

SEXUAL LIBERATION/SEXUAL EPISTEME:

Modern China and the World History of Sexuality

Howard H. Chiang (Princeton University)

Paper for Presentation at the Rutgers *Constructing Knowledges* Conference (Oct. 26-27, 2007)

The aim of this position paper is to inspire conversations and discussions about the way scholars currently periodize the historical conceptualizations of sex, gender, and sexuality in the West, and its significance for the increasingly popular endeavor to study the history of sexuality in a comparative/global context, especially by taking into consideration non-Western frames of analysis. To that end, my point of departure will be two foundational contributions to the historiography of sexuality: namely, Thomas Laqueur's *Making Sex* (1990) and the first volume of Michel Foucault's *History of Sexuality* (1976).¹

In *Making Sex*, Laqueur broaches the shifting conceptualization of sex in Western civilization from the one-sex model, in which men and women were thought to be two versions of a single-sexed body, to the two-sex model, which treated men and women as opposite counterparts. According to Laqueur, this dramatic switch took place during the eighteenth century. Before then, male and female differed in degrees based on a single-sexed body, and were not separated into two distinct kinds of species. After the Enlightenment "intervention," however, people no longer perceived the female organ as a lesser form of the male's; in the two-sex model, men and women did not imply different variations of the single-sexed body, but represented two distinct types of species that occupied different realms of social life, performed unique social and cultural duties, and behaved with separate sets of manners. Gender, as it was conceived after the Enlightenment, changed from being the *definition* of sex to the *socialization*

of sex.

In the first volume of his *History of Sexuality*, Foucault is notorious for signaling that the concept of homosexuality was first consolidated in the literature of sexual science (“Scientia Sexualis”) in the second half of the nineteenth century. Through scientific classification and the making of a sexual nosology, the term “homosexuality” first appeared in 1869, and, for Foucault, it was precisely through the coinage of the term that individuals who experienced same-sex attraction or who engaged in same-sex behavior came to constitute a distinct group of people in Western society.

So how do we reconcile the two different turning points in the history of sexuality that Laqueur and Foucault proposed respectively? In this paper I will emphasize the importance of the Foucauldian epistemic turning point that the Laqueurian narrative has largely overlooked. Taking homosexuality as a concurrent focal point, I will first show that the excavation of a new episteme of sexuality in the late nineteenth century plays a more significant role in the modern genealogy of sexual liberation. One of the main themes that Laqueur’s narrative fails to highlight is the emergence of a psychological style of reasoning about gender and sexuality in the late nineteenth century. As the early sexologists began to study human erotic desire in an unprecedented manner around that time, gender was no longer determined only through reference to anatomical biology: it came to be perceived as having a psychological basis in congruence with an individual’s sense of inner self.

I then quickly look at how the liberating impulse of sexual science reached a crescendo around the mid-twentieth century. The Kinsey reports—the epitome of sexology—fundamentally reoriented the way many American mental health experts conceptualized sexual normality. The tension between sexual medicine and sexual science therefore was significantly

altered, for instance, when the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of mental disorders in 1973. The beginning and the middle of the twentieth century thus constitute two critical epistemic junctures in the history of sexuality in the West. I conclude by commenting on the applicability of the Foucauldian approach to the study of the history of sexuality in non-Western contexts. Drawing from my research on sexual science in modern China, I propose that Foucault's insight concerning the emergence of a "homosexual identity" in the West can serve as a useful guide for thinking about similar issues in the historical epistemology of sexuality in the East Asian context.

The First Turning Point: Liberating Sex beyond the Flesh

The concrete influence of medicine and science in the cultural normalization of the two-sex model first culminated in the investigation of same-sex desire around the turn of the twentieth century, when European sexologists began to produce an unprecedented number of volumes on the subject. On the one hand, many sexologists, including Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Sigmund Freud, and the Swiss neurologist August Forel, contended that homosexuality was a pathological condition. Meanwhile, other sexologists, such as Karl Ulrichs, Edward Carpenter, and Magnus Hirschfeld, advocated the view that same-sex eroticism was simply a benign variation in the human population.

