Beyond the Depathologization of Homosexuality: Reframing Evelyn Hooker as a Boundary Shifter in Twentieth-Century US Sex Research

STEPHEN MOLLDREM
University of California, Irvine

Evelyn Hooker (1907–96) was a psychologist best known for a 1957 paper that showed no statistically significant differences between what she characterized as the "adjustment" of thirty homosexual men and thirty heterosexual men drawn from nonclinical samples who "on the surface at least, seemed to have average adjustment."[1] That landmark study, titled "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual" and published in the *Journal of Projective Techniques*, played a key role in laying the foundation for the removal of homosexuality from the American Psychiatric Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (*DSM*) in 1973.[2]

For their feedback and support in bringing this article to publication I thank Alexandra Minna Stern, Tom Boellstorff, David M. Halperin, Gayle S. Rubin, Scott De Orio, Rostom Mesli, Kai Mishuris, Esther Newton, Kris Klein Hernandez, Kate O'Connor, Anthony K J Smith, Jean Hardy, Roderic Crooks, Patrick Grzanka, Trevor Pinch, Andrew Jensen, Annette Timm, the anonymous reviewers, the University of Michigan Doing Queer Studies Now Rackham Interdisciplinary Workshop, and the late Joseph M. Carrier. I also thank the archival staff at UCLA Library Special Collections, the ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives at the University of Southern California, and the Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan. A portion of the research was funded by the University of Michigan Rackham Graduate School.

[1] Evelyn Hooker, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 21, no. 1 (March 1957): 18–31, quote at 18.

[2] For three key examples of scholarship that discuss the role of Hooker's work in the removal of homosexuality from the DSM and that are emblematic of what I call the "great depathologizer" narrative, see Ronald Bayer, *Homosexuality and American Psychiatry: The Politics of Diagnosis* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981), 49–54, 118; Henry L. Minton, *Departing from Deviance: A History of Homosexual Rights and Emancipatory Science in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 219–42; Katherine A. Hubbard, *Queer Ink: A Blotted History towards Liberation* (New York: Routledge, 2019), 48–53. See also this article by Daniel Noam Warner, which offers an example of the great depathologizer narrative from within psychology: "Towards a Queer Research Methodology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 1, no. 4 (January 2004): 321–37.

Journal of the History of Sexuality, Vol. 30, no. 1, January 2021

DOI: 10.7560/JHS30103

Historians and other scholars who have written about Hooker's contributions have overwhelmingly emphasized this effect of her work—a tendency that Hooker herself promoted and that I call the "great depathologizer" narrative.[3]

Hooker's contributions to the depathologization of homosexuality in psychiatry and psychology are undeniably her most enduring influence on sexual science and clinical practice. However, in this essay I will show that limiting the historical understanding of Hooker primarily to her clinical contributions has had the unfortunate effect of overlooking her direct influence on the development of then-novel approaches to the study of sexuality in social scientific disciplines such as sociology and anthropology from the 1950s until the late 1970s. I will further show that the tendency to characterize Hooker as the great depathologizer of homosexuality glosses over substantive transformations and oscillations in her own conceptualization of the origins and causes of human sexual identifications from the 1950s until her death in 1996. I will also demonstrate that the extant historiography has obscured how Hooker's most influential clinical work from the 1950s was also deeply influenced by sociological research and social psychology that was published from the 1930s to the 1950s, including the then-emergent Chicago school of sociology and the sociology of deviance.[4]

I thus offer a different view of Hooker—one in which she appears not only as someone who contributed to the depathologization of homosexuality in psychiatry and psychology but also as a more complex figure whose contributions to the study of sexuality in the clinical and social sciences also went beyond the depathologization of homosexuality.

I draw on over fifteen hundred pictures of archival material that I took on a research trip to Los Angeles in the summer of 2014. I also viewed or

[3] See Evelyn Hooker, "Reflections of a 40-Year Exploration," *American Psychologist* 48, no. 4 (April 1993): 450–53.

[4] For a discussion of the "Chicago school" not as a coherent "school of thought" but as "a vigorous and energetic school of activity, a group of sociologists who collaborated in the day-to-day work of making sociology" that focused on urban sociology and socially marginalized groups, see Howard S. Becker, "The Chicago School, So-Called," *Qualitative Sociology* 22, no. 1 (1999): 3–12. On the Chicago school's impact on early sexuality research, see Chad Heap, "The City as a Sexual Laboratory: The Queer Heritage of the Chicago School," *Qualitative Sociology* 26, no. 4 (Winter 2003): 457–87. On sexuality studies within the sociology of deviance, a movement that partly emerged from the Chicago school and focused on developing sociological explanations for the formation of subcultures and marginalized subjectivities, see Gayle Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures: Excavating the Ethnography of Gay Communities in Urban North America," in *Deviations: A Gayle Rubin Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011), 314–44, where Hooker is mentioned on 322–24. On the Chicago school, sexuality, gender, and its legacies of racism, see Roderick A. Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*, Critical American Studies Series (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 31–53. For a brief discussion of Hooker as a contributor to deviance scholarship, see Heather Love, "Doing Being Deviant: Deviance Studies, Description, and the Queer Ordinary," *differences* 26, no. 1 (January 2015): 79–81.

listened to a number of video and audio recordings held in the archives. These materials come from Hooker's papers, the Judd Marmor Papers, and several other collections held at University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Library Special Collections. I also draw from collections held at the ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives at the University of Southern California Libraries, including the Joseph M. Carrier Papers, the Betty Burzon Papers, the Adele Starr Collection, the Jim Kepner Papers, the Laud Humphreys Papers, ONE Incorporated bulk records, several subject files, and a selection of relevant unprocessed archival material. I also consulted several relevant collections at the Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan and utilized the University of Michigan Library's extensive holdings to retrieve and scan the front matter and main body text pages of key journals and several rare books, conference proceedings, and manuscripts where Hooker was published. I also present close readings of Hooker's publications from 1955 onward, along with descriptions of how a range of clinical and nonclinical researchers cited Hooker and used her work in their scholarship from the 1950s onward.

