. But I don't want to know. Maybe nobody does. I felt like maybe there was something down there I shouldn't ever see. I'm better off like I am. Everything on the outside. Pretty, sexy, a good kid to have along on a party. They think of me that way and mostly I think of me that way too. It's not a bad way to be. I have lots of kicks. Life isn't bad for me like it is. Why should I go around poking into dark holes and maybe screwing everything up?

7. [*page 337*]

Most of my data come from eleven heterosexual subjects (five males and six females), from three homosexual subjects (two males and one female), and from my personal experience with mescaline. The group is of course too small to permit any generalizations, and I submit my information only with a view to stimulating some research by other investigators with larger groups, and because I think it will be not without interest for most readers. Also, some of the material is, I think, instructive in other ways than strictly with regard to mescaline.

My group suffers, if that is the way to put it, not only from

Notes

lack of numerical strength, but from atypicality. Of considerable importance, almost all members of the group have at least some familiarity with psychological, especially psychoanalytic, literature (Freud, Reich, Reik, Jung, Rank, Stekel, Fromm, Horney, etc.). All are between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-four years, all have had at least some higher education, all are of above average intelligence, all are above average in imagination, most are the kind of people one thinks of as "creative," and more or less "bohemian." None is psychotic or unusually neurotic. (The homosexuals might be classified by some as seriously neurotic just because they are homosexuals, but I do not subscribe to that opinion.) All of the subjects studied were functioning well in society, socially and economically, which is perhaps as good a criterion of "normality" as any. All are functioning sexually at least as well, and probably better, than do most.

The fact that the members of the group are better than ordinarily equipped imaginatively, combined with their psychological knowledge, was certainly a factor in determining the content of their experiences (as I have determined in interviews). Nonetheless, there were many similarities in what they reported—I have in fact mentioned in this paper only experiences common to at least several subjects—and it is not unreasonable to suppose that certain aspects of the mescaline experiences (the sexual ones) would be shared by a great many or most persons.

Of those who engaged in sexual relations while under the influence of the drug (most of them), it was generally reported that the experiences were unusually gratifying both psychologically and physically. Feelings of unusual engorgement of the genitals were reported by almost all, as were the act's prolongation and the feelings of being more than usually "in

control" of the situation. The males felt that they were more than usually potent, and more than usually self-assured and dominant. This male dominance was reported—curiously?—even by those who became strongly aware of their female components. The females sensed the more authoritative manner of the males and responded to this in most cases by feeling unusually feminine. These are the results I would expect to find among many or most other persons having sexual relations while under the influence of the drug.

On an individual basis there were some very "far out" experiences, which probably attest more to the imaginative powers of the individual subjects than to what may be expected from the drug. However, what became plain was that the imagination can to a large extent determine the course that the mescaline intoxication will take. To a degree, one can think of a sensation and, in many cases, experience it. One can think of an emotion and, in many cases, experience that. Consciousness, as mentioned, can be shifted and localized, and several of the subjects spontaneously hit upon the finding that consciousness could be localized in the genitals.

The wealth of phenomena reported by these subjects would be sufficient to fill this volume. Presumably, less imaginative and knowledgeable persons would have experiences less varied and less complex while more imaginative and more knowledgeable persons would have an even greater wealth of experience. On the other hand, the "divine cactus"—or mescaline, its "heart and soul"—is sufficiently democratic so that even the illiterate dullard is likely to benefit sexually to some extent.

A D U L T - C H I L D S E X R E L A T I O N S H I P S

History and the crime of Humbert Humbert

*"Ah, leave me alone in my pubescent
park, in my mossy garden."*

H U M B E R T H U M B E R T
(in Nabokov's *Lolita*)

It is not true that in the late 1950's, by means of his novel, *Lolita*, a depraved and diabolic European, Vladimir Nabokov, sought to infect us with the virus of a vice he had viciously invented. The hypothetical visitor from Venus, or at least from Betelgeuse, the impressions of imaginary spacemen being nowadays solicited, might however have thought so. Denunciations (more than countered by acclaim) of a novel relating an adult male's passion for a twelve-year-old girl, marriageable in two states, made the commonplace seem unprecedented.

It was this outcry, not any legitimate concern for the

protection of children, which merits ridicule. Hypocrisy, outrage at the rape of a pretended innocence and ignorance, rage that yet another bastion of literary prudery had fallen—these were the symptoms I now treat with therapeutic derision.

But so much for that. As we all know well enough, the sexual relationships of adults with children,¹ in and out of wedlock, are nothing new or particularly rare,² though we might wish that they were, especially in the cases where the “children” are really children, and not such just by legal definition.

As a widespread practice, adult-child sex relationships have always tended to display a rather singular temporal flux, their vogue coming and going, waxing and waning, with the sexual *Zeitgeist*. Presently, though there is much “understanding” that children will engage in sex play, and even some sentiment favoring the free expression of adolescent sexuality, we tend to take a very stern and emotionally aggressive stand against the adult who seduces the child, or even the adolescent, into sexual activity of any kind. (And the adult is always, of course, the seducer, never the seduced, in such relationships, at least so far as official opinion is concerned.) Meanwhile, like every other nation on earth, we have in our midst a considerable number of adults who have sexual relations with children well under the age of consent, a good many more who would like to, and at least a substantial minority of incestuously inclined fathers and uncles, if the testimony of a great many juvenile delinquents and prostitutes is to be taken as factual.

Generally speaking, we today attribute two possibly distinct motivations to the adult who has sexual relations with a child: He is depraved, or he is perverted. (Or he is both. *He*, since women are almost never held accountable for this offense, though they may be guilty of it.) Where the perversion is concerned, or we think it is, we now use the word *pedophilia*—which formerly meant the love, sexual and/or ideal, of boys, but which has more recently come to be used to include children of both sexes. (P. L. Harriman, for example, in his *New Dictionary of Psychology*, accepts the term as it was employed by Krafft-Ebing in 1879, defining pedophilia as “a sex perversion in which young children arouse erotic impulses in an adult.”)

For the purposes of the discussion to follow, I will retain the earlier homosexual flavor of the term *pedophilia*, defining it, however, as a sex perversion in which *male* children arouse erotic impulses in *male* adults. The perversion in which *female* children arouse erotic impulses in *male* adults, I shall call *nymphophilia*. (Why this distinction is not customarily made is difficult to understand, since comparatively seldom is there encountered a “desire for children” indifferent to the sex of the child.)

It is of course true that in the same way everyone who engages in homosexual relations is not a true homosexual, so everyone who desires a prepubescent or barely adolescent girl is not necessarily a nymphophile; and the same is true in the case of pedophilia. The degree of pervertedness of nymphophilia, from society's point of view

—and it is an important point clinically as well—depends in large measure upon the physical and psychological maturity of the child; and to some extent this is equally true of pedophilia where homosexuals are concerned. (Relations between adult females and boys may be sometimes deplored, but are not often considered to be perverted. Relations between adult females and young girls, though described fairly often in lesbian literature and in psychoanalytic case studies, seem never to come to the attention of the public or of the courts at all, and, perhaps for that reason, receive relatively scant attention from any quarter.) But returning to nymphophilia, sexual activity involving an adult male and a girl of, say, eleven or twelve, is by no means, if at all, so indicative of perversion as the same activity involving a girl of six or seven would be. No doubt the most well adjusted of males has sometimes been attracted by twelve-year-old girls. His normality here consists less in his not being so attracted than in his capacity to understand why it is that his desires will have to be restrained.

In the foreword to *Lolita*, written by the fictitious John Ray, Jr., it is “conservatively” estimated that “at least 12 per cent of American adult males” are guilty each year of the offense committed by *Lolita*’s protagonist, Humbert Humbert. This offense is, of course, sexual relations with a young girl, presumably between the ages of nine and fourteen—the age limits within which, according to Humbert Humbert, the “nymphet” is to be found.

Lolita, the novel’s heroine, is twelve years of age when

Humbert first encounters her, and she is not the first nymphet who has aroused (and fulfilled) his desires. While Humbert recognizes the immorality and criminality of his activity, which the sympathetic reader may, in this case, be inclined to think not too awfully immoral, he still is not above trying to justify it by precedents. Thus he observes that:

“Rahab was a harlot at ten . . . Marriage and cohabitation before the age of puberty are still not uncommon in certain East Indian provinces. Lepcha old men of eighty copulate with girls of eight, and nobody minds. After all, Dante fell madly in love with his Beatrice when she was nine. . . . And when Petrarch fell madly in love with his Laureen, she was a fair-haired nymphet of twelve . . .”³

Other data brought forward by Humbert Humbert might also be regarded by some as extenuating:

“The bud stage of breast development appears early (10.7 years) in the sequence of somatic changes accompanying pubescence. And the next maturational item available is the first appearance of pigmented pubic hair (11.2 years) . . .” Lolita is thus upon the threshold, at least, of womanhood, a conclusion further fortified by the fact that she becomes pregnant not long after eluding the clutches of Humbert. There is an abundance of evidence elsewhere in the novel too that Nabokov is not quite so at ease with his subject matter as the lucid and often brilliant manner of the book might seem to suggest.

Perhaps this is the American influence, or at least the stark realities of the American situation. It is safe to as-

sume that the scholarly Nabokov is acquainted with at least a good bit of the vast lore of historic pedophilia and nymphophilia; and one doubts that his attitudes in these matters are less than sophisticated. However, this is still, in the U.S., the sort of thing one can get punched in the nose, and otherwise chastised, for talking about too flippantly. (For example, William Burroughs' "joke" in *The Naked Lunch*, where the answer to the riddle "What did one child molester say to the other child molester?" is "May all your troubles be little ones." I am personally acquainted with a fellow of not atypical reactions who, after reading that passage, expressed the hope that he might run into Burroughs one day and "break the bastard in half.")

What would have been the fate of *Lolita*, a friend of mine wondered aloud, had its heroine been seven or eight years of age, rather than barely prepubescent (and no virgin at that)? The question is easy enough to answer: The novel, if published at all, would still be in its *French* (Olympia Press) *English language* edition. Of course, the novel would not necessarily have been any the less remarkable for the lesser age of its child sex-object. But it would have been unpalatable and unacceptable to many who now accept and enjoy it. Nabokov understood this, of course, and while he felt able to place the nymphet's minimal age at nine, he placed his heroine beyond the mid-point of the nymphet's age boundaries—at twelve.