Above all, the turn-of-the-century sexological discourse achieved two major outcomes. The first outcome was the emergence of a psychological understanding of gender through which homosexuality was theorized as a specific manifestation of gender "inversion"—or, to use the term the sexologists favored, "sexual inversion." When discussing homosexuality in the context of sexual development, Krafft-Ebing, for instance, stressed the importance of a psychic

dimension: “With the inception of anatomical and functional development of the generative organs, and the differentiation of form belonging to each sex, [...] *rudiments of a mental feeling corresponding with the sex* are developed.”² Similarly, the Berlin psychiatrist Albert Moll viewed male same-sex desire as the “feminine” mentality of a person with normal male biological genitalia—“sexual sensations of a feminine nature among men whose genital organs are normally formed.”³ Even sexologists who promoted greater tolerance of homosexuality also portrayed homosexuals’ inner sense of self as merely an inverted sex. Presenting himself as speaking on behalf of male homosexuals, Ulrichs wrote: “Nature developed the *physical male* germ in us, yet *mentally*, the *feminine* one.”⁴ Even though they had diverging opinions with respect to the clinical status of homosexuality, all of these early sexologists described people with same-sex desire as possessing a mentality of the opposite sex.

The second outcome was the reinforcement of the two-sex model in which the nature of sexual desire was expansively theorized by adhering to a binary oppositional framework for both sex and gender. For those sexologists who pathologized homosexuality, normal sexuality was defined as the status of having a biological sex and a psychological gender that were aligned properly so that sexual desire would be channeled toward the opposite sex. In depicting homosexuals as individuals whose inner psychological sex (gender) was the opposite of their physical sex, even those sexologists who did not pathologize homosexuality constantly relied on the idea of two incommensurable sexes (the two-sex model). Indeed, the idea of a psychological version of sex, first articulated in the early discourse of sexology, expanded scientists’ and physicians’ conceptual space for thinking about the relationship between sex and gender beyond the strict terms of biology versus culture.

With the rise of this psychological model of gender between 1880 and 1920, the

conceptual space of sexual freedom emerged from two stages of historical development: first, the psychiatric implantation of sexual psychopathology around the 1880s and 1890s that gave sexuality for the first time in history both a psychological *and* a pathological character under the name of medicine; and second, the subsequent sexological impulse around the 1900s and 1910s to deploy the existing vocabularies of perverse sexuality in a system of normalizing and liberalizing scholarly endeavors under the name of science.⁵ In the final two decades of the nineteenth century, in hoping to gain a better understanding of sexual deviance specifically and diseases of the mind more generally, psychiatric experts shifted from an emphasis on bodily causes to psychogenic accounts; brain localizations of mental defects slowly lost their appeal and psychical considerations came to the fore. A popular, and perhaps somewhat valid, tendency is to attribute the root of this transition to Freud; however, it is worth noting that by turning their attention to sexual perversion, psychiatrists had also created a new platform of professional discourse that played a catalytic role in the transformation of their therapeutic emphasis. This new psychiatric discourse, originally intended for the medical surveillance, regulation, and control of sexuality, inadvertently constituted a distinct ground for the emergence of the modern notion of sexual freedom.