To assemble and analyze these materials, I employed an approach from the history of sexology that anthropologist Gayle Rubin calls "excavation," which combines archival research and bibliographic reconstruction.[5] I also use the method of "historical epistemology" from philosopher of science and historian of sexuality Arnold I. Davidson and the concept of a "boundary shifter" from the work of science and technology studies scholars Trevor Pinch and Frank Trocco—frameworks that I describe at greater length in subsequent sections.[6] Employing these approaches, I reconstruct Hooker's career and contributions as I have described. I demonstrate that she was influenced by social scientists in constructing her clinical studies in the 1950s and that during the 1960s and 1970s she had substantial impact on researchers who helped lay the groundwork for the emergence of the social constructionist thesis in sexuality research that would become dominant in the social sciences and humanities during the late 1970s and early 1980s. I then show how, starting in the 1980s, Hooker's impact on social scientific epistemologies and methods was largely downplayed in favor of a more one-dimensional view of Hooker as the great depathologizer of homosexuality.

[5] Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 311–12; Gayle Rubin, "Geologies of Queer Studies: It's Deja Vu All Over Again," in *Deviations*, 353–54.

[6] Arnold I. Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality: Historical Epistemology and the Formation of Concepts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 1–92, 192–208; Trevor J. Pinch and Frank Trocco, *Analog Days: The Invention and Impact of the Moog Synthesizer* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 313–14; Trevor Pinch, "Technology and Institutions: Living in a Material World," *Theory and Society* 37, no. 5 (October 2008), 478–79.

Biography, Extant Historiography, and a Reconceptualization of Hooker as a "Boundary Shifter"

Hooker (née Gentry) was trained as a behavioral psychologist at the University of Colorado, Boulder (where she received her bachelor's and master's degrees) and Johns Hopkins University (where she received her PhD). She held several nontenured appointments at UCLA, beginning in 1939.[7] Her student Sam From introduced her to gay male life in 1943 and convinced her to study homosexuality. He also introduced Hooker to the Mattachine Society, an early homophile activist group, and to gay men in the Los Angeles literary and art scenes. Hooker received a National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) grant to study male homosexuals in 1953. This was renewed until 1961, when she received an ongoing NIMH Career Research Grant. During the 1950s, Hooker primarily employed clinical methods using projective tests such as the Rorschach inkblot test and other instruments. In the 1960s, however, she shifted her primary focus to ethnography and in-depth interviews with gay men. In 1967 Hooker was also tapped to chair the interdisciplinary NIMH Task Force on Homosexuality.[8] She would suffer a breakdown in 1969 in the lead-up to the completion and release of the task force's final report later that year.[9] She then retired from research and went into clinical practice focused on providing therapy

[7] Information about Hooker's life in this paragraph is drawn from the following sources: Richard Schmiechen, *Changing Our Minds: The Story of Dr. Evelyn Hooker*, DVD (Frameline, 1992); Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 219–64; Andrew M. Boxer and Joseph M. Carrier, "Evelyn Hooker," *Journal of Homosexuality* 36, no. 1 (1998): 1–17; David W. Dunlap, "Evelyn Hooker, 89, Is Dead; Recast the View of Gay Men," *New York Times*, November 22, 1996, sec. D; Douglas C. Kimmel and Linda D. Garnets, "What a Light It Shed: The Life of Evelyn Hooker," in *Psychological Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Experiences* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 31–49; Marcus, "The Psychologist"; Judd Marmor, "Evelyn Hooker—In Memoriam," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 26, no. 5 (1997): 577–78; Oliver Myrna, "Evelyn Hooker; Her Study Fueled Gay Liberation," *Los Angeles Times*, November 22, 1996; Edwin S. Schneidman, "Evelyn Hooker," *American Psychologist* 53, no. 4 (April 1998): 480–81.

[8] NIMH Task Force on Homosexuality, "National Institute of Mental Health Task Force on Homosexuality: Final Report and Background Papers" (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1972), iii–10.

[9] Hooker was treated at Cedars-Sinai Hospital in Los Angeles by her colleague, psychiatrist Judd Marmor. Marmor was also Hooker's friend, was deeply involved in the removal of homosexuality from the *DSM*, and served as president of the APA. See Bayer, *Homosexuality*, 60–64, 110–54, 155–78. See also Marmor, "Evelyn Hooker—In Memoriam," 577–78; and Marmor's eulogy at Evelyn Hooker's funeral on December 20, 1996, folder 1, box 1, Judd Marmor Papers, UCLA Library Special Collections. Hooker's friend Christopher Isherwood would write in his diaries about how the breakdown affected their relationship; see Christopher Isherwood, *Diaries: Volume 3, Liberation, 1970–1983*, ed. Don Bachardy, 1st American ed. (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 2010), 126. Hooker would later acknowledge this episode in at least one public address. She thanked Marmor for his care and for prescribing her lithium, the benefits of which she extolled and which she continued to take until at least 1983. See video of Evelyn Hooker giving a speech to the ONE Institute on December 20, 1983, minute 44, ONE Archives Bulk Collections.

to gay and lesbian patients. During this period, she also advised graduate students, spoke widely, received many awards, and supported a range of gay and lesbian causes until her death in 1996.[10]

The dominant tendency in both scholarly and popular writing about Hooker has been to concentrate on the impact of her research on clinical psychology and psychiatry. This has led to a one-dimensional interpretation of her conceptualization of the origins and causes of human sexual identifications. While Hooker always maintained her position that homosexuality was not an illness, she published and expressed a variety of conflicting perspectives about the origins and causes of homosexuality from 1955 to 1996. She expressed views that ranged from early and prescient forms of social constructionism in the 1950s, to tepidly positive assessments of theories popularized in the 1960s that argued that homosexual "etiology" (a framework that assumes pathology) was partly rooted in parental relations, to more mixed views on the question of causation in the 1970s and 1980s, before ultimately ending with an embrace of genetic determinist theories of homosexual causation in the mid-1990s.[11]

In addition to glossing over these transformations in Hooker's thought, the great depathologizer narrative downplays how her cross-disciplinary engagements with researchers in clinical and nonclinical disciplines from the 1950s to the 1990s shaped her thought and flattens historical understandings of how she influenced the development of sex research outside of clinical disciplines. By demonstrating that Hooker's conceptualizations of homosexuality changed over time and that she was in dialogue with a wide and highly interdisciplinary range of scholars from the social, behavioral, and clinical sciences—as well as with gay writers, artists, and activists, many of whom were her friends and research subjects—I offer a more robust interpretation of her approach to the study of homosexuality and human sexuality, of how she conceptualized homosexuality in different periods, and of her overall contributions to science and sexual knowledge.