Before passing from *Lolita*—to which, and to whom, we shall return a little later on—it might be well to take a look at "John Ray, Jr.'s" opinion that by conservative

estimate 12 per cent of adult American males engage annually in sex activities with girls of fourteen or younger. The figure seems plump, though most students will agree that the percentage of adult males who would engage in such dalliance were they able to do so with impunity is probably much in excess of 12 per cent. This is especially true at the present time, when many girls of twelve, thirteen, and fourteen give the appearance of sexual maturity—and behave accordingly. Of course, in the case of girls who appear mature sexually, it is not to the nymphophile that they appeal, but to males generally; and indeed the nymphophile would not, unless stimulated by the factor of age alone, be attracted to such prematurely womanish girls at all.

The figure mentioned by "John Ray, Jr." is perhaps not intended to be taken seriously. However that may be, it is too high, especially in view of the socially imposed difficulties attending the relations of young girls with adult males. Of course, many adolescent girls, and some younger, have sexual relations with their contemporaries. But that is a matter with which we are at most only indirectly concerned here.

Genuine nymphophilia, with the child the only or major source of erotic stimulation and desire, may be considered a relatively rare perversion. In fact, all kinds of sexual activities involving adults and children are, for a multiplicity of reasons, encountered rather infrequently. We will see that this has not always been the case, and that social attitudes toward pedophilia and nymphophilia—and toward adult-child sex relationships

generally—have sometimes been quite different from our own. Examination of these practices and attitudes will perhaps contribute to a more rational view of these phenomena as they exist in our own time.

AGE OF CONSENT

The utmost confusion surrounds the question of appropriate age of consent to sexual intercourse—an age which varies, so far as legal restraints are concerned, from time to time and place to place; and, most significantly for the average citizen, from state to state. The man who is denounced in one courtroom for corrupting the morals of an innocent child, and more precisely for rape, might be guilty of nothing more heinous than common fornication if he lived a few miles away, over the state line.

“With us, when the sheep is fat, it is killed for salting, and when the gutter of a girl’s house begins to flow, she is ripe for marriage,” says the Kabyle girl. The view that the onset of menstruation is nature’s own verdict on age of consent has been widely held; though our own courts, which are customarily so concerned with what is natural and what is unnatural where other sex “offenses” are in question, do not choose to follow nature’s signpost in this particular matter.

And it is certainly true that the sign of sexual maturity nature has here provided for us—menstruation—is by

no means *always* a reliable guide to readiness for participation in sexual relationships. Rather, it only indicates a capacity for becoming pregnant—if that.⁴ It is very clear that even premenstrually some girls are well prepared for sexual intercourse, and equally clear that postmenstrually some other girls are not.

Literature, history, and the opinions and findings of sexological experts demonstrate to us beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt that girls may be ready for the sexual relationship, both physically and psychologically, at the ages of twelve, thirteen, and even younger. The same evidence indicates, with equal clarity, that some girls are not ready for the sexual relationship even at sixteen and beyond.

It is thus very difficult to arrive at any age of consent that is at all realistic in terms of individuals. Perhaps, from the legal standpoint, it is impossible to do so (incapacity for dealing with individuals as such and with the exceptions to the rule, being a notable, unfortunate, and perhaps inevitable defect of laws). Certainly, we in the U.S. have not been able to deal with this matter in any reasonable or realistic way, and the best evidence for this is the wholesale rebellion of the young against absurd statutes placing the age of consent in many instances well beyond the time when probably 95 per cent of all girls are ready and eager to enter into sexual relationships.

The greatest impetus to restraints upon *adolescent* sexuality—which a great many authorities agree nowadays ought not, from a medical and psychological point of view, to be restrained—is the problem of illegitimate

children, which goes hand in hand with the fact that adolescents are most always economically (and intellectually and emotionally) unequipped for marriage. This (illegitimacy) objection to free exercise of adolescent sexuality could, of course, be eliminated by placing on the open market ⁵ available pills and other preventives of conception. But the resistance to so practical a solution "surpasseth understanding and transcendeth belief."

Guyon (*Sex Life and Sex Ethics*), who along with others has amply proved the existence of sexual desires in even quite young children, cites some of the legislation which historically has regulated age of consent and age of marriage:

"The French penal code of 1808 reserved punishment for cases of sexual violence; the law of April 28, 1832, fixed the age of consent at eleven years, and it was only in 1863 that this limit was raised to thirteen. England, true to ancient Christian usage, until 1929 retained the marriage age at twelve for girls and fourteen for boys. To mention only the case of girls, the age for marriage is fixed at twelve years in the Argentine, Mexico, Spain, Kentucky, Louisiana, Virginia, Kansas, Missouri; and at thirteen in New Hampshire. (Some revisions—upward—have occurred since Guyon's book was written.) Sometimes no age is fixed beyond that of puberty (Chile), and the question of fact only is considered. The law of the Koran, very well informed, like all Oriental documents, on the sexual psychology of children, authorized the marriage of girls at nine and of boys at twelve. In India, as is well known, infantile marriage has been customary

for many centuries . . . This Hindu custom seems to be very popular and never shocked anyone until a few years ago."

Morris Ploscowe, a well-known legal authority, writing in the Duke University Law School's journal of *Law and Contemporary Problems*, observes that presently in the U.S. ". . . the age over which a female is regarded capable of consenting to coitus varies widely. The common-law age of consent of ten years has been discarded by modern statutes. An age limit of sixteen or eighteen years is now most common, although some states place it as low as twelve years, and another, going to the other extreme, places it at twenty-one years."

Ploscowe recommends that the law should "take a more realistic view and fix the age of consent at fourteen years . . ." and that "the lack of chastity of the young woman (should) be deemed a defense to a charge of statutory rape." (Both of these recommendations, if put into effect, would represent quite a departure from the long-prevailing trend in U.S. sex legislation. That is to say, they would move us in the direction of realism and sobriety.)

Equating age of consent with the onset of puberty still seems, to many, the most rational and "natural" procedure. When sex desire awakens, and capacity is present both for gratification and conception, then obviously there is a readiness on the part of the individual for sexual intercourse—such is a traditional point of view. It is interesting to note in this connection that in the U.S., while permissible marriage ages have been increased as a result

of moralistic zeal, sometimes well-meaning stupidity, and perhaps as a consequence of pressures applied by older women interested in minimizing competition for husbands, the age of first menstruation has been going down (as a result of better diet and other health factors tending to hasten sexual maturity). The result of this warfare of science with theology and other forces is that the legal period of compulsory abstinence from sex relations after reproductive capacity is biologically established, and desire is present, becomes ever greater, though not in fact, since illicit intercourse among adolescents is currently a taken-for-granted aspect of the social life of large segments of the young.

It is also interesting to note, before turning from the matter of age of consent, that some very extreme opinions have been expressed as regards the age when girls are ready for sexual intercourse. Thus, during the witchcraft epidemic, when children ranging from the smallest up were accused of erotic intercourse with the Devil and punished, sometimes burned, for their infamies, the famous demonologist, philosopher, and legal authority, Jean Bodin, held that the Devil often had carnal knowledge of children of six years, "which is the age of consent for young girls." That in fact girls of this age were taken by their parents to the Sabbats, there to participate in sexual orgies, has probably been adequately established. It does not, of course, follow that because children are raped, seduced, or prostituted at age six, that age should be taken as the appropriate age of consent.

The ancient Babylonians are said to have taken only a

slightly less "liberal" view of this matter than Bodin, regarding seven years as the age when girls could properly be relieved of their virginity. And it was when they reached this age that Babylonian maidens were taken, by their mothers, to the temples of Venus, where they were deflowered and temporarily prostituted.

While it is certain that no girl is prepared in any way for sexual relations at the ages of six or seven years, it should also be recognized that for the Babylonian child the experience was probably not a psychologically traumatic one. Much depends in these matters on social attitudes and mass psychology; conduct that is not condemned is invariably less harmful to the individuals involved than the same conduct would be if they were made to feel damaged and guilty about it.

BEHAVIOR OF PRIMITIVES

Among most primitive peoples—who, one supposes (falsely, some anthropologists say), tend to behave rather "naturally"—sexual activity begins at a much earlier age than is officially the case in this country presently. This is edifying for the reason that it gives us at least some insight into the course sexual behavior takes when it is relatively free of the artificialities enjoined in civilized countries by the doctrines of theology and the political concerns of the state. And it is instructive, too, in that we

are provided with evidence that early sex relations need do no harm when approved by society. In the case of primitives, we need consider only a few representative instances of their sexual behavior in order to get an idea of the general attitudes towards sexuality prevailing in primitive societies. That is, a lengthy catalogue is unnecessary to make the desired points, and the reader may be spared it.

In Tahiti, previous to the invasions and subsequent sowing of guilt complexes and other degeneracies by Christian missionaries, girls of eleven years engaged happily and healthily in sex relations. Sometimes they did so publicly, receiving instructions in matters of technique from older women coaching on the sidelines.

In Matomba province, children, when they reached the age of twelve, were locked up together with others of their age in a hut, where both sexes were erotically indoctrinated by the priests. Under no circumstances were the children afterwards permitted to tell what use the priests had made of them—a seemingly superfluous prohibition, since all of the adults had taken their degrees at the same university. However, the regulation undoubtedly contributed to the performance of all manner of sexual variations and deviations by the priests with the children—behavior which it may be assumed the children then practiced among themselves and carried over into their adult sex relationships, where it would be regarded as altogether normal.

On Ponape, children are given detailed sex instruction at the age of four or five years, but the Kwoma of New

Guinea, who take a more intolerant view of youthful sexuality, repeatedly caution their young boys against fingering their genitals. Professor Clellan Ford, an anthropologist, instructs us that when a Kwoma woman happens upon a young boy with an erection, she will strike his turgid member with a stick—a mortification of the flesh which is probably one of the more effective methods of detumescing the organ of copulation whether in man or beast.