By a modern notion of sexual freedom, I simply mean the ability to conceive of, articulate, and enact a sense of sexual self-definition and self-agency without subsuming sexual desire under heterosexual obligations (such as marriage and procreation). In creating an unprecedented type of discourse about sexual perversion towards the end of the nineteenth century, psychiatrists entered a fresh realm of medical knowledge in which they claimed for themselves exclusive expertise. But if we take Michel Foucault's contention that "where there is power, there is resistance" seriously, this new technique of medical surveillance facilitated the

possibility for a subsequent generation of sexologists to appropriate the language of sexual perversion in a “reverse discourse” that would then displace its initial pathological meanings by making new claims for its normalcy.⁶

In the 1900s and 1910s, “sexual inversion,” “homosexuality,” “sadism,” “masochism,” and “fetishism” were concepts now to be studied intensively, extensively, and not just medically but more importantly *scientifically*. A second wave of sex scientists, including Iwan Bloch, Havelock Ellis, and Magnus Hirschfeld, represented a group of individuals at the beginning of the twentieth century who published monographs, edited disciplinary journals, founded learned societies, and organized conferences, all devoted to the goal of establishing a comprehensive scientific discipline of human sexuality that incorporated a variety of research methodologies. In this process, they often advocated more liberal attitudes toward both the medical and legal aspects of sexual behavior, directly reflecting their conviction that social reform could be achieved through sexual science.

The Second Turning Point: Knowing Desire in Competing Orders of Normality

By the mid-twentieth century, two concurrent developments in sexology fundamentally changed the way people thought about issues of gender and sexuality. First, “gender” got defined officially as a separate concept from “sex” by a medical psychologist at Johns Hopkins University, John Money. In an article published in 1955, Money used the phrase *gender role* for “all those things that a person says or does to disclose himself or herself as having the status of boy or man, girl or woman,” and *gender* to refer to “outlook, demeanor, and orientation.”⁷ In 1964, building on Money’s vocabulary, the psychoanalyst Robert Stoller, working with his colleague Ralph Greenson at the UCLA Medical School, coined the concept of *gender identity* to

indicate more directly one's core sense of self as "being a member of a particular sex."⁸ If by "gender role" Money referred to socially prescribed behavior patterns, Stoller and Greenson adopted the term "gender identity" to identify another layer of gender that is strictly psychological. In fact, they further differentiated gender identity from *sexual identity*, which encompasses one's sexual desire and erotic drive, and thus distinguished gender from sexuality accordingly.⁹ Whereas both concepts were lumped together in the turn-of-the-century discourse of sexual inversion—the sexual invert had both an inverted gender identity and an abnormal sexual identity simultaneously—the language of psychoanalysis now provided medical and scientific authorities, as well as the lay public, sufficient working definitions for setting them apart.

Another significant development in sexology around the mid-twentieth century was the publication of the two Kinsey reports on male and female sexual behavior.¹⁰ With respect to the discussion of homosexuality in particular, historians of sexuality have generally depicted the mental health profession in the United States prior to the mid-1960s as a monolithic field that pathologized homosexual behavior. Indeed, as mental health professionals gained increasing cultural authority in the post-war era, they worked closely with legal and political officials to associate male homosexuality with the concept of "sexual psychopath" and portrayed homosexuality with an image of "menace" that threatened national security.¹¹

It was within this conservative Cold War context of the mid-20th-century that Alfred Kinsey and his collaborators published their two reports on the sexual behavior of Americans.¹² In both volumes, by providing statistical findings of the prevalence of homosexual behavior in American society, Kinsey explicitly challenged the mental health profession's description of homosexuality as a psychological illness. Given the context, many historians have correctly

documented that among the critics of Kinsey's work, the most vociferous ones were the psychiatrists, especially the psychoanalytic group. In addition to the failure to take into consideration the unconscious and dynamic nature of sexual experience, psychiatrists and psychoanalysts dismissed Kinsey's attempt to normalize homosexuality by arguing that statistical findings of the prevalence of a specific sexual behavior could not constitute sufficient grounds for establishing its normality. Based on their clinical experience, many psychotherapists insisted that homosexuality was neither normal nor desirable and could be cured even though it may be somewhat prevalent according to Kinsey's findings.¹³