Drawing on Pinch and Trocco, I will problematize the great depathologizer narrative and reframe Hooker as a specific kind of historical actor that they call a "boundary shifter."[12] According to Pinch, boundary shifters are people who "cross boundaries to produce transformations in institutions" and in doing so alter the discursive and methodological borders that surround the institutions that they traverse and help to change.[13] Deploying anthropologist Victor Turner's notion of liminality, Pinch writes that boundary shifters "work with liminal entities" and are "liminal persons" situated

[10] To view the physical awards she received, see boxes 14 and 15, Evelyn Caldwell Hooker Papers, UCLA Library Special Collections (hereafter ECHP).

[11] Citations for these claims are too numerous to place here. They appear in the sections that follow, where the arguments are elaborated.

[12] For examples of how they used the term, see Pinch and Trocco, *Analog Days*, 313–14; Pinch, "Technology and Institutions," 478–79.

[13] Pinch, "Technology and Institutions," 479; Pinch and Trocco, *Analog Days*, 313–14.

in a mode Turner famously describes as "betwixt and between the positions assigned and arrayed by law, custom, convention, and ceremony."[14]

In Hooker's case, the discipline of psychology was methodologically flexible, thus allowing her to move relatively easily across its subfields of behavioral, clinical, and social psychology and then laterally into fields such as sociology and anthropology. Additionally, research about human sexuality in the mid-twentieth-century United States was not a single coherent field or area of inquiry and can be considered a liminal entity. Sex research existed in a decentralized fashion at research centers, private foundations, individual research agendas, clinics, and other locations but without its own disciplinary formation, departmental structure, or even a dominant field or major annual conference. With relatively few knowledge gatekeepers, sexuality researchers in this period worked from their own individual disciplinary vantage points and developed their own idiosyncratic methodologies. The studies of Alfred Kinsey and his collaborators, which were housed at his Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University and which used in-depth interviews and idiosyncratic practices of taxonomization and quantitation to describe human sexual behavior, are preeminent examples of this phenomenon.[15]

The liminal zone of mid-twentieth-century sex research in the United States both relied on and was fueled by cross-disciplinary exchange. Hooker was an especially liminal person even within this liminal zone. In her papers and in interviews, Hooker would also describe how her gender played a role in allowing her to cultivate specific forms of access to gay male communities.[16] Along with Hooker's overall approach—which involved clear and explicit assurances of confidentiality and long-term trust-building work with gay men—her gender, which had been a major professional disadvantage in her career, was an important factor in her ultimate success and thus her

[14] Pinch, "Technology and Institutions," 479; Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (London: Penguin, 1969), 95.

[15] On Kinsey's methodology, see Alfred C. Kinsey, Wardell Baxter Pomeroy, and Clyde E. Martin, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948; Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 35–154; and Paul A. Robinson, *The Modernization of Sex: Havelock Ellis, Alfred Kinsey, William Masters, and Virginia Johnson* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989), 42–119.

[16] In Schmiechen, *Changing Our Minds*, Hooker describes how her becoming "wise"—gay male slang used in the mid-twentieth-century United States to describe a woman with gay male friends who had been granted access to the gay social world—played a crucial role in opening up her research engagements with gay men. Hooker also describes the role that her gender played in structuring her inquiries into gay male life in a methodological paper from 1963, which discusses the complex role of investigators' gender, age, demeanor vis-à-vis gay male social norms, and assurances of confidentiality in negotiating access to gay male communities for research purposes. See Evelyn Hooker, "Male Homosexuality," in *Taboo Topics*, ed. Norman L. Farberow, Atherton Press Behavioral Science Series (New York: Atherton Press, 1963), 48–50.

enduring influence.[17] Owing to her training, subjectivity, and approach, she was able to act as a boundary shifter who moved between—and functioned as an insider within—many different worlds of artists, activists, social scientists, and clinicians. She helped induce transformations within and across these various social and epistemic lifeworlds, making contributions that go beyond the depathologization of homosexuality.

I will describe how Hooker's position on what "causes" homosexuality shifted from the 1950s to the 1990s. I will pay special attention to how her conceptualization of homosexuality's clinical and/or social origins changed through direct dialogue with scholars in many different fields. From the 1950s to the 1990s, her scholarly interlocutors ranged from experts in clinical disciplines such as psychiatry, endocrinology, and gynecology to those in social and behavioral disciplines such as sociology and anthropology. Hooker has been rightly characterized as a crucial actor in the official depathologization of homosexuality in US psychiatry and psychology, but it will become clear that the overwhelming emphasis on this aspect of her work has foreclosed a more robust understanding of her scholarship, views, and impact. Crucially, I will demonstrate that Hooker's claim in the 1950s that "homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist" can be read as a prescient form of social constructionism—a perspective that would only emerge as a dominant approach in the study of sexuality in the social and behavioral sciences some two decades later, in the late 1970s and early 1980s.[18] However, I will also show how Hooker's position on the question of causation and on homosexuality's status as a personality characteristic that could be identified using clinical instruments oscillated and changed.