The cases mentioned above are typical of the attitudes and behavior of the primitive peoples where the sexual indoctrination and practices of the young are concerned. Sometimes, however, primitives sexually exploit children, carrying this to cruel and perverted lengths.

The North American Indians, for example, who are for some reason supposed by the ignorant to have been paragons of manliness and repositories of all stoic virtues, were notorious sexual exploiters of children, using very young children, boys or girls indifferently, for their pleasures. Pederasty and fellatio, especially, were practiced with the young, and without consideration for any pain it might cause the child to be brutally embuggered. It was characteristic of the Indians that no vice they did not already possess would they fail to acquire once it had been pointed out to them.

The Caribs, much addicted to the sexual exploitation of children, would purchase infants while they were still in their mothers' wombs, and they marked the bellies of the purchased infants at birth that there might be no evasion later on. They would claim their purchases

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

when the child had reached an age of seven or eight years, and when they had made sexual use of him (or her) to a surfeit, they frequently disposed of their little victim by murdering him.

The sexual relations of adults with children may sometimes take the form of open and socially sanctioned incest. Thus, in Guatemala, there used to be celebrated certain holidays on which orgies were staged, with men copulating with their young daughters, and boys with their mothers. (The findings of anthropologists have long since tolled a death knell for the alleged unvacillating universality of the rule of exogamy, or incest prohibition.)

De Sade, who as might be expected applauds incest, asserts that "there are few more delicious pleasures than sexual intercourse with one's own children," noting that such intercourse was once practiced widely in Persia and in "three-quarters of Asia."

CHILD PROSTITUTION

In the more civilized countries, where a premium is often placed on virginity at the time of marriage, the desires of adults to have sexual relations with children have traditionally been gratified by child prostitutes.

Anciently, as in Egypt, the prostitution of children

was carried out as a religious practice, so that, according to Strabo, some of the most beautiful and highest-born Egyptian girls were forced into prostitution, and they continued as prostitutes *until their first menstruation*, when they were free to marry. (That so-called religious prostitution was often nothing more than a pious fraud, intended to cast an aura of sanctity over public and private lecheries, is of course understood.)

In Rome, usually without religious or other pretensions, child prostitution flourished on a grand scale, with even babies in cradles being introduced into the brothels, there to stimulate the voluptuaries and sadists with their wailings as their tiny bodies were violated. The emperor Domitian, who put an end to this outrageous practice, has been highly and rightly praised for so doing.

These cradled babes apart, both young girls and young boys were a standard feature of the Roman brothel where the services required of them included not just coitus, sodomy, and fellatio, but the entire gamut of perversions as the lascivious and debauched Roman imagination, inventive in this respect, could conceive it.

In the East, Chinese entertaining their friends at dinner used to have stationed beneath their tables children of both sexes. It was the function of these children, according to Guyon, "discreetly to masturbate the guests." The use of preadolescents as prostitutes and concubines was also widespread in China, and this remained true up until the advent of the "agrarian reformers," though the practice had become less overt as a result of Western criticism.⁶ Elsewhere in the Far and Middle East, child

prostitution was also practiced, and still is today, though on a smaller scale than formerly.

That children will *voluntarily* engage in prostitution was made quite evident to American servicemen scattered around the globe during and after World War II. In the Philippines, for example, the GI copulated freely and abundantly with prepubescent and barely adolescent girls, some of them prostitutes, many seemingly interested only in their own pleasures. The same was true of Germany just after the war. Outside the Flak Kaserne, a Munich U.S. Army installation staffed by Negro troops, I used to see lines of girls a block or more long, waiting for their lovers and/or patrons to get off duty. The majority appeared to be less than sixteen, while many looked to be eleven, twelve, and even younger. In Marburg, where the sterile shadow of Kant still stalks the university corridors, a clique of "gypsy" girls, ranging in ages from eight to fourteen or fifteen, with many of the older ones pregnant, strolled better lighted passages, profitably prostituting themselves to GIs and occasional renegade metaphysicians. The examples of child prostitution were multiplied all over Germany, and in Italy, France, Austria, and other European countries as well. It would be inaccurate to say, in many cases, that the children were driven into harlotry by hunger or other dire economic need. Some were so motivated it is true, but many others were merely availing themselves of a freedom from erotic restraints not usually vouchsafed female children.

Sara Harris, the noted biographer of Father Divine, in her book *They Sell Sex*, devotes a chapter to present-day

big city child prostitution in the U.S. The “Lolitas” of American whoredom, or “baby pros” as they are known in the profession, sometimes earn, according to Miss Harris, twenty to thirty thousand dollars a year—“tax free”—and tend to range in ages from ten to fifteen years. Also known as “million dollar babies,” they work usually out of stables presided over by paternalistic panders, and enjoy “all the material advantages.” (These are, of course, the aristocrats of child prostitution in this country, the counterparts of the adult call girls. Other children in prostitution function more on the level of the street-walkers and other common laborers and non-technicians in the vice trade.)

Miss Harris further includes in her book, it is relevant to add, some material on male prostitution, including both youthful hustlers and “kept boys.”

There is probably no large city in the world where mothers and other custodians of children do not, as those in control of children have done in all times and places, indoctrinate their offspring and wards in the ways of vice, and hire them out to adults addicted to one or another kind of craving requiring the use of a child sex partner. Nowadays, in the West, this is done most often with girl children, but at other periods boys have been the more in demand. This is a practice that is with us always, and it can no more be entirely eliminated than can the “oldest profession” generally. However, in the case of enforced child prostitution there is a very strong incentive for trying; children, whether they derive pleasure from prostitution or not, are almost always engaging in it as slaves, and

furthermore they do so without adequate insight into their own behavior, and thus they are stripped of their human dignity and freedom and degraded for the profit of others.

DEFLORATION AND DEFILING OF CHILDREN

For some persons at all times, and for a good many persons at certain periods of history, the virgin has been the most desired sex-object, and the deflowering of virgins regarded as the uttermost height of sexual pleasure. This craving often goes hand in hand with child prostitution, and at various periods of history virgins, real and alleged (and manufactured with considerable ingenuity and artistry), have been a stock commodity of the more enterprising brothels. Where a high premium is placed on virginity, and defloration is regarded as a defiling and debauching of the virgin, the motivations of the adults involved become increasingly more sadistic in tone. When such sadism takes other directions than the defloration of virgins, or in addition to defloration of virgins, with child sex-objects, we encounter a variety of other sadistic acts with children, some of them worse by far than the mere rupturing of a hymen.

The eighteenth century, one of the most erotically debauched interludes in the history of the West, found children especially in demand by voluptuaries and sadists

and other perverts, and subjected to all manner of sexual practices and atrocities. J. X. Hood (*Curiosities of Love and Sex*) remarks that:

“The mania for defloration and the lust for virgins was very widespread in England of the eighteenth and even the nineteenth century. Defloration was considered to be the acme of sexual pleasure. . . .

“The mania for defloration of virgins naturally led to child prostitution and many brothels were established for the supply of young girls. According to Ryan, in the year 1810, a brothel in Crispin Street, Spitalfields, was started to prostitute girls of fourteen and under. Another such brothel, run by David Romaine in Mile End, was equally popular. Iwan Bloch says, ‘The most depraved activities were carried on by William Sheen, who had numerous brothels in the worst districts of the town (Wentworth Street, Spitalfields and others). He organized regular pornological clubs, where men and women practiced the most horrible immorality with the children! There were always from thirty to forty children in his brothels.’ A correspondent of the French paper *Figaro*, reported that at midnight nearly 500 girls, 12 to 15 years of age, paraded between Piccadilly Circus and Waterloo Place, a distance not more than 300 yards long.”

Partridge (*History of Orgies*) also takes notice of this eighteenth century (and early nineteenth century) predilection for children as sex-objects, a craving even more extensively indulged in France, it should be added, than in England.

“In this century (the eighteenth),” Partridge writes,

“first appear, in their really violent and most extreme forms, the three manias: ‘defloration mania,’ the mania for girls below the age of puberty, and ‘flagellomania.’

“To deflower a girl can be an assault, an act of hostility. In the pornographic literature of this period, emphasis is placed on the victim’s screams of pain and cries for help: the blood, the humiliation, the fear. Copulation with a girl in whom the sexual instincts are not fully aroused is, as far as she is concerned, a frightening and cruel attack. Thus, the sexual act, instead of being a source of pleasure for the participants, has become equated with the degradation of woman, a means for man to display his superiority and display his contempt.”

Partridge, we should recognize, is both unduly romantic and a victim of erroneous information. The degradation or defiling of the child, first of all, is an aberration quite distinct from any degradation of woman. That is to say, the girl is subjected to pain and degradation *as a child*, a good part of the adult’s pleasure being contingent upon the child’s helplessness on the one hand and its presumed innocence and purity on the other; and it is this purity and innocence which is assaulted and despoiled when the symbolic hymen is rent asunder, and not at all womankind generally. Secondly, copulation with a girl “in whom the sexual instincts are not fully aroused” *can* certainly be “a frightening and cruel attack,” but to assume that it is always and necessarily so, is, of course, to embrace nonsense—as the author of any “history of orgies” ought to have learned in the course of his research.

It is ironic that where the desire to defile, humiliate, or otherwise sadistically abuse children is concerned, it is so often the very notion of the child's purity and innocence that leads to the violation. If the child were regarded as possessing sexual desires, or as being capable of enjoying the sex act, the sadist would have no use for him (or her) *as a child*. That children are not innocent in the sense of being devoid of sexual desires, and that they may derive pleasure from coital and other sex relations, is nowadays well known. Thus, the sadist's pleasure, and its result, the child's enforced prostitution, derives often from an illusion. (In cases where it is primarily the child's helplessness that appeals, the psychology of the saidst is more nearly akin to that found in sadistic rapes generally. Also, where no presumption of innocence is made, there is a greater likelihood of brutality and injury to the child, since sexual relations with a girl or boy who neither suffers apparent physical or psychological damage, nor is regarded as being corrupted by the contact, cannot fulfill the sadist's requirements. Of course, the sadist's requirements may not be fulfilled *just* by the corruption even where the innocence and purity of the child are most strongly believed in. Jadedness or a more extreme form of the perversion may require further and stronger stimuli.)