More pertinent to my argument, however, is the explicit disagreement on the most appropriate way to conceptualize sexual normality between Kinsey's sociological approach and the psychiatric experts' psychoanalytic perspective. My own research suggests that Kinsey's notion of sexual normality defined around the metric of statistical occurrence had already begun to alter many mental health professionals' view of homosexuality since the late 1940s. For example, at the 38th annual meeting of the American Psychopathological Association held in 1948, psychiatrist David Levy was convinced by Kinsey and warned his medical colleagues about their clinical definition of normality:

Kinsey's findings are naturally disturbing to an analyst when he finds a discrepancy between his assumed norms and the supposedly true norms. True, the finding that a certain item of behavior is more frequent than you supposed does not mean that it is not a neurotic symptom in any particular individual. Nevertheless, the possibility that some of your subjectively social values may be illusory calls for a critical reevaluation. It may mean recasting a number of other ideas you have worked with on the basis that they are generally accepted social values. You begin to wonder about the particular segment of the population represented by yourself and your patients, out of which your world of social values, your clinical norms of values and behavior have been derived. It is a jolt, but it is also an important corrective of those "norms" that may represent arbitrary and dogmatic standards.¹⁴

The relation between gay activists and the Kinsey reports has been explained by scholars

as a basic relation in which Kinsey's statistics merely functioned as a piece of scientific evidence, around which gay people could demand the mental health profession to recognize their sexuality as "normal" while forging a collective identity and consolidating a political group consciousness.¹⁵ However, it is evident that some of the experts themselves, in dialogues with one another, had already autonomously started to modify their understanding of homosexuality by referring to the Kinsey reports as early as the late 1940s. Culminating in the American Psychiatric Association's 1973 decision to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders, the politics of knowledge surrounding the clinical status of homosexuality thus adds the mid-twentieth century as a second critical epistemic turning point to the history of sexuality.

Toward a Foucauldian History of Non-Western Sexuality?

I have shown the critical salience of Foucault's approach to the study of the history of sexuality in the West, especially in the Euro-American context. For if we take homosexuality and sexual liberation as concurrent prisms of historical analysis, we see that the modern epistemic foundations of gender and sexuality are rooted in an order of knowledge that emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century and continue to define our conceptual space. Within this knowledge structure, science maintains an authoritative role in determining the kinds of statements—such as truth claims—that could or could not be made about gender and sexuality.

At the same time, as I hope to have also demonstrated, this notion of medical surveillance and governmentality that Foucault's work tends to emphasize allows us to assess the inherent *subversive* effects of elite medico-scientific discourses, in that the articulation of any psychopathological descriptions of sexuality simultaneously generated room for potential knowledge claims that would contest these original descriptions through the "liberating" effect of

science. My historicization of the notion of sexual freedom shows that between 1880 and 1920 sex got “liberated,” so to speak, through the sexologists’ effort to transform the discipline of sexual science by slowly replacing an exclusive medical tradition with a more inclusive scholarly endeavor under the broad banner of “scientification.” As another example, the medico-pathological paradigm of homosexuality in the United States gradually lost its appeal as mental health experts, under the influence of Kinsey’s studies, became increasingly aware of how problematic the notion of sexual normality was for the clinical practice of psychoanalysis.

But is the usefulness of the Foucauldian approach for the study of the historical epistemology of sexuality restricted to the Western context? Here, I would like to suggest that Foucault’s understanding of power, knowledge, and their relation to discourse in the historical analysis of sexuality is as useful when applied to non-Western contexts as it is to the Western context. Let me conclude by returning to one of the most contentious tasks that has preoccupied historians of Western sexuality for decades, arguably even to this date—situating the emergence of a homosexual identity in its proper historical and technical context. But this time, let us put aside the historiographical debate as framed around the West, and reflect on the global dynamics of sexual knowledge by shifting our focus to somewhere on the other side of the world, the home to one of the oldest civilizations in human history: China.