I will also complicate the historical understanding of Hooker's initial motivations for questioning arguments about homosexual pathology, which launched her famous clinical studies on this topic in the 1950s. Her openness to the idea that homosexuality might not be pathological has rightly been attributed by historians and herself to her friendships with gay men and her association with homophile activists in the Los Angeles

[17] In addition to the myriad forms of discrimination that women in academia (and women in general) faced in the mid-twentieth-century United States, Hooker describes specific forms of discrimination that she endured. In Schmiechen, *Changing Our Minds*, Hooker describes how the department chair at the University of Colorado, Boulder, would not write her a recommendation to Yale because she was a woman, which is why she attended Johns Hopkins. This is also recounted in APA Staff, "Awards for Distinguished Contribution to Psychology in the Public Interest: Evelyn Hooker," *American Psychologist* 47, no. 4 (April 1992): 502.

[18] Quote from Hooker, "Adjustment," 31. My use of "mentality" as a framework for describing sexual epistemologies that are connected to institutionalized methodological practices is drawn from Arnold I. Davidson, "How to Do the History of Psychoanalysis: A Reading of Freud's Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality," in *The Emergence of Sexuality: Historical Epistemology and the Formation of Concepts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 90–92.

Mattachine Society.[19] However, her engagements with nonclinical sexuality research in some of her less-studied papers from the 1950s make it clear that the grounding insights that shaped her most famous and influential clinical work were indebted not only to her gay friends and research subjects (groups that overlapped) but also to social scientists who were publishing in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. Some of the scholars Hooker drew on, such as Kinsey and anthropologist Margaret Mead, were studying sexuality. However, she also cited scholars from the Chicago school and the sociology of deviance, such as William F. Whyte and Ernest W. Burgess, who were developing frameworks to understand other marginalized or "out" groups, ranging from racial and ethnic minorities to other types of social outcasts and working-class people.

I will show how Hooker translated findings from this early literature in the sociology of deviance to the situation of gay men, thus demonstrating that insights from social science formed a major part of the basis for how Hooker constructed her clinical study that would produce the 1957 "Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual" article in the *Journal of Projective Techniques*, which is credited with laying the groundwork for depathologizing homosexuality in the psychiatric and psychological professions in the United States. I will demonstrate that Hooker's novel—and highly consequential—clinical approach in the 1950s was directly enabled by a combination of her clinical expertise, her personal relationships with gay men, data provided by her research subjects, and her ability to translate social scientific epistemologies into her clinical research methods. It will become clear that the way she crossed and shifted boundaries between academic disciplines and social lifeworlds is at the core of her most influential scholarship and that epistemic frameworks from the sociology of deviance informed her most enduring clinical findings.

In addition to elucidating Hooker's early boundary shifts in the 1950s, I will also show that she directly influenced and/or mentored many prominent social scientists who were studying sexuality in the mid-twentieth century, including sociologists Erving Goffman, Al Reiss, Harold Garfinkel, Mary McIntosh, Kenneth Plummer, Laud Humphreys, and others—all of whom understood Hooker to be a social scientist in her own right, not only a

[19] Schmiechen, *Changing Our Minds*; Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 220–21. An early version of "Adjustment" based on a paper she delivered at the Western Psychological Association was in fact published by the Mattachine Society in the first issues of their journal, the *Mattachine Review*. See Evelyn Hooker, "Inverts Are NOT a Distinct Personality Type," *Mattachine Review*, February 1955, Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan. For an analysis of the relationship of the Mattachine society to gay-friendly psychology and social services, see also James T. Sears, *Behind the Mask of the Mattachine: The Hal Call Chronicles and the Early Movement for Homosexual Emancipation* (New York: Harrington Park Press, 2006), 249; Martin Meeker, "Behind the Mask of Respectability: Reconsidering the Mattachine Society and Male Homophile Practice, 1950s and 1960s," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10, no. 1 (2001): 78–116; Bayer, *Homosexuality*, 73–74.

clinical psychologist. She was interpreted as such because, as I have noted, she stopped employing clinical methods in the 1960s and fully transitioned to using approaches from the social sciences, such as ethnography. It will become clear that Hooker's personal influence and publications were foundational to early studies in the social construction of sexuality in the 1960s and 1970s that would later solidify into a research mentality in the late 1970s and early 1980s.[20]

The reinterpretation I offer thus serves to enhance extant narratives about Hooker that present her primarily as the great depathologizer of homosexuality. These narratives miss the influence of deviance sociology on her clinical work from the 1950s, crucial shifts in her thinking, her turn to social science methods in the 1960s, and the uptake of her research by a wide range of social scientists, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s. Drawing attention to how Hooker's thought evolved in relation to a variety of currents in sexuality research reveals her to have been a more interdisciplinary scholar than previous accounts have revealed, as well as a boundary shifter.

Locating Social Construction and Epistemic Tensions in Evelyn Hooker's Clinical Sexuality Research from the 1950s

In the conclusion of her 1957 article, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual"—the piece that is canonically credited with laying the groundwork for the depathologization of homosexuality in US psychiatry and psychology—Hooker wrote that "homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist. Its forms are as varied as are those of heterosexuality."[21] She wrote that she made this determination "very tentatively" after presenting the statistical analysis of the results from the thirty homosexual and heterosexual men in her sample, data from which were analyzed by three of her colleagues who were experts in projective techniques such as the Rorschach inkblot test and two other lesser-known instruments that she used in these clinical studies, the Make-a-Picture-Story (MAPS) test and the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT).[22] She presented this key finding as one of three "psychological implications of the hypothesis that homosexuality is not necessarily a symptom of pathology."[23] However, it is a substantively different statement to argue that "homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist" than to say that "homosexuality is not necessarily a symptom of pathology," both of which are quotations from the 1957 paper.[24] The former statement

[20] On the notion of scientific mentalities and how they emerge unevenly over time in the history of systems of thought, see Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality*, 90–92.

[21] Hooker, "Adjustment," 30.

[22] These experts were her officemate and editor of the *Journal of Projective Techniques,* Dr. Bruno Klopfer, Dr. Mortimer Meyer, and Dr. Edwin Schneidman, all three of whom were highly regarded experts in the interpretation of results from projective tests. See Hooker, 21.

[23] Hooker, 30.