We see this belief in the child's purity and innocence, accompanied by the craving to tarnish and degrade these qualities, and finally to go beyond that pleasure to extreme cruelties, exemplified most extravagantly in the cases of human monsters such as Gilles de Rais and Tipu

Sahib who combine the ravishing of children with the excremental defiling of them, followed or accompanied by torture, mutilation, murder, and dismemberment, and by necrophilia as well. There are many instances of similar behavior to be found in the pages of De Sade, though such inclinations as the Marquis may have had along these lines he seems to have sublimated or vicariously indulged through the vehicle of his writings. (De Sade, we note, would like to have his cake and eat it too. Thus, he wishes to believe that children, when not corrupted by Christian ethics or other repressive moral systems, are naturally inclined toward vice. On the other hand, he would have the child pure so that it may be corrupted by the libertine.)

For the sadist of the kind extremely exemplified by De Rais, the child serves his purpose incomparably more satisfactorily than could the adult who is already, or so it is believed, partially contaminated, soiled and degraded, and thus able to offer less in the way of possibilities for debasement. All of this implies, of course, an underlying belief in the essential filthiness and capacity to degrade of the sexual relationship; and, at bottom, in many cases, a profound belief in the evil nature of matter—the notion Saint Paul took over from the Persians with results which have poisoned the erotic life of the Western world for centuries.

THE NYMPHOPHILE

Generally speaking, the whole situation wherein an adult sexually exploits a child is one in which the adult is able to feel unusually powerful and dominant, which is an important reason why men who are sexually impotent or inadequate with adult women are sometimes able to function well enough when they seduce, assault, or purchase the erotic services of a child. Both such sexually inadequate individuals, who are able to regain potency only in the psychological climate of intercourse with a child; and the nymphophile, who is attracted to children for reasons to be discussed, prevent our arriving at what might seem to be the obvious conclusion that all sexual offenders against children fall into one or the other of two categories: the voluptuary and libertine, along with the sexual psychopath or amoralist on the one hand, the sadist on the other. That is to say, it would be easy to fall into the error of supposing that where violation of children is concerned, sadism is the main feature of the psychology in the one case, perhaps a special variety of sadism, whose object-choice is a child; and that in the other case, the child is simply a vehicle among vehicles which may be rather indifferently exploited in the interests of a sensuality capable of being gratified in a multiplicity of ways.

But Humbert Humbert, who is a particular variety of nymphophile, falls into neither of these categories, and the novel makes it plain that he is not sexually inadequate with adult women (though he has "some initial trouble" consummating his relationship with Mrs. Haze).

As with others who are mostly or exclusively stimulated by female children (nymphophilia), what appeals to Humbert Humbert in *Lolita* is indissolubly bound up with her childishness. Both her body, which is straining at the bonds of childhood but has not yet become the body of a woman; and her mind, which is in somewhat the same condition, arouse in him powerful psychosexual responses. It is at this period of their lives that children appeal most to the true nymphophile—at what is the last phase of childhood or the barest beginnings of adolescence; unless, perhaps, we hypothesize some transitional and distinctive stage in between. That the female child is, by this time, usually quite capable of containing the male organ is, of course, an important factor (and indeed where the child is obviously, or has been proved to be, too small for this, we should usually assume that sadism is the predominant psychological factor in the motivation).

Humbert Humbert is a "particular variety" of nymphophile, an interesting variety and one which may incorporate in its ranks far more persons than is generally assumed, in that it is only a special kind or type of child who attracts him: The child whose psychosexuality is precociously developed (a less full-blown version, it may be, of the child harlot of Baudelaire). That there are more than a few such children—"nymphets"—in the

world, and that they have brought many a man to grief, is not to be doubted. There is more than a trace of the nymphophile in many or most of us, at least where the psychosexually precocious child is concerned, as both literature and the known phantasies of relatively normal individuals thoroughly attest.

Humbert Humbert is romantically "in love" with Lolita, and it is not uncommon for the nymphophile to be genuinely in love with the child who is the object of his desires. This is especially true where sexual intercourse repeatedly takes place and the intimacy endures over a relatively lengthy period of time. And it is doubtful that the "tragedy" of the child, prematurely involved in that sort of sexual relationship with an adult, is any greater than the misfortune of the adult who lavishes upon a psychosexually precocious child a love which cannot possibly be returned in kind. So far as the child is concerned, there would indeed be no necessary disadvantage or trauma at all were it not for our still sexually hypocritical society, which exacts a tariff of remorse and sense of sinfulness for indulgence in the pleasures which it everywhere suggests.

By comparison to the sadist and the voluptuary, who exploit children ruthlessly and sometimes brutally, the nymphophile—often a tender, abject, fumbling, grotesque type, like Humbert Humbert—seems almost innocuous. Certainly, he arouses our sympathies to an extent the others do not. Nonetheless, he can do great harm to a young girl, inflicting psychological trauma from which the victim may never recover. Of course, a great deal de-

depends upon the extent of the girl's physical, emotional, and intellectual development. But in any case, where the child is really a child, and not a young woman who is a child only in terms of the number of her birthdays, at least a certain amount of damage, in our present culture, seems inevitable.

PHYSICAL INJURY

Some truly horrible and terrifying data have been compiled aimed at showing the physical and psychological suffering to which children are subjected when they enter into sexual relationships with adults. Most of these data, describing mutilations of the flesh and the spirit, have at least some basis in fact. On the other hand, the data, usually compiled expressly for the purpose of deterring and arousing public opinion against adult-child sex intercourse, are misleading, since they are derived from rape cases almost exclusively, while the exceptions are still mostly instances of unusual brutality.

It is not with the intention of encouraging or excusing the offenses of nymphophiles, but only with the intention of sticking as best I can to the facts, that I must insist that such traumatic results are by no means an inevitable concomitant or consequence of adult-child sex relations. There is simply too great a mass of historical and clinical data to the contrary for us to be able to swallow all these

tales of bloodshed and agony resulting from a child's participation in coitus or pederasty with an adult. And we know with absolute certainty that girls well below their teens have, throughout history, married and engaged in sexual relations, and this without any significant amount of damage to their sexual organs or otherwise, when their husbands did not intentionally or with brutal negligence inflict such damage. That the same has been the case with boys, sexually used by adult males, we know with equal certainty, and in the light of perhaps even more extensive historical data.

Returning for the moment to *Lolita*, Nabokov is at some pains to let us know that she does not physically suffer, though there is some difficulty with the initial penetration, and a few after-pains, as might be the case with any sexually inexperienced girl or young woman subsequent to unaccustomed intercourse. Indeed, so concerned is Nabokov with establishing Lolita's physical capacity for coitus that her bodily measurements are specifically set forth:

“. . . hip girth, twenty-nine inches; thigh girth (just below the gluteal sulcus), seventeen; calf girth and neck circumference, eleven; chest circumference, twenty-seven; upper arm girth, eight; waist, twenty-three; stature, fifty-seven inches; weight, seventy-eight pounds; figure, linear;”—and we are further given to understand that she has grown some in the interim since the measurements were taken. In any case, physicians will recognize that it is altogether possible for a girl of this size to engage in the sexual connection without abnormal pain or physical in-

jury resulting, even from defloration, which, in Lolita's case, had been accomplished previous to her coition with Humbert. Of course, allowance must be made for individual disparities in the size of the sexual organs, but this would be the case whatever the other physical measurements, and in the absence of any unusual underdevelopment of the genitals it would be expected from the over-all picture of Lolita's physique drawn from the measurements given that she would be able to experience copulation without injury.

We should always keep in mind that the vaginal sphincter (and the sphincter ani as well) is quite elastic, and that in the case of a young girl, even though some pain may be experienced in the beginning, the sheath is not long in adjusting the more pleasureably to accommodate the intrusions of the phallus.

Indeed, the anonymous author of *Wanderings in Untrodden Fields of Anthropology* maintains in that volume that one of the dangers of regular coitus for a young girl is that the vagina may consequently become *too* large:

"Little girls who begin to have connection with men from the age of 8 to 9 years," writes this pseudonymous French army surgeon, "have the vagina large. It is all distended, withered, and has lost its elasticity. I had the opportunity of observing this in Cairo on a little girl whom I visited in company with Mr. ———. Her vagina was monstrous in width." It should be added that this observation of the author's, from which he irresponsibly generalizes as he does with some of his other observations,

does not find much corroboration in other medical literature.

PEDOPHILIA

While I have been more concerned in this presentation with the sexual relations between adult males and female children, it is relevant to take at least a brief look at pedophilia—a term here used to denote sexual relations of adult males with male children, or boys. While this term is customarily applied to relations with children of both sexes, and used quite sweepingly even when confined to the male sex and without regard for matters of motivation, I would prefer, for any analytic purposes, to make generally the same distinctions made with regard to nymphophilia. However, not even so modest an analysis as that made of nymphophilia is contemplated presently, and the popular usage, limited only to the extent that heterosexual relationships are excluded, might as well be followed.

It is very interesting to note that there is probably a more sizeable historical literature of sexual use of boys by adult males than of the (adult male) sexual use of very young girls. And this is true though the latter has surely been by far the more commonplace.⁷ The question “why?” can only be answered speculatively: Doubtless the writers found pedophilia the more absorbing phenome-

non (and, in some cases, the phenomenon requiring the greater justification). If we ask again "why?" the answer will probably be: Because it was more unusual (and, where justification is a factor, because the writer was personally involved in the practice).

If we inquire as to why pederasty (sodomy, or anal intercourse) has often been more commonly practiced (by non-homosexuals) with boys than with girls, somewhat more satisfying explanations seem to be at hand. We may suppose, for example, that the purity attributed to female virgins had a great deal to do with the use of boys for pederasty. Also, traditionally girls have been regarded as not ready for sexual relations until such time as they begin to menstruate. The erotic literature (poetic homosexual fancy and the Marquis de Sade⁸ to the contrary) indicates no particular difference between the anus of the boy and the anus of the girl so far as the quality of sodomistic pleasure afforded is concerned. Thus, we must look for the answer largely in terms of the virginity and premenstrual inviolability taboos—the female here perhaps being compensated for such discomforts as are usually connected with the rupturing of the hymen and "the curse."

