

## Book Reviews

therapeutics. He even hypnotized guests as a party trick, drawing criticism from his more orthodox colleagues.

Of course, Krafft-Ebing continues to be known, not for his asylum and clinic practice, but for his work with sexual “perverts” and the multiple editions of his *Psychopathia sexualis*, new editions of which have continued to appear with some regularity in a multitude of languages even in the decades since his death. One enterprising American publisher produced an edition, appropriately enough in 1969, that was explicitly advertised as pornography, a recital, it would appear, “of unnatural sex practices, weird auto-erotic methods, sex-lust-torture—much, much more”. But as Oosterhuis dryly comments, “Today, fully three decades after the sexual revolution of the 1960s, it is difficult to imagine that *Psychopathia Sexualis* is still read because of its titillating qualities” (p. 278).

Once seen as a daring explorer of the sexual underworld of late-nineteenth-century society, in our time a chorus of Foucaultians and Szaszians (echoed in a more minor key, oddly enough, by their fierce critic, Edward Shorter) has more recently condemned Krafft-Ebing as anything but a progressive in the struggle against sexual repression. For such scholars, on the contrary, Krafft-Ebing has been the purveyor of a new medical disciplinary power, a “biopower” devoted to repressing and “controlling the free and easy pleasures of the body” (p. 7). It is a set of views against which Oosterhuis issues a sharp and closely reasoned dissent, which he buttresses with a careful analysis of Krafft-Ebing’s relationships with his patients and correspondents. Just as it will not do to reduce Krafft-Ebing to a simple stick figure who embodies the stock materialist impulses of late-nineteenth-century psychiatry, so, Oosterhuis asserts, it will not do to see him as just a closet manipulator, the propagator of new and more subtle schemes of social control.

Oosterhuis has produced a fine piece of scholarship. His book deserves a wide readership.

**Andrew Scull,**  
University of California, San Diego

**Henry L. Minton,** *Departing from deviance: a history of homosexual rights and emancipatory science in America*, University of Chicago Press, 2002, pp. xi, 344, US\$65.00 (hardback 0-226-53043-4), US\$20.00 (paperback 0-226-53044-2).

For some time now, the academic world has been waiting for a book that looks at sexual science without suggesting that all the participants were evil men out to spurn homosexuals. This moment has arrived with Henry Minton’s *Departing from deviancy*. Of course other texts, such as Harry Oosterhuis’s *Stepchildren of nature* (Chicago University Press, 2000), have argued that not all sexologists were anti-homosexual, but a vast number of books on American sexology have certainly assumed that scientists who dared to speak about “sexual perversions” were necessarily trying to protect white patriarchy from such pathological individuals. What this unsophisticated view neglects is that homosexuals and other so-called “perverts” actually engaged with sexologists in order to construct medical knowledge about “perversions”, that many sexologists (such as Havelock Ellis, Magnus Hirschfeld, Iwan Bloch, etc.)—unlike psychoanalysts—actually had a reform agenda and wanted to change the laws which incarcerated people for acting upon their sexual desires for people of the same sex (and other sex crimes), and that many sexologists held that the “perversions” were natural, that they existed in other cultures and in other epochs, so should not be illegal. It is too much to assume that these same “homosexual-friendly” sexologists would not also hold some ideas about women, race, and sexuality which do not meet today’s politically-correct criteria—but that should come as no surprise to any historian. Nevertheless, it is only recently that such a revision of the story of sexology as some kind of evil conspiracy out to “get” homosexuals has been proposed. Minton’s *Departing from deviancy* is an important part of this account.

Minton’s book offers us the clearest indication that homosexuals took an active role in the construction of scientific knowledge about homosexuality. Initially, as Oosterhuis showed

## Book Reviews

in the case of Richard von Krafft-Ebing, it was by writing to sexologists with descriptions of sexual behaviour that challenged pathological interpretations. Other sexologists, such as Hirschfeld, were gay themselves, and so projected relatively positive images of homosexuality. This “gay-liberation” trend continued throughout the history of scientific writing about homosexuality. Either the participants in the research were themselves homosexual, such as Jan Gay, Alfred Gross, or Thomas Painter, or researchers such as Alfred Kinsey and Evelyn Hooker linked into networks of homosexuals who supported the research that would present homosexuality in a more positive light. For the bulk of the pre-Hooker/pre-Kinsey work this involved using a psychiatric or medical model of homosexuality, and one of the achievements of Minton’s study is to show that there was a concerted effort to overthrow this model, not just by homosexuals themselves, but also by psychiatrists who wanted homosexuality removed as a category from the American Psychiatric Association’s *Diagnostic and statistical manual*, something which happened in 1973 after pressure from gay psychiatrists and other activists. This change was necessary; there were problems with the medical model. Homosexuality was represented as an immature sexual expression, especially in the American psychiatric world dominated by psychoanalysis. But research emerged within psychological and sexological studies showing that it was not uncommon, that it was not necessarily linked to prostitution, and that homosexuals were not necessarily unhappy or criminal. This research had a strong emancipatory aspect that Minton makes clear in his book. Much current work critical of sexology has not focused on these challenges to the medical model both in and outside psychiatry, but rather has framed itself in a neo-Foucaultian way, showing how doctors had the power to pathologize “perverts”, and as such has missed many subtle points that Minton and Oosterhuis have brought to the fore.

Minton’s book is the best survey to date of medical opinions about homosexuality in America between 1900 and 1973. There still could have been more about the early sexologists,

as many of the ideas employed by later scientists—such as using non-psychiatric, non-legal cases to demonstrate that not all homosexuals were criminal or mad—already existed in non-American sex psychology. There is also excessive attention paid to Thomas Painter, whose hitherto unstudied biography dominates the text. Nevertheless, the book is an important contribution to the history of sexology.

Ivan Crozier,

The Wellcome Trust Centre for  
the History of Medicine at UCL

**Roy Porter**, *Bodies politic: disease, death and doctors in Britain 1650–1900*, London, Reaktion Books, 2001, pp. 328, 137 illus., £25.00 (hardback 0-8014-3953-1).

In *Bodies politic*, the late Roy Porter returned to the heterogeneous nature of medicine in the early modern period but added a new dimension, suggesting that historians should not be too quick to dismiss what visual images can say about the past. *Bodies politic* is not a book with glossy illustrations added, but an erudite and entertaining study that seeks to ask questions about the meanings behind the representations of the body and medicine and what symbolic significance they possessed in the period 1650 to 1900. The theme of representation holds *Bodies politic* together. Although the aim to explore these meanings is not always successfully achieved—some of the images are taken at face value—and the range of visual sources is limited, in investigating the interplay between the visual and the written as it portrayed the corporal and the medical, Porter’s narrative interweaves literary and pictorial evidence from across the period. In doing so, it draws together different strands in the history of medicine to examine the metaphorical commentary the body and healing supplied on the worlds of politics and the body politic in post-Reformation England. The principal focus, however, is on the years when Hogarth, Gillray and Rowlandson along with numerous novelists, social commentators and poets, were producing an