[24] Hooker, 30.

asserting homosexuality's clinical nonexistence makes clear that—at some point—Hooker believed that homosexuality was not simply a feature or effect of the individual personality and that homosexuality could not be located in the individual personality by using clinical techniques. However, the latter statement about homosexual nonpathology merely expresses the view that homosexuality is not an illness, which leaves open the question of whether homosexuality could potentially be identified within persons using clinical methods such as projective techniques or others. There are crucial conceptual differences between these two positions, with practical consequences for clinical practice, sexual knowledge, and sexual politics. Indeed, disputes over homosexual pathology, nonpathology, cause, innateness, and clinical identifiability have arisen repeatedly throughout the history of sexology and social movements aimed at advancing the rights and well-being of sexually marginalized people and communities, including in debates over the depathologization of homosexuality in the United States.[25]

Since the nineteenth century, there has been a general tendency across many different progressive tendencies in sex research to take the position that homosexuality is clinically identifiable but not pathological.[26] Hooker occasionally adopted this position even in the late 1950s, directly contradicting her 1957 statement that "homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist."[27] For example, in a less well known 1958 article for the *Journal of Projective Techniques* titled "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach," she claimed that "*some kinds of homosexual records can be distinguished with certainty*" using standard Rorschach interpretation protocols, even using the language of "diagnose" in reference to uses of the Rorschach to identify homosexual cases where the sexual orientation was not disclosed to the psychologist or psychiatrist interpreting the record.[28] In the 1950s, projective tests like the Rorschach were often used to diagnose or identify homosexuality, which the vast majority of practitioners during this period understood to be pathological and a totalizing feature of the individual personality, with the singular and stereotyped figure of "the homosexual" often being invoked by clinical researchers and practitioners.[29] This reflects

[25] Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 219–64.

[26] For two discussions of researchers working with very different methods and in two different periods who took the view that homosexuality was a clinically identifiable variation but not necessarily an illness or pathology, see James D. Steakley, "Per Sciantiam Ad Justitiam: Magnus Hirschfeld and the Sexual Politics of Innate Homosexuality," in *Science and Homosexualities*, ed. Vernon A. Rosario (New York: Routledge, 1997), 133–54; Elizabeth A. Wilson, "Hypothalamic Preference: LeVay's Study of Sexual Orientation," in *The Routledge Queer Studies Reader*, ed. Donald E. Hall et al. (New York: Routledge, 2013), 498–512.

[27] Hooker, "Adjustment," 30.

[28] Evelyn Hooker, "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 22, no. 1 (March 1958): 51–52. The emphasis in the text is Hooker's.

[29] There is an emergent history about issues at the intersection of projective testing, sex research, and gay and lesbian politics. See especially Peter Hegarty, "Homosexual Signs and Heterosexual Silences: Rorschach Research on Male Homosexuality from 1921 to 1969,"

the classic psychiatric formulation of the homosexual as species that Michel Foucault famously elucidated in volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality*, which was the underlying epistemology that Hooker sought to scrutinize and ultimately to undermine.[30] It is therefore not surprising that Hooker opted to use the Rorschach and other projective tests to investigate whether homosexuality was inherently pathological, nor is it surprising that—in the 1950s—she would fall back into the language of diagnosis to discuss the very object (homosexuality) that she was trying to argue "does not exist" in the clinical sense.[31] By using recognized clinical instruments to undermine the diagnostic category of homosexuality, she was critiquing the epistemological apparatus of psychiatry and psychology from within the discipline itself. This gave her findings weight and authority among clinicians that protocols used by other prominent nonclinical sexologists working in this period—such as Kinsey, sociologist Wardell Pomeroy, anthropologist Margaret Mead, anthropologist Clellan Ford, and ethologist Frank Beach—simply could not because they were not psychologists or psychiatrists. However, Hooker clearly did not hold to her most radical claim about the clinical nonexistence of homosexuality.

Despite Hooker's efforts to undermine the idea that "the homosexual" existed as a discrete pathological personality type or that "homosexuality" existed as a clinically identifiable entity, she maintained an inconsistently articulated interest in the etiology of homosexuality and theories of what caused homosexuality. Beyond her clinical papers from the 1950s, her position shifted on the question of homosexuality's clinical identifiability and the etiology or causes of homosexuality from the early 1960s until her death in 1996. For example, in a 1969 paper she wrote approvingly of a study by psychologist Ray B. Evans, arguing that the results were "a partial confirmation of the Bieber assumption about causal relation between parental relations in early childhood and adult homosexuality" and that "In my view, Evans is overly cautious in his assertion that his findings neither confirm nor refute the etiological role of parent-child relations as one set of many variables influencing or causing homosexuality in adult life" before encouraging further research in this area, in part to identify other potentially causal variables.[32] In that paper, she also noted that she was "in complete agreement with Evans about potential genetic or other etiological

Journal of the History of Sexuality 12, no. 3 (2003): 400–423; Katherine Hubbard and Peter Hegarty, "Blots and All: A History of the Rorschach Ink Blot Test in Britain," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 52, no. 2 (April 2016): 146–66; Hubbard, *Queer Ink*, 23–46.

[30] Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, trans. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 42–44.

[31] Hooker, "Adjustment," 18, 30; Hooker, "Rorschach," 33–35.

[32] Evelyn Hooker, "Parental Relations and Male Homosexuality in Patient and Nonpatient Samples," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 33, no. 2 (1969): 141–42.

contributions to a homosexual object choice."[33] Several years later, in a 1975 interview in *Psychology Today*, Hooker demurred on the question of what (in the words of interviewer Paul Chance) "makes a person homosexual," saying in response that "there are lots of ways to get to Pittsburgh, and there are also lots of ways to arrive at a homosexual orientation" before going on to critique dominant models of causality in American psychiatry, including Bieber's parental relations model.[34] In 1983, however, Hooker discussed research on causality in affirmative terms, so long as research did not use the framework of willful "choice."[35] By 1995 Hooker argued in a conversation with psychologist Linda Garnets and Garnets's father that "she believed homosexuality was genetic."[36]

Thus, from the time she started publishing about homosexuality in the 1950s and her death in 1996, Hooker's position on the status of homosexuality as a clinical object shifted uneasily between a belief in its locatability within the individual person ("*some kinds of homosexual records can be distinguished with certainty*" in 1958 ultimately turns into a genetic determinist position by 1995) and a conviction that homosexual identifications were mainly the result of social forces and could not be legitimately discussed as clinical objects ("homosexuality as a clinical entity does not exist" in 1957 transmutes into positive assessments of multifactor "causation" theories for much of her career after 1969). Epistemologically speaking, these positions cannot be reconciled with one another, yet they evidently coexisted within her.