Previous studies have tended to stress the eugenics agenda behind the importation of Western sexology in China during the Republican period (1912-1949). This interpretation had led a number of scholars to conclude that the emergence of the concept of *tongxing lian’ai* (“same-sex love/desire”) immediately after the fall of empire did not produce the same kind of social effect that Foucauldians have identified for the history of sexuality in the West. In his groundbreaking but brief overview of sex and medical science in early Republican China, Frank

Dikötter argues that “Where a multiplication of ‘sexualities’ occurred in European sexology, particularly in the work of Freud and his followers, modernizing élites in China on the contrary reduced all sexual practices to the expression of one ‘natural’ desire for heterogeneity. Instead of attributing social prejudice and official hostility towards homosexuals in twentieth-century China to an ‘importation of Western intolerance’—a simplistic and naïve interpretation put forward by Bret Hinsch—the strong conceptual link between sex and reproduction was precisely what impeded the recognition that ‘homosexuality’ was more than a nonprocreative act.”¹⁶ For Dikötter, precisely because Chinese modernizing élites could never dissociate sex from procreation, “most of the literature in Republican China remained entirely independent from the sexological inquiries into ‘perversions’ which became widespread in European medical circles,” and homosexuality “was represented as a socially acquired vice which discipline should overcome for the sake of the self, the married couple and the nation.”¹⁷

In her more nuanced study of the changing social meaning and significance of female same-sex relations in modern Chinese history, Tze-lan D. Sang criticizes Dikötter for “overlook[ing] the intellectual debate over same-sex relations that occurred during the May Fourth era (1915-27),” the historical period in which the topic of another presentation at this conference, delivered by Leon Rocha, is situated.¹⁸ But in some ways, Sang’s analysis of Chinese intellectuals’ translation of Western sexological texts seems to support Dikötter’s claim that no similar tendency to “individualize” homosexuality took place in Republican China. In the context of the May Fourth era, “*tongxing ai* [“same-sex love”],” writes Sang, “is primarily signified as a modality of love or an intersubjective rapport rather than as a category of personhood, that is, an identity.”¹⁹ This effect, according to Sang, exemplifies a powerful system “deploying sexuality...as social control in modernizing China.”²⁰

Most recently, in his study of Chinese male same-sex relations in the first half of the twentieth century, Wenqing Kang draws a similar conclusion:

Chinese intellectuals, influenced by social Darwinist evolutionary thinking, were concerned about the danger that Chinese people might become extinct. They introduced Western sexological understandings of male same-sex relations in order to reform society and strengthen the nation. Whereas in the West, homosexuality was pathologized as social deviance through sexological knowledge and thus reduced to an individual psychological problem, in China sexology as a form of modern knowledge was used to diagnose social and national problems. No medical institution was founded to treat homosexuals during this period, and sexological knowledge remained in the domain of public opinion and scholarly works. In the process of introducing Western sexology to China, male same-sex relations were stigmatized as a disruptive social deviance rather than a personal medical condition.²¹

Through the eugenics lens, Dikötter, Sang, and Kang all agree that the transmission of sexological knowledge in Republican China did not result in a medicalized and individualized notion of “homosexual identity,” which many historians of Western sexuality have described as the increasingly dominant paradigm for conceptualizing same-sex desire across Europe and North America since the late nineteenth century. Instead, Dikötter, Sang, and Kang have all argued that homosexuality in early twentieth-century China was conceived more in terms of a social problem, one that modernizing elites thought could be “fixed” with the technology of eugenics. But I think we would get a picture that is decidedly different, and perhaps more interesting, if we move beyond the eugenics perspective, which most of the existing secondary literature have adopted by giving the famous Chinese eugenicist Pan Guandan the spotlight of analysis. Without assuming nation-state building as the most immediate backdrop, we could make even larger claims about the epistemic foundations of non-Western sexuality by actually going inside the “*Scientia Sexualis*” to probe the multiplicative and diverse dimensions of the science and medicine of sex in twentieth-century China.