Pederasty originated, according to the speculations of some authorities, as a result of the disparity between the (relatively small) male and the (relatively large and lax) female organs of copulation. The anal sphincter is, moreover, some have argued, better adapted to intercourse than the constrictor cunni. Other arguments, especially

that of geometric design, have also been advanced pro the anus.⁹

Once it had been decided that such a disparity of male and female genitalia existed (in adults), it was of course but a step to the sexual use of girls and boys, the former offering superior friction with her smaller vagina, and children of both sexes offering a more titillating friction where the anus was concerned. Some peoples, making this great discovery of the compatibility of anus and penis, have flitted from coitus to buggery and back again on the basis of practical and not specifically sexual considerations. Thus, the Persians used "women in the winter, boys in the summer, because in the summer women stink."

So far as society and the law are concerned, it is unnecessary to determine whether the adult male having sexual relations with a boy is a homosexual or not. The point is at most of academic interest, and quite often it is simply assumed that anyone having homosexual relations—any kind of sex relations with a member of one's own sex—is by definition a homosexual. This is not, of course, the point of view of science, which distinguishes between heterosexuals who may, on occasion, have relations with one of their own sex; bisexuals, who habitually engage in relations with members of both sexes; and homosexuals, who seldom or never have anything to do erotically with members of the opposite sex. And it is recognized that there are a good many degrees and shadings and overlappings of each of these conditions.

Scientists join with the courts and the general public, however, in opposing sexual relations between adult males and young boys, whatever the sexual habits and predilections of the adult involved. Of course, the scientist may have different *reasons* for opposing such relationships. Thus, the public is most often opposed on moral and irrational emotional grounds; the scientist is opposed, or ought to be, on factual scientific grounds; and the judge usually shares some of the attitudes and beliefs of both camps. Perhaps one of the main sources of opposition is the belief which all tend to share (in the case of the scientists, probably most, though by no means all) that the homosexual seduction of a young male (or female) is likely to result in his continuing with the homosexual practices thus acquired. Bloch many years ago succinctly stated this belief, which is still quite generally held, and which even skeptics would in most cases hesitate to dismiss as totally baseless:

“Direct seduction,” Bloch wrote, “is tremendously important in the etiology of sexual aberrations. Naturally it is the more dangerous the younger the subject is. Children whose sexual sense is not yet aroused or not yet differentiated can most easily be led into deviation and taught to become sexual perverts.”

What those who challenge this view question is the “tremendous importance” of early seduction in the etiology of perversions. Few would deny that seduction is *ever* the precipitating factor, doubting only that perversion usually or even with significant frequency may be regarded as a consequence of seduction. But what-

ever one's beliefs in this matter, and there are only beliefs, based on conflicting evidence, there can be no doubt that it is an unpleasant thing to be a homosexual in contemporary society; that there are no significant *gains* for the boy seduced into homosexual practices; and that for these reasons, as well as for others, boys should be protected from adult males who wish to seduce them into homosexual relationships.

Historically, most notably of course in the case of the ancient Greeks, it has not always been true that pedophilia conferred no benefits on the young participants. Many of the greatest men of the pinnacle of the Greek civilization were homosexual or bisexual, and the boys with whom they had erotic relations were not looked down on by intelligent Greek society. Since the older Greek males believed that it was a part of their obligation in such relationships to instill high ideals in their young sex partners, and to instruct them otherwise as well, it may accurately be said that youths derived considerable advantage from their homosexual intercourse with adult males. This situation was, however, almost unique; and excepting the Roman imitation, half-hearted and sporadic, for the most part only isolated individuals have since sought to revive the Greek practice.

Far more commonly, boys, when they have been the desired sex partners of adult males, have reaped no such harvest of benefits. Rather, they have been placed in the positions of prostitutes and concubines—vehicles for the gratification of lusts, and nothing more.

It is said that in the Middle East the Prophet Mo-

hammed contributed to the spread of pedophilia by his promise that young boys, "forever in their bloom," would wait upon the faithful in Paradise.

This was eagerly and wishfully taken as a sanction for much pederasty and other sexual use and abuse of boys on earth as well, since what is a Good after death is surely not an Evil while one is still alive. It seems certain that the resultant thriving traffic in male children, sold or hired into prostitution by their own fathers, was not at all the sort of behavior the Prophet had intended.

In Persia, boy brothels were popular for a long time, and pederasty in particular was glorified in song, verse, and sermon, by both priests and poets. In the *butchakhana*, houses of prostitution staffed by youths, the male children were taught to contract the anal sphincter so that they could grip and milk the penis, as the girls of India were long taught to do with their vaginas, and as some experts on marital relations are now encouraging American housewives to learn to do in the interest of greater togetherness. Boys who could master this feat were able, of course, to afford their customers more exquisite and varied pleasure, and consequently commanded higher fees than those received by boys not accomplished in providing such rare sensations.

Also in the East, male prostitution flourished, and perhaps flourishes, in China and Japan. In China, boys as young as four years of age were tutored in the fine art of passive pederasty, and in Japan the boy brothels were superintended by Buddhist monks, whose customers were the worshipers at the temples. Edwardes, whose most

admirable volume, *The Jewel in the Lotus*, is my principal source for the practices of Middle and Far Eastern pedophiles, tells us that the boy prostitution of China was an honorable profession, sanctified by Tcheou-Wang, God of Sodomy.

With the Romans, as I have mentioned previously, prostitution of children of both sexes extended, agewise, down into the cradle. The inspiration for much of this depraved and brutal eroticism descended to the Roman people from their emperors, one of the most notorious of whom, in this respect, was the Emperor Tiberius.

Of Tiberius, Suetonius the historian says that he was accustomed to swim in a grotto where boys of tender years, whom he called his "little fishes," were taught to move about between his thighs, darting at his penis with tongue and mouth, and biting (or nibbling) at it gently. With children not yet weaned, he would put his phallus to their lips, as if it were a teat, encouraging them to suckle it. He also delighted in witnessing sexual orgies with children as the participants.¹⁰

Rosenbaum (*Plague of Lust*) recorded that children, as a result of their sexual exploitation by Roman adults, often acquired diseases which ravaged them horribly, and to which they not infrequently succumbed. The enforced practice of fellatio by children led to the acquisition of venereal infections described by Roman historians and social commentators. Martial, for example, mentions the case of Canace, a girl of seven: ". . . contagion ate away her face, and settled in the tender little mouth. Cruel disease infected her very kisses; and her lips were half

gone when they were consigned to the grim pyre." Cunnilinguists, Rosenbaum does not neglect to add, fared no better.

As with the sexual exploitation of female children, there has probably been no period of history when the desire for boys could not find fairly ready gratification. Again, at the present day, it is in the large cities where the traffic is largely to be found; and again, too, it is often the parents of the younger children who are responsible though there is also a considerable amount of childish freelancing; more, one surmises, than in the case of pre-pubescent girls.

It should be added, however, and it is to our credit, that child prostitution in the U.S., and especially the adult sponsored prostitution of young boys, is far from commonplace. The deviate who seeks hard and long enough will still find his prey, but only in the case of boys who have reached adolescence will he find it in any abundance. The phenomenon of freelance prostitution by male adolescents, sometimes conducted under the auspices of juvenile gangs, is one which merits a more extended discussion than I am able to provide here. It will have to suffice to say that this delinquency is on the increase and is a vexing social problem, linked specifically to homosexuality and especially to the increasing and humane tolerance for homosexual practices of adults; and it is a problem which will not be easily disposed of in any near future.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The foregoing—it is hoped the reader understands—is in no way intended to be a complete historical survey of adult-child sex relationships while the brief psychological observations are of course superficial. To do justice to either the history or the psychology of such relationships, lengthy works would obviously be required.

The value of such a montage as this one lies rather, it is hoped, in conveying some idea of the blend and variety of historical attitudes and practices on the one hand, and of the multivarious motivations to, and effects of, adult-child sex relationships on the other. My purpose here, as elsewhere in this volume, has been, first of all, to make clear the inadequacy of moralistic absolutes and the laws derived from them where human sexual practices and compelling—and compulsive—human sexual cravings are concerned.

That some ethical and legal restraints are essential with regard to the expression of some sexual desires is not questioned, and has probably been amply demonstrated to the satisfaction of everyone, though whether these restraints should take the form, in most cases, of specifically *sexual* prohibitions, is, as I have pointed out elsewhere, at least thoroughly debatable. However that may be, one point is clear: Contemporary antisexual legislation is so

outmoded both in terms of contemporary sexual behavior and current scientific knowledge as to reduce that legislation to absurdity, with many individual tragedies resulting.¹¹

The case of Humbert Humbert makes this strikingly clear. Coming to trial for his relationship with Lolita, he might, depending on what state he was brought to trial in, and of course depending on the individual psychologies and competencies of judge, jurymen and attorneys, receive possible sentences ranging from a few months' imprisonment up through life imprisonment and even death, though it is supposed that if the jury were in possession of all the facts given by Nabokov, his penalty would be somewhat less than the possible maximum in those states where the ultimate remedy against malefactors is authorized.

Unfortunately, juries seldom if ever possess such a wealth of relevant facts, and even when they do there is usually a distorted version or versions, presented by one or both parties, which makes it impossible to decide accurately what is truth, what is falsehood, and what is unintentional misrepresentation. In the case of Lolita, it is not at all unlikely that that good public servant the prosecutor might seek to strengthen his case by persuading her that she should attribute various atrocities, perhaps including defloration by force or threat, to the defendant. That she might have done so persuasively enough to convince a jury is scarcely to be doubted—and this sort of thing has occurred in such cases many times.