To this point, seriously entertaining the question of what causes homosexuality presupposes homosexuality's clinical identifiability and also that the category of homosexuality is a more-or-less stable object that can be located within the individual personal using clinical techniques, even if pathology is not assumed. Rather than trying to resolve these tensions, I would like to posit that Hooker's various statements about homosexuality's

[33] Hooker, 141. I note for readers unfamiliar with the history of psychology that the psychoanalytic concept of "object choice" is not equivalent to "choice" as a willful act; rather, "object choice" is more closely aligned with the contemporary category of "sexual orientation," although the two concepts are not synonyms. See Sigmund Freud, *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality*, trans. James Strachey (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 10–14; Steven Epstein, "Sexuality and Identity: The Contribution of Object Relations Theory to a Constructionist Sociology," *Theory and Society* 20, no. 6 (1991): 828; Davidson, "How to Do," 78–81.

[34] Paul Chance, "The Facts That Liberated the Gay Community: A Conversation with Evelyn Hooker, Whose Research Helped Make Gay Liberation Possible, about Homosexuality and the Difference between Tolerance and Acceptance," *Psychology Today*, December 1975, 52–55, 101, folder 5, box 1, ECHP.

[35] Speech to the Los Angeles chapter of Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, promoted as a talk by "Dr. Evelyn Hooker, author of the original study which showed 'It's OK to be Gay,'" audiocassette, minute 57, Adele Starr Collection, ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives.

[36] Kimmel and Garnets, "What a Light It Shed," 33.

clinical nonexistence constitute what Davidson calls—in reference to the development of concepts in relation to the emergence and solidification of new scientific mentalities in the history of psychology—"conceptual innovation of the kind . . . that create a form of friction between what could be said and what is said" within particular systems of psychiatric reasoning that exist in specific historical periods.[37]

In other words, in Hooker's 1957 "Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual" and 1958 "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach" papers, her oscillations regarding whether homosexuality (1) clinically exists *at all* or (2) is *a nonpathological personality characteristic that can be identified using clinical methods* such as the Rorschach test, are an expression of the deep and uneven structural changes in method and epistemology that were at work in academic studies of sexuality across the disciplines during the time that she was publishing most actively in the 1950s and 1960s. This tension in these papers shows Hooker wrestling with two conflicting—and ultimately irreconcilable—epistemologies that existed together within her and that emerged from her intellectual milieu in the 1950s: on the one hand, the epistemology of progressive sexology (which often assumed homosexual identifiability but usually not pathology) and, on the other hand, the epistemology of institutional psychology and psychiatry (which assumed homosexual pathology and treated it as a diagnosis and personality type).

In 1957 Hooker was writing before the psychiatric position on homosexual pathology would come under sustained assault by gay and lesbian activists and a new generation of progressive sexologists during the 1960s and 1970s, many of whom Hooker knew. These included researchers who had trained under Kinsey at the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University (particularly social scientists William Simon, John Gagnon, and Paul Gebhard), gynecologist William Masters and his research partner and spouse, Virginia Johnson, psychologist John Money, endocrinologist Harry Benjamin, and psychiatrists Richard Green and Robert Stoller. However, the process of undermining understandings of homosexuality as a singular personality type or diagnostic category was already well under way in the United States during the 1950s, mainly following the publication of Kinsey's research. Indeed, to support her claims about homosexuality in the famous 1957 paper, Hooker cited Ford and Beach's 1951 book *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*, which noted wide variabilities of sexual behavior across human cultures and across species but did not discuss these variations as pathologies.[38] As I describe in more detail below, Hooker—along with Ford and Beach, Mead, Kinsey's group at the Institute for Sex Research, and others working within the Chicago school of sociology—was part of a group of researchers in different disciplines who were engaged in prescient

[37] Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality*, 92.

[38] Hooker, "Adjustment," 30–31. She cites Clellan Stearns Ford and Frank A. Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1951).

styles of proto–social constructionist research on sexual behaviors, identities, and cultures that would lay the groundwork for the eventual emergence of the social constructionist paradigm in sexuality research.[39] Some of these scholars were epistemologically opposed to the notion of homosexual pathology, of its clinical identifiability, or even its existence as a discrete entity.[40] Hooker was uniquely situated as a disciplinary boundary shifter in this terrain, and while she used her clinical training and clinical techniques to affirm the findings of these nonclinical sexological researchers, she also was epistemologically constrained by her investments in clinical psychology, at the root of which questions of diagnosis and treatment would always, to some degree, remain. This epistemic tension would never leave her.

Nonetheless, in her clinical papers that followed the 1957 article, Hooker made a series of statements about uses of projective techniques to identify homosexuality that denaturalized the categories of both homosexuality and heterosexuality. In these papers, which were published between 1958 and 1960, Hooker contends that sexual identifications are primarily the result of social arrangements rather than individual personality characteristics. These statements place her at a far conceptual distance from the psychiatric mentality regarding homosexuality that dominated this period—a mentality that assumed homosexual pathology, clinical identifiability, and the existence of "the homosexual" as a singular personality type.[41] She began to reveal a social constructionist approach that would characterize her work from this point forward, but also continued to show her investment in psychological epistemologies and clinical approaches. For example, in her 1958 article about the Rorschach test, Hooker wrote: "Our research raises as many questions about heterosexuality as it does about homosexuality. . . . The relation of the Rorschach picture to overt behavior depends, as the astute clinician knows, on many complex social variables in the life situation. It is precisely these complex social variables which are frequently ignored in our concepts of homosexuality. . . . Continued use of the Rorschach alone for diagnosis of homosexuality . . . will . . . greatly delay our understanding of a problem which is at least as much 'cultural' as 'clinical.'"[42] In this statement, Hooker displaces the question of how clinicians should identify

[39] Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 310–46.