Indeed, based on my own research, I disagree with Dikötter, Sang, and Kang’s

interpretations of the social consequences of the appropriation of sexological knowledge in Republican China. To give just one stellar example here, the circulation of the journal *Sex Science* in the second half of the 1930s has thus far completely escaped the attention of historians of sexuality and science in modern China. Although many of the articles published in the journal were actually translations of texts written by foreign scientific and medical experts, the mere existence of the journal nonetheless indicates the seriousness of those Republican Chinese researchers who tried to organize and consolidate a discipline of sexual science (or sexology) among themselves. In fact, the editors of the journal even devoted special issues to particular themes such as “sex endocrinology,”²² “homosexual love,”²³ and “sex techniques.”²⁴ In the special issue on “homosexual love,” questions concerning whether homosexuality could be acquired, cured, prevented, or arise from intimate relations with same-sex classmates were all discussed in detail.²⁵ The editors even included an article that featured a focused discussion on female homosexuality.²⁶ Therefore, far from being confined to pure intellectual debates about broader social and national problems, as suggested by Sang and Kang, homosexuality in Republican China was in and of itself treated as a serious topic of empirical investigation by those who claimed for themselves expertise in the scientific study of human sexuality. Dikötter’s interpretation of how Chinese medical experts failed to grasp the Western idea of homosexuality is apparently also incorrect. Most importantly, commentators repeatedly used the label *tongxing aizhe* (“persons of same-sex love”) for both men and women, and some even associated these individuals with neuropathic disorders.

Therefore, the discourse of “Scientia Sexualis” in early twentieth-century China bears striking similarities to that of late nineteenth-century Europe, although their differences, of course, need to be teased out more carefully. But before then, my principal aim here has been to

invite historians of sexuality, science, and modern East Asia to take the development of Chinese “Scientia Sexualis” more seriously on their own terms. According to Gregory Pflugfelder’s classic study of Japanese male same-sex sexuality from the seventeenth to the twentieth century, the first half of the twentieth century was characterized by what he calls the “medico-scientific” or “sexological” paradigm of male-male sexuality, which replaced the “disciplinary” paradigm of the Edo period (1600-1868) and the “civilized” paradigm of the Meiji period (1868-1912).²⁷ In some ways, then, my insistence on a deep examination of the Republican Chinese discourse of “Scientia Sexualis” thus complements Pflugfelder’s study remarkably well, especially in terms of our periodization.

Yet, precisely because Pflugfelder’s analysis completely avoids discussing the timing of the emergence of a modern homosexual identity in Japan, I am compelled here to make and defend an even bolder, albeit perhaps premature and overly crude, claim: namely, that what had already happened in the Western world before the dawn of the twentieth-century—namely, the emergence of a homosexual identity through a “reverse discourse” of medical sexology—took on a particular significance in the East Asian context a few decades later. The two parallel epistemic turning points—one around the late nineteenth century for the European context and another around the early twentieth century for the East Asian context—that this simple model of “technological transfer” identifies, nonetheless, should at least be a valuable point of departure for thinking about the comparative historical processes of sexuality and the global life of its epistemic circulation.

¹ Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990); Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (1976; New York: Vintage Books, 1990).

² Richard v. Krafft-Ebing, *Psychopathia Sexualis, with Especial Reference to Contrary Sexual Instinct: A Medico-Legal Study*, 7th ed., trans. Charles Gilbert Chaddock (1886; Philadelphia: F. A. Davis, 1892), 185-186 (emphasis added).

³ Albert Moll, *Perversions of the Sex Instinct: A Study of Sexual Inversion*, trans. Maurice Popkin (1891; Newark: Julian, 1931), 17.

⁴ Karl Heinrich Ulrichs, *The Riddle of 'Man-Manly' Love*, trans. Michael A. Lombardi-Nash, vol. 1 (1863-74; New York: Prometheus Books, 1994), 58.

⁵ The remainder of this section of the paper draws on my paper, "Historicizing the Emergence of Sexual Freedom: The Medical Knowledge of Psychiatry and the Scientific Power of Sexology, 1880-1920," paper presented at the 80th Annual Meeting of the American Association for the History of Medicine, May 2007.