But looking at the case of Humbert Humbert in the

light of the information provided by his creator, we surely see that Humbert's case is a far cry from those of the libertines, psychopaths, and sadists who callously gratify their appetites with children who are nothing but vehicles for this gratification. Unfortunately, society generally and the courts in particular are often not well equipped, either by knowledge or inclination, to make much of the distinction.

NOTES

1. [page 366]

Child: A person fourteen years of age or younger. An arbitrary definition, reinforced by Nabokov's upper age limit for nymphets.

2. [page 366]

The predilection, and public awareness of it, are common enough so that in the rich compost of American argot, *coitus cum nymphet* is known as "honey-fucking"—or, eunuchoidly, as "honey-fuggling." (Cf. *Dictionary of American Slang*.)

3. [page 369]

We might add that the famed and fatal beauty Helen—she whose face launched a thousand ships and the Trojan War—was but a tender ten when carried off by Theseus (who snatched her from the midst of an already sizable group of panting suitors). Also: Juliet was but twelve or thirteen when she goaded the gonads of Romeo, her own passions rousing in response to those she had kindled. In each of these classic love affairs—Beatrice, Laura, Helen, Juliet—the girl is not regarded as an inappropriate love-object on account of her youth. Indeed, only one, Beatrice, is below the common law age of consent of ten years, which was not unrealistic in every case.

4. [page 373]

“Sexual maturation in boys and girls,” writes Clellan Ford in the Spring, 1960, *Law and Contemporary Problems*, “is a gradual process that takes several years before they are capable of reproduction. The signs everywhere noted to indicate puberty do not appear to coincide with attainment of reproductive maturity. In the girl, first menstruation serves everywhere as a dramatic indicator of the onset of puberty, but it may be several years after menarche before the adolescent girl is capable of being successfully impregnated. Evidence from societies in which adolescent boys and girls regularly indulge in sexual intercourse reveals that only rarely do pregnancies occur for some years after the first recognition of puberty.”

Whether this would hold generally true in our own society remains uncertain. Kinsey and others have suggested that quite possibly it would, citing the “adolescent sterility” first noted by anthropologists—a term which refers to irregular

Notes

early ovulatory processes tending to diminish the chances of adolescent conceptions.

5. [page 374]

“Open market”—that is, available without prescription. Presently, it is true, there remain in any case medical objections to unsupervised use of the existing “birth control pills” (Enovid, the pioneer in the field; and Norlutin; and the similar nostrums the other drug companies are rushing into the field). The use of Enovid is not recommended for a period of longer than two years; and for other reasons than the possibility that the drug will be used beyond that period—with consequent possible damage to ovulatory function—it is desirable that there be some medical control of usage.

However, even when pills—and the forthcoming inoculations against pregnancy, and sperm-production-inhibiting drugs—are stripped of their hazards, as should eventually occur, there will be powerful pressures to keep them out of the hands of adolescents, who might then copulate with impunity (or at least immunity).

6. [page 381]

In China, little girls were still being sold into prostitution by their parents up to the time when the Bamboo Curtain closed over the Chinese mainland, and the practice may still be common. It used to be argued in defense of this practice that it was a deterrent to infanticide since poor parents who could look forward to selling their children would be less likely to murder them at birth. Also, money raised by selling an older child could then be applied to the rearing of others. Further, more males could be spared if the family derived income from selling or hiring out its females to brothels. In some cases, where infanticide would otherwise have been a necessity, brothel keepers would advance to the family a por-

tion of the purchase price, to be used to keep the child alive until she was old enough to begin working (which was not, in many cases, very old). That prostitution is "a fate worse than death" is a view not many persons cling to when the choice becomes an actuality.

7. [page 395]

There is also a quite extensive (fictional and poetic) literature of lesbian relations between adult females and young girls—though not small children—which I will forego discussing at the present time.

8. [page 396]

The philosopher of vice Dolmancé, De Sade's particular spokesman in *La Philosophie dans le Boudoir*, declares that: "I worship it (sodomy) in either sex; but I'll confess a young lad's (anus) gives me yet more pleasure than a girl's To (sodomize) the (anus) of a woman is but the half of buggery; 'tis with men Nature wishes men to practise this oddity, and it is especially for men she has given us a predilection."

9. [page 397]

According to Edwardes, a band of Turkish sodomists explained their preference with the following motto:

"The penis, smooth and round, was made
with anus best to match it;

Had it been made for vulva's sake,
it had been formed like a hatchet!"

De Sade's philosopher also, and similarly, declares himself on this point: "Is not this aperture (the anus) circular, like this instrument (the phallus)? Why, then! What person, no matter how great an enemy of common sense, can imagine

that an oval hole (vagina) could have been created for our cylindrical pricks!"

10. [page 401]

A number of historians and biographers of the Emperor Tiberius, one of the most recent being the psychiatrist Gregorio Marañón, have regarded most of the tales of Tiberius' lecheries, and that of the "little fishes" in particular, as apocryphal—scurrilous canards, vicious journalistic sensationalism, by Suetonius and others. This is not the place, even were I inclined, or competent, to do so, to argue the matter. Nor is much to be gained by debating a question which can never be answered with any assurance of correctness (though of course the not negligible pleasures of disputation should never be minimized).

11. [page 404]

A final, fundamental, universal, sexual absurdity:

Science has lately determined that by the time women have reached their pinnacle of desire and capacity for sexual intercourse—a position they then maintain for many years—men have already passed their sexual peak and gone into decline. We can only infer from this that it was the intention of Mom Nature that young boys be mated with older women on the one hand, and young girls—though only transiently—with older men, on the other. We assume here, from our finite perspective, that the Almighty would approve sound sexual pairing on the basis of similarity of sexual capacities and cravings. On the other hand, of course, there are factors of intellectual and emotional maturity to consider. And, since God or Nature has made it impossible to achieve a union of males and females of similar desires, capacities, *and* maturity, perhaps it would be best, if we are really to do what is natural, to detach sexuality from marriage. That is to say, where

marriage is concerned, the factors of similar intellectual and emotional development should be given first consideration; and, where sex is concerned, physical compatibility should be the determinant.

If we were able to toss out all the psychosexual paraphernalia of the millennia, and start all over again, who can say that such an approach would not result in the greatest happiness of the greatest number?

S E L E C T E D
B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- Aldrich, Ann. *We Walk Alone*. New York: 1955.
- . *We, Too, Must Love*. New York: 1958.
- (Ed.). *Carol in a Thousand Cities*. Greenwich, Conn.: 1960.
- Allen, C. *The Sexual Perversions and Abnormalities*. London: 1949.
- Baring-Gould, S. *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*. Boston: 1882.
- Barnes, Hazel, *The Literature of Possibility*. Lincoln, Neb.: 1959.
- Berg, C., and Allen, C. *The Problem of Homosexuality*. New York: 1958.
- Bergler, Edmund, *1000 Homosexuals*. Paterson, N.J.: 1959.

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

- Bloch, Iwan. *Strange Sexual Practices*. New York: 1933.
———. *Marquis de Sade*. New York: 1953.
Boguet, Henry. *An Examen of Witches*. London: 1929.
Boss, M. *Meaning and Content of Sexual Perversions*. New York: 1949.
Briffault, Robert. *The Mothers*. New York: 1931.
Brill, A. A. *Lectures on Psychoanalytic Psychiatry*. New York: 1956.
Buliet, C. *Venus Castina*. New York: 1956.
Burckhardt, J. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. New York: 1958.
Burns, Eugene. *The Sex Life of Wild Animals*. New York: 1953.
Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy*. New York: 1927.
Butcher, M. *The Negro in American Culture*. New York: 1957.
Caprio, F. *The Sexually Adequate Female*. New York: 1959.
Caprio, F., and London, L. *Sexual Deviations*. Washington, D.C.: 1960.
Carpenter, E. *The Intermediate Sex*. London: 1941.
Cauldwell, D. *Animal Contacts*. Girard, Kan.: 1948.
Chesser, E. *Women*. London: 1958.
Chideckel, M. *Female Sex Perversion*. New York: 1938.
Choisy, M. *Psychoanalysis of the Prostitute*. New York: 1961.
Cholden, L. (Ed.). *LSD and Mescaline in Experimental Psychiatry*. New York: 1956.
Cohen, C. *Religion and Sex*. Edinburgh: 1919.
Cory, D. *The Homosexual in America*. New York: 1951.
Crawley, E. *The Mystic Rose*. New York: 1960.
Crowley, Aleister. *Works*.
Davis, M. *The Sexual Responsibility of Woman*. New York: 1956.
De Beaumont, E. *The Sword and Womankind*. New York: 1930.
De Beauvoir, S. *Works*.
De Leeuw, Hendrik. *Woman: The Dominant Sex*. New York: 1957.
De Ropp, R. *Drugs and the Mind*. New York: 1957.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- De Sade, D. A. F. *Justine*. Paris: 1959.
 ——. *Juliette*. Paris: 1960.
 ——. *The Bedroom Philosophers*. Paris: 1957.
 ——. *The 120 Days of Sodom*. Paris: Undated.
 Dingwall, E. *The Girdle of Chastity*. New York: Undated.
 ——. *The American Woman*. New York: 1957.
 Drummond, I. *The Sex Paradox*. New York: 1953.
 Dubois-Desaulle, G. *Bestiality*. New York: 1933.
 Du Laure, J.-A. *The Gods of Generation*. New York: 1934.
 Edwardes, A. *The Jewel in the Lotus*. New York: 1959.
 Egen, F. *Plainclothesman*. New York: 1959.
 Eisler, R. *Man Into Wolf*. London: 1951.
 Eliade, M. *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*. New York: 1958.
 Ellis, E. *Love in the Afterlife*. New York: 1958.
 Ellis, H. *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*. New York: 1936.
 Epton, Nina. *Love Among the French*. Cleveland: 1959.
 Feldman, F. and Gartenberg, M. (Eds.), *The Beat Generation and the Angry Young Men*. New York: 1958.
 Fielding, W. *Strange Customs of Courtship and Marriage*. New York: 1949.
 Finch, B. *Passport to Paradise*. New York: 1960.
 Fortune, D. *Psychic Self Defence*. London: 1957.
 Foster, J. *Sex Variant Women in Literature*. New York: 1956.
 Frazer, J. G. *The Golden Bough*. New York: 1940.
 Freud, Sigmund. *Works*.
 Gallichan, W. *Human Love*. New York: 1939.
 Gardiner, H. *Catholic Viewpoint on Censorship*. New York: 1958.
 Gebhard, Pomeroy, Martin and Christenson. *Pregnancy, Birth and Abortion*. New York: 1958.
 Geddes, D. (Ed.). *An Analysis of the Kinsey Reports*. New York: 1954.
 Genet, Jean. *Works*.
 Gilman, L. *Insomnia and Its Relation to Dreams*. New York: 1958.