[40] For a preeminent example of this position from a group of Hooker's contemporaries and interlocutors, see Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin, *Sexual Behavior*, 631–39.

[41] For discussions of this mentality in the United States and the broader history of sexuality, see Abelove, "Freud, Homosexuality," 385; Jennifer Terry, *An American Obsession: Science, Medicine, and Homosexuality in Modern Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 16–28; Arnold I. Davidson, "Closing Up the Corpses," in *The Emergence of Sexuality: Historical Epistemology and the Formation of Concepts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 18–25; David M. Halperin, "How to Do the History of Male Homosexuality," in *How to Do the History of Homosexuality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 130–35.

[42] Hooker, "Rorschach," 52–53.

or address homosexuality. She moves this work partly out of the domain of clinical methods and techniques built to identify personality traits such as the Rorschach instrument and extends it into the realm of inquiring about homosexual patients' social and cultural situations. She argues that practitioners should not limit themselves to the use of clinical tools when working with homosexual patients, instead making the case for greater therapeutic attention to the lives and experiences of patients. In doing this, she also posits that homosexual identifications emerge in persons and cultures through the interplay of social and individual factors rather than mainly or only from personality dynamics.

Hooker built on this perspective in a short paper published in 1959 titled "What Is a Criterion?" in which she similarly disclaimed uses of projective psychological tests to assess, diagnose, or predict homosexuality.[43] In a careful analysis and critique of several papers by psychologists and psychiatrists who assumed homosexual pathology—and while citing Kinsey and her own 1957 paper to support her argument—she insisted that categories of both homosexuality and heterosexuality were primarily social labels and not stable phenomena that could be identified clinically:

> A basic assumption which they have in common is that "the" homosexual exists. . . . I venture to suggest that not only is it too simple but it is not altogether true. . . . We need to get beyond the fact that the individual is homosexual, to the kind of homosexual that he is. We are badly in need of fruitful theory which will take into account the multiplicity of variables which appear to be operating. . . . It will have become evident by this time that I am not greatly disturbed by the fact that projective techniques are not demonstrably valid means for diagnosing homosexuality. In fact I am rather encouraged by this, because I hope it will force us to re-examine the much over-simplified picture we have had and encourage us to remind ourselves that the first goal of science is understanding, with prediction and control as secondary to it.[44]

In addition to being a critique of dominant models of homosexual pathology in psychology and psychiatry, this article was in part an epistemological reflection on the findings that she had already reported in 1957 and 1958. She was at that time, in 1959, attempting to destabilize the categories of homosexuality and heterosexuality, and she insisted that clinicians needed to pay more attention to social variables in responding to the needs of homosexual patients. This was in part because, in her words, "at the risk of stating a self-evident fact, it is apparent to anyone with knowledge of the wide individual variations in homosexual patterns and life styles, as well as

[43] Evelyn Hooker, "What Is a Criterion?," *Journal of Projective Techniques* 3, no. 23 (September 1959): 278–81.

[44] Hooker, 280–81.

to anyone who has looked at projective test protocols or life histories, that homosexuality is not an entity but is, rather, a multifaceted phenomenon."[45] Rather than painting the inability of projective techniques to correctly identify heterosexuality as a shortcoming of the disciplines of psychiatry and psychology, Hooker called upon practitioners to serve their patients by understanding how homosexuality is a complex and many-layered phenomenon shaped by social, cultural, and individual factors. However, in her 1958 paper, "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach," she had argued that "*some kinds of homosexual records can be distinguished with certainty*" using Rorschach protocols (i.e., that homosexuality was, in fact, a kind of clinical entity) but that this did not indicate pathology *unless one assumed that homosexuality was an illness.*[46] I have said that Hooker was working within multiple irreconcilable paradigms in sex research. Her self-contradictions in these clinical papers from the 1950s show her trying to make sense of them.

This epistemic impasse comes through most clearly in a 1960 discussion paper that was a direct response to several papers delivered by psychiatrists and psychologists at a symposium titled "The Prediction of Overt Behavior through the Use of Projective Techniques." In this paper, Hooker denaturalized heterosexuality as the normal or preferred form of human sexuality. Many of the papers in the symposium had described attempts to use projective techniques to identify or diagnose homosexuality in a patient sample and were based on the paired assumptions that heterosexuality was the default sexual orientation and that homosexuality was a personality type–defining illness. Hooker rebuffs this: "We do not know what heterosexuality is—beyond the obvious fact that it involves attraction to opposite-sexed persons. And, further, even if we knew the parameters of heterosexual object-choice, it is an assumption still to be proved that homosexuality is frustrated heterosexuality."[47] Such arguments put her at odds with the prevailing consensus about homosexuality among the overwhelming majority of psychiatrists and psychologists practicing in the United States at that time and moved her from a position of merely depathologizing homosexuality to one that retrospectively appears somewhat radically constructionist. This is because she not only problematizes psychiatric understandings of homosexuality (as pathology) but also, through her questioning of heterosexuality as the default sexuality, takes aim at the grounding epistemology of the modern sexual system.

The social constructionist mentality in sexuality research coalesced into a coherent mentality in the late 1970s and early 1980s around an extended critique of psychiatric and medical models of sexuality. This work was led by scholars in the humanities and social sciences such as Michel Foucault,

[45] Hooker, 280.

[46] Hooker, "Male Homosexuality in the Rorschach," 51.

[47] Evelyn Hooker, "Discussion," in *The Prediction of Overt Behavior through the Use of Projective Techniques*, ed. Molly Harrower (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1960), 83.

sociological historian Jeffrey Weeks, historian John D'Emilio, historian Judith Walkowitz, classicist Robert Padgug, and anthropologist Gayle Rubin.[48] Constructionists maintain that sexual identifications and sexuality itself are produced through a complex array of interlocking social and historical dynamics, possibly but not necessarily along with psychic, bodily, and other forces. They argue that sexuality is not strictly (if at all) the result of biological or psychological drives or other interior forces that are redirected in the process of socialization and individual development.[49] Historians of sexuality have located the origins of this social constructionist paradigm earlier than the late 1970s in fields such as deviance sociology, history, and cultural anthropology.[50] However, many of the conceptual foundations of the social constructionist mentality that came to dominate research on sexuality in the late 1970s and early 1980s were already evident in Evelyn Hooker's clinical papers published from 1957 to 1960. As with Kinsey and his coauthors' chapter "Homosexual Outlet" in *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, where they introduce the idiosyncratic zero-to-six-point scale to measure individuals' degrees of homosexuality or heterosexuality, Hooker's critique was destabilizing the category of homosexuality and taking aim at heterosexuality as the default or preferred sexual orientation.[51] However, she critiqued mid-twentieth-century psychiatry's conceptualization of sexuality as easily separated into "normal" and "abnormal" sexual categories *from within the epistemology of psychology itself* and also rejected the notion that such judgments could be extended to the entire personality of an individual.[52] She instead placed primary therapeutic and clinical emphasis on the homosexual individual's social situation. In addition to depathologizing homosexuality, her method at times constituted a prescient form of social constructionist methodology that not only noted human sexual diversity but also made affirmative claims about the origins of sexual identifications in social arrangements of power that created identifications in relation with the individual personality. However, as I have shown, she would also regularly waver from this position until the end of her life, affirmatively discussing theories of "etiology," "cause," and genetic determinism.

[48] Rubin, "Blood under the Bridge," 396.

[49] For characterizations of this constructionist position, see, for example, Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 310–46; Rubin, "Blood under the Bridge," 396; Heap, "The City," 457–87; Janice M. Irvine, "'The Sociologist as Voyeur': Social Theory and Sexuality Research, 1910–1978," *Qualitative Sociology* 26, no. 4 (December 2003): 429–56; Steven Epstein, "A Queer Encounter: Sociology and the Study of Sexuality," *Sociological Theory* 12, no. 2 (July 1994): 188–202.

[50] See, for example, Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 310–46; Heap, "The City," 457–87; and Heather Love, "Reading the Social: Erving Goffman and Sexuality Studies," in *Theory Aside*, ed. Jason Potts and Daniel Stout (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 237–60.

[51] Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin, *Sexual Behavior,* 610–66.

[52] Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality*, 1–65; Abelove, "Freud, Homosexuality," 381–93.

In sum, in her clinical papers from the 1950s, Hooker articulated a theory of homosexual difference without assuming pathology while also gesturing beyond mere depathologization and toward the importance of psychologists and psychiatrists centering social forces in their analyses of homosexuality as well as in their clinical encounters with homosexual patients. At the same time, she did not fully abandon the project of identifying homosexuality using clinical methods or of discussing its "causes." I now turn to much less well known and seldom-studied aspects of Hooker's oeuvre: her research, mainly undertaken in the 1960s, that employed social science methods such as ethnography in gay bars, in-depth interviews with gay men, and historical analyses of the medicalization of homosexuality. This work further shows her to be a boundary shifter in twentieth-century US sex research.

Evelyn Hooker's Social Science Research and Cross-Disciplinary Engagements

The relative dearth of citations from the social scientific literature on sexuality in Hooker's clinical work from the 1950s obscures her deep engagements with emerging literatures on sexuality in anthropology, social psychology, and the sociology of deviance during this period. Hooker was particularly engaged with the so-called Chicago school of sociology, which emerged mainly from the University of Chicago's sociology department.[53] Insights from the sociologists of the Chicago school were vital to the development of her clinical insights and informed her exchanges with gay activists, clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, and other medical practitioners starting in the 1950s.

In a 1956 ethnographic article published in the *Journal of Psychology* titled "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior of Homosexuals," Hooker cites Mead, Ford and Beach, and Kinsey and his coauthors to argue that homosexual identity is culturally variable and possibly the result of the interplay between social structures and individual personality dynamics.[54] To support her claim that homosexuals constitute a socially defined "out-group," she also draws on deviance sociology, a movement within sociology that emerged largely from the Chicago school and was focused on what its proponents defined as "social problems" such as criminal behavior, suicidality, youth delinquency, and sexual and gender deviance.[55] Hooker drew on the work

[53] On the Chicago school and sexuality, see Heap, "The City," 457–87; Becker, "The Chicago School," 3–12; Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 314–27.

[54] Evelyn Hooker, "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior of Homosexuals," *Journal of Psychology*, no. 42 (1956): 217–25. She cites the following: Margaret Mead, *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies* (New York: Morrow, 1935); Ford and Beach, *Patterns of Sexual Behavior*; and Alfred C. Kinsey et al., "Concepts of Normality and Abnormality in Sexual Behavior," in *Psychosexual Development in Health and Disease*, ed. P. H. Hoch and J. Zubin (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1949).

[55] On the "out-group," see Hooker, "Preliminary Analysis," 219–24. For "social problems," see Love, "Doing Being Deviant," 74–95.

of William F. Whyte and Ernest W. Burgess, both of whom were influential Chicago school sociologists.[56] Hooker also drew extensively upon the 1951 book *The Homosexual in America* by Donald W. Cory, a pseudonym for gay sociologist Edward Sagarin, arguing that homosexuals, a group that sociologists had all but ignored, were like "every deviant group [in having] a special culture with its own norms, standards, mythology, and goals."[57]

Hooker also employed concepts from the emergent discipline of social psychology to draw parallels between racial and ethnic minorities and male homosexuals. In her 1956 *Journal of Psychology* article, she relies on Gordon Allport's 1954 book *The Nature of