⁶ Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, 95 and 101.

⁷ John Money, "Hermaphroditism, Gender, and Precocity in Hyperadrenocorticism," *Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital* 96 (1955): 254, 258.

⁸ Ralph R. Greenson, "On Homosexuality and Gender Identity," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 45 (1964): 217.

⁹ Robert J. Stoller, "A Contribution to the Study of Gender Identity," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 45 (1964): 220-226.

¹⁰ The remainder of this section draws on my paper, "Effecting Science, Affecting Medicine: Homosexuality, the Kinsey Reports, and the Contested Boundaries of Psychopathology in the United States, 1945-1965," paper presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the History of Science Society, November 2006.

¹¹ John D'Emilio, "The Homosexual Menace: The Politics of Sexuality in Cold War America," in *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, eds. Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), 226-40; Estelle Freedman, "'Uncontrolled Desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960," in *Passion and Power*, eds. Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons, 199-225.

¹² Alfred Kinsey, Wardell Pomeroy, and Clyde Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1948); Alfred Kinsey, Wardell Pomeroy, Clyde Martin, and Paul Gebhard, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female* (Philadelphia: Saunders, 1953).

¹³ For the psychiatrists and psychoanalysts' criticisms of Kinsey's work, see, for example,

Edmund Bergler, "The Myth of a National Disease: Homosexuality and the Kinsey Report," *The Psychiatric Quarterly* 22 (1948): 66-88; Edmund Bergler and William Kroger, *Kinsey's Myth of Female Sexuality: The Medical Facts* (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954); Norman Brill, "A Psychiatric Evaluation of the Kinsey Report," *California Medicine* 80, no. 6 (June 1954): 455-61; Marc Lanval, "The Kinsey Reports," *International Journal of Sexology* 7, no. 2 (Nov 1953): 88-90.

¹⁴ David M. Levy, "Clinical and Psychoanalytic Approach: Discussion I," in *Psychosexual Development in Health and Disease: The Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the American Psychopathological Association, held in New York City, June 1948*, eds. Paul Hoch and Joseph Zubin (New York: Grune & Stratton, 1949), 205.

¹⁵ Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 65.

¹⁶ Frank Dikötter, *Sex, Culture, and Modernity in China: Medical Science and the Construction of Sexual Identities in the Early Republican Period* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1995), 145.

¹⁷ Dikötter, *Sex, Culture, and Modernity*, 143, 141.

¹⁸ Tze-lan Deborah Sang, *The Emerging Lesbian: Female Same-Sex Desire in Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 99-100.

¹⁹ Sang, *The Emerging Lesbian*, 118.

²⁰ Sang, *The Emerging Lesbian*, 7.

²¹ Wenqing Kang, "Male Same-Sex Relations in China, 1900-1950" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz, 2006), 70-71.

²² *Xing Kexue* [Sex Science] 2, no. 3 (October 1936).

²³ *Xing Kexue* 2, no. 4 (November 1936).

²⁴ *Xing Kexue* 3, no. 2-3 (March 1937).

²⁵ "Jiachong huo xide de tongxing ai tezhi," *Xing Kexue* 2, no. 4 (1936): 9-11; "Zhenzheng tongxing ai keyi zhiliao ma?" *Xing Kexue* 2, no. 4 (1936): 4-8; "Tongxing ai yanjiu he fangzhi," *Xing Kexue* 2, no. 4 (1936): 15-26; "Xuesheng jian tongxing ai yu fumu shizhang de jianyu," *Xing Kexue* 2, no. 4 (1936): 2-4.

²⁶ "Nuxing de tongxing ai he xing de biantai," *Xing Kexue* 2, no. 4 (1936): 13-15.

²⁷ Gregory M. Pflugfelder, *Cartographies of Desire: Male-Male Sexuality in Japanese Discourse, 1600-1950* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).