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

- Goldberg, B. *The Sacred Fire*. New York: 1958.
- Gorer, G. *The Devil's Disciple*. Paris: Undated.
- Gould, G., and Pyle, W. *Anomalies and Curiosities of Medicine*. New York: 1956.
- Greenwald, H. *The Call Girl*. New York: 1958.
- Greenwald, H. and Krich, A., Eds., *The Prostitute in Literature*. New York: 1960.
- Guyon, R. *Sex Life and Sex Ethics*. London: 1949.
- Hamilton, G. *A Research in Marriage*. New York: 1929.
- Hansen, J. *Zauberwahn*. Leipzig: 1900.
- Harris, S. *They Sell Sex*. Greenwich, Conn.: 1960.
- Harris, S. and Murtagh, J., *Cast the First Stone*. New York: 1957.
- and ——, *Who Live in Shadow*. New York: 1959.
- Heidegger, M. *Sein und Zeit*. Tuebingen: 1949.
- . *Existence and Being*. Chicago: 1949.
- Henry, G. *All the Sexes*. New York: 1955.
- Herodotus. *The Histories*. Baltimore: 1959.
- Hesse, E. *Narcotics and Drug Addiction*. New York: 1946.
- Hirsch, E. *The Power to Love*. New York: 1948.
- Hirschfeld, M. *Sexual Anomalies and Perversions*. London: 1937.
- Hood, J. *Curiosities of Love and Sex*. Paris: 1953.
- Hunt, M. *The Natural History of Love*. New York: 1959.
- Jacobus, X. *Wanderings in Untrodden Fields of Anthropology*. Girard, Kan.: 1948.
- James, E. *The Ancient Gods*, New York: 1960.
- Joad, C. E. M. *Decadence*. London: 1958.
- Jones, E. *On the Nightmare*. New York: 1951.
- Jung, C. G. *Works*.
- Kiefer, O. *Sexual Life in Ancient Rome*. London: 1934.
- Kierkegaard, S. *Works*.
- Kinsey, A. (et al.). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*. Philadelphia: 1948.
- . *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia, 1953.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Knight, R. *An Account of the Remains of the Worship of Priapus*. London: 1786.
- Krafft-Ebing, R. *Psychopathia Sexualis*. New York: 1947.
- Krich, A. (Ed.). *Women: The Variety and Meaning of Their Sexual Experience*. New York: 1958.
- . *Men: The Variety and Meaning of Their Sexual Experience*. New York: 1957.
- . *The Homosexuals*. New York: 1958.
- Kronhausen, P. and E. *Pornography and the Law*. New York: 1959.
- . *Sex Histories of American College Men*. New York: 1960.
- Laing, R. *The Divided Self*. Chicago: 1960.
- Lamb, G. (Ed.). *Love and Violence*. New York: 1954.
- Langner, L. *The Importance of Wearing Clothes*. New York: 1959.
- Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology*. New York: 1960.
- Laurent, E., and Nagour, P. *Magica Sexualis*. New York: 1934.
- Lea, H. C. *Materials Toward a History of Witchcraft*. New York: 1957.
- Levi, Eliphas. *The History of Magic*. London: 1957.
- Lewinsohn, R. *A History of Sexual Customs*. New York: 1958.
- . *Animals, Men, and Myths*. New York: 1954.
- Licht, H. *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece*. London: 1931.
- Linn, L. and Schwarz, L. *Psychiatry and Religious Experience*. New York: 1958.
- London, L. *Sexual Deviations in the Female*. New York: 1957.
- . *Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: 1952.
- Lucas, G. *The Symptoms and Treatment of Acute Poisoning*. New York: 1953.
- Lundberg, F. and Farnham, M. *Modern Woman*. New York: 1947.
- McCabe, J. *The History of Flagellation*. Girard, Kan.: 1946.
- . *The History of Torture*. Girard, Kan.: 1949.
- Sailer, N. *Advertisements for Myself*. New York: 1959.

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

- Mannix, D. *Those About to Die*. New York: 1958.
- Maranon, G. *Tiberius*. New York: 1956.
- Mason, E. *Tiberius*. New York: 1960.
- Mathison, R. *Faiths, Cults and Sects of America*. Indianapolis: 1960.
- May, R., Angel, E., and Ellenberger, H. (Eds.). *Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology*. New York: 1959.
- Mead, M. *Male and Female*. New York: 1955.
- . *Sex and Temperament*. New York: 1950.
- Metraux, A. *Voodoo*. New York: 1959.
- Meyer, J. *Sexual Life in Ancient India*. New York: 1953.
- Nabokov, V. *Lolita*. New York: 1958.
- Niemoller, A. *Bestiality and the Law*. Girard, Kan.: 1946.
- . *Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times*. Girard, Kan.: 1946.
- Nietzsche, F. *Works*.
- Palmer, H. *Psychopathic Personalities*. New York: 1957.
- Partridge, B. *A History of Orgies*. New York: 1960.
- Patai, R. *Sex and Family Life in the Bible*. New York: 1959.
- Penzer, N. *Poison Damsels*. London: 1952.
- Plutarch. *Lives of the Noble Greeks*. New York: 1959.
- . *Lives of the Noble Romans*. New York: 1959.
- Reich, Wilhelm. *Works*.
- Reik, Theodor. *Works*.
- Reinhardt, K. *The Existentialist Revolt*. New York: 1960.
- Remy, N. *Demonolatry*. London: 1930.
- Rhodes, H. *The Satanic Mass*. New York: 1955.
- Rigney, F. and Smith, L., *The Real Bohemia*. New York: 1961.
- Robbins, R. *The Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and Demonology*. New York: 1959.
- Roche, P. *The Criminal Mind*. New York: 1958.
- Rosenbaum, J. *The Plague of Lust*. New York: 1955.
- Rubin, H. *Eugenics and Sex Harmony*. New York: 1949.
- Russell, F. *The Behavior of Animals*. London: 1938.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Sanger, W. *The History of Prostitution*. New York: 1937.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Works*.
- Schenk, G. *The Book of Poisons*. London: 1956.
- Schopenhauer, A. *Works*.
- Scott, G. *History of Prostitution*. New York: 1954.
- . *Far Eastern Sex Life*. London: 1953.
- . *The History of Corporal Punishment*. London: 1954.
- . *The History of Torture Throughout the Ages*. London: 1949.
- Sprenger, J. and Kramer, H., *Malleus Maleficarum*. London: 1928.
- Stekel, Wilhelm. *Works*.
- Suetonius. *The Twelve Caesars*. Baltimore: 1960.
- Summers, M. *The Vampire: His Kith and Kin*. New York: 1960.
- Sumner, W. G. *Folkways*. New York: 1960.
- Symonds, J. *The Great Beast*. London: 1951.
- Tarnowsky, B. *Pederasty in Europe*. New York: Undated.
- Taylor, G. *Sex in History*. New York: 1954.
- Vatsyayana. *Kama Sutra*. Paris: 1958.
- Ward, R. *A Drug-Taker's Notes*. London: 1957.
- Webber, E. *Escape to Utopia*. New York: 1959.
- Weinberg, S. *Incest Behavior*. New York: 1955.
- Wentworth, H. and Flexner, S. *Dictionary of American Slang*. New York: 1960.
- Westermarck, E. *A History of Human Marriage*. London: 1921.
- Westwood, G. *Society and the Homosexual*. New York: 1953.
- Wildeblood, P. *A Way of Life*. London: 1956.
- Wolfe, D. *The Image of Man in America*. Dallas: 1957.
- Wolff, W. *Values and Personality*. New York: 1950.
- Wood, R. *Christ and the Homosexual*. New York: 1960.
- Xenophon, *Anabasis*. New York: 1959.

I N D E X

- A**
- Advertisements for Myself* (Mailer), 262, 263, 264
- Agrippa, Henry Cornelius, 153
- Alcohol, and sex, 306-309
- Aldrich, Ann, 222, 226
- Alexander VI, Pope, 111, 157
- Animal coitus, exhibitions of, 110-112, 114-116
- Animal Contacts* (Cauldwell), 97
- Animals:
- and bestial relations, 79-84, 112-116
- Animals (*Cont.*)
- protection of, 45-46
- Anomalies and Curiosities of Medicine* (Gould-Pyle), 65
- Anus; *see* Pederasty; Sodomy
- Aphrodisiacs; *see* Drugs
- Aretino, Pietro, 105
- Art, bestiality in, 100-101, 103-109
- B**
- Baboons, as sexual partners, 11, 21
- Barnes, Djuna, 100

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

Beisse, Jean, 16
Belladonna; *see* Thorn apple
Bermo, Cardinal, 51
Bestiality:
 in antiquity, 10-17
 and love and lust, 70-84
 in modern times, 17-31
 and monstrous births, 59-70
 in myth, literature and art, 84-109
 penalties for, 15-17, 31-46
 as perversion, 116-134
 prehistory of, 4-7
 among primitives, 8-10
 psychical, 109-116
 therapeutic, 55-59
 and witchcraft, 47-54
Bestiality (Dubois-Desaulle), 29, 69, 98
Bestiality in Ancient and Modern Times (Niemoller), 97
Bestiality and the Law (Niemoller), 38, 97
Betel nut, 323
Birth control pills, 408
Bloch, Iwan, 55, 101, 123, 311, 398
Bodin, Jean, 376
Borgia, Cesare, 157
Borniche, Francois, 16
Boss, Medard, 124, 125, 172
Bryk, Felix, 18
Bufotenin, 324
Burgot, Pierre, 151
Burns, Eugene, 25
Burroughs, William, 370
Burton, Robert, 13, 62

C

Caldwell, Erskine, 290
Call Girl, The (Greenwald), 259
Cambray, Jeanne de, 150
Cantharides, 302, 303-305
Capitularies (Charlemagne), 34
Catamites, 219, 220
Cauldwell, D. O., 97, 122
Centaurs, 77, 95
Charlemagne, 33, 34
Child prostitution, 380-384
Clement of Alexandria, 61
"Cloaca theory," 230-231
Cocaine, and sex, 314-316
Cory, Donald Webster, 170
Crocodiles, as sexual partners, 12
Crowley, Aleister, 51-52
Cubeb pepper, 322-323
Culam, Claudine de, 16, 38
Cunnilingus, 23, 28, 164, 167, 169, 172, 185, 187, 188, 200, 203, 204-205, 210, 234, 235-236

D

Datura; *see* Thorn apple
De Rerum Natura (Lucretius), 304
De Ropp, Robert, 313, 318
Defloration, 384-388
Demoniality, 36, 104
Demons, and bestiality, 47, 49-50
Devil, and bestiality, 48-49, 50
Dingwall, E. J., 101, 256
Dogs, as sexual partners, 22-23, 25-26

D
Dreams, animals in, 86-89
Drugs, and sex, 297-346
Drummond, Isabel, 41
Dubois-Desaulle, G., 29, 34, 47, 62,
 69, 98, 122
Dunning, Jack, 350

E

Edwardes, Allen, 21, 291, 327, 400,
 409
Egypt, ancient; bestiality in, 10-12,
 89-90
Eisler, Robert, 100, 129
Ellis, Havelock, 17, 26, 110, 112,
 120, 121, 284
*Encyclopedia of Witchcraft and
 Demonology* (Robbins), 104
England, H. S., 69
Enovid, 408
Erotogenic zones, 178, 184

F

Faulkner, William, 264
Fellatio, 20, 28, 164, 165, 167, 174,
 185, 192, 193, 195-212, 234,
 235-236
Finch, Bernard, 315, 319, 320, 327,
 340
Foligny, Angelina de, 150
Ford, Clellan, 379, 407
France, Hector, 318
Frederick the Great, 40

Freud, Sigmund, 87, 135, 183, 230-
 231

G

Garnier, Guillaume, 16
Genet, Jean, 222, 240
Genitalia, female, 179-183
Goats, as sexual partners, 11, 51
Gonorrhea; *see* Venereal diseases
Gould, G., 65, 68, 69
Graves, Robert, 84, 85
Greece, ancient; bestiality in, 12-
 13, 89
Green, Jack, 331
Greenwald, H., 155, 252, 259, 314
Guazzo, Francesco-Maria, 63, 64
Guyon, R., 374

H

Haire, Norman, 12, 89
Haleby, Omar, 56
Harminc, 324
Harriman, P. L., 367
Harris, Sara, 155, 286, 382-383
Henbane; *see* Thorn apple
Herodotus, 10
Heroin, and sex, 313-314
Hesse, Erich, 310, 311, 314, 318,
 328
Himes, Chester, 290
Hirschfeld, Magnus, 40-41

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

Hittites, and bestiality, 33

Homosexual acts:

fellatio, 195-212

gratification of, 163-164

lesbian, 186-189

limitations of, 170-172

masturbation, 190-194

physiological basis of, 177-186

revulsion to, 165

role-taking in, 165-168

sodomy, 212-221

Hood, J. X., 385

Humbert, Humbert; *see Lolita*

Huxley, Aldous, 351

I

Incest, 380

Insects, as sexual partners, 24

Intermarriage, 266-267

Interpretation of Dreams (Freud),
87

Interracial sex relations; *see* Negro
sexuality

Ivanoff, Elie, 69

J

Jewel in the Lotus, The (Ed-
wardes), 291, 401

John XII, Pope, 34, 35, 148

Jones, Ernest, 156

Jorgensen, Christine, 171

Juliani, Veronica, 150

Justine (de Sade), 246

K

Kama Sutra, 201

Kant, Immanuel, 143

Kat, 324-325

Kinsey, A. C., 23, 27-29, 76, 172,
180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185,
187, 216, 232, 282, 314, 407

Klaatsch, Herman, 69

Kola nut, 323

Krafft-Ebing, R., 21-22, 97, 123, 124

Kronhausen, Eberhard and Phyllis,
100, 157, 158, 284

Kunz, H., 125

L

Lees, G. Robinson, 20

Leo VIII, Pope, 148

Lesbian relationships, 167-169, 171-
172, 186-189, 231, 232

Lewinsohn, R., 147

Life of Hildebrand (Bermo), 51

Lindner, John, 57

Literature, bestiality in, 98-100

Lolita (Nabokov), 365, 368-371,
390-392, 393-394, 404-405

LSD 25, and sex, 335, 339, 344-345

Lucas, G. H. W., 305

Lucian, 14

Lucretius, 304

Lycosthenes, 65, 67

M

Mailer, Norman, 262-264, 267-269,
271-276, 278-279, 284, 287, 288
Malinowski, Bronislav, 9
Man Into Wolf (Eisler), 100, 129
Maranon, Gregorio, 410
Marijuana, and sex, 317-322
Martial, 14, 401
Masturbation, 172, 186, 187, 190-
194
Mather, Cotton, 101
Mayor's Committee on Marihuana,
report of, 320-322
*Meaning and Content of Sexual
Perversions* (Boss), 172
Medical Jurisprudence (Herzog),
22
Mescaline, and sex, 301, 330-344,
351-361
Metempsychosis, 146
Mexican red bean, 323
Michelangelo, Buonarotti, 93
Miller, Henry, 244
Miscegenation, 251-282
Monstrous births, 59-70
Morphine, and sex, 313-314
Myrdal, Gunnar, 265
Mythology, bestiality in, 84-96

N

Nabokov, Vladimir, 365, 393, 404,
406
Nanacatl, 323

Narcotics and Drug Addiction
(Hesse), 310
Negro sexuality, myth of, 251-282
Nero, 14
New Dictionary of Psychology
(Harriman), 367
Niemoller, A. F., 38, 97
Norlutin, 408
Nymphophilia; *see* Sex relation-
ships, adult-child

O

Occultism, and bestiality, 51-54
Old Testament, 7, 31, 32-33
Ololuigui, 324
Opium, and sex, 309-313

P

Paré, Ambroise, 65, 66
Partridge, B., 385-386
Patai, Raphael, 20, 57
Pederasty, 396-402; *see also* Sod-
omy
Pedophilia; *see* Sex relationships,
adult-child
Penitentials, 35
Perls, F. S., 100
Perversions, 116-134
Peuckert, Erich-Will, 349-351
Pindar, 11
Ploscowe, Morris, 138, 375
Plutarch, 11, 61, 66

Forbidden Sexual Behavior and Morality

Pornography, 103
Pornography and the Law (E. and P. Kronhausen), 284
Proctology, 238
Prostitution; *see* Child prostitution
Psychoanalysis, 135-136
Psychology of Sex, The (Ellis), 110
Psychopathia Sexualis (Krafft-Ebing), 22, 97
Pyle, W., 65, 68, 69

R

Randolph, Vance, 68
Reich, Wilhelm, 112, 224
Rhodiginus, 66
Robbins, R., 104
Roche, Philip, 144
Roman Games, 14-15, 17
Rome, ancient; bestiality in, 13-15
Roosevelt, Eleanor, 264
Rosenbaum, J., 401

S

Sade, Marquis de, 130, 246, 380, 388, 396, 409
Sadism, and bestiality, 45, 127-128, 129-134
Saint Jerome, 62
Saint Mechtildis, 151
Sartre, Jean-Paul, 241, 244

Satyrs, 77
Savage, Charles, 335
Schenk, Gustav, 304, 323
Schnabel, Ernst, 158-159
Scott, George Ryley, 132
Seabrook, William, 151
Semen, 206-209, 236-237
Sex, and drugs, 297-346
"Sex crimes," 142-143
Sex relationships, adult-child, 365-411
Sex statutes, 43-45, 135-144, 403-405
Sexual behavior, of primitives, 8-10, 377-380
Sexual intercourse, age of consent to, 372-377; *see also* Bestiality; Sex, and drugs; Sex relationships, adult-child
Sexual perversions; *see* Perversions
Sexuality; *see* Negro sexuality
Sheep, as sexual partners, 29-31
Sodomy, 164, 165, 167, 174, 185, 192, 193, 211, 212-221
Solanaceae; *see* Thorn apple
South, and Negro sexuality, 256-257
Spanish fly; *see* Cantharides
Spina, Alphonsus de, 50
Strange Sexual Practices (Bloch), 311
Suetonius, 401, 410
Sybarites, 13
Symptoms and Treatment of Acute Poisoning, The (Lucas), 305
Syphilis; *see* Venereal diseases

T

Tarnowsky, B., 24, 158, 219, 220
They Sell Sex (Harris), 286, 382
Thief's Journal, The (Genet), 240
 Thorn apple, 325-329
 Tiberius, 401, 410
 Tribadism, 168, 172, 185, 187, 188-189
 Trobrianders, 9

U

Ulrichs, K. H., 170

V

Venereal diseases, and bestiality, 55-59
 Vinci, Leonardo da, 93
 Voltaire, 11, 38-39
 Voodoo ceremonies, 54

W

Walker, Kenneth, 316
 Ward, R. H., 344

We Walk Alone (Aldrich), 226
 Weir, Thomas, 102-103
 Werewolf, 52-53, 151
 Westermarck, E., 55
 Wheeler, Stanton, 281
White Negro, The (Mailer), 262, 263, 271, 278
 White-Negro sex relations; *see* Negro sexuality
 Winick, Charles, 347
 Witchcraft, and bestiality, 47-54
 Wright, Richard, 289

X

Xenophon, 12

Y

Yohimbin, 323-324

Z

Zooerast, punishments of, 15-17, 31-46
 Zooerasty, 71, 72
 Zoophilia, 70, 72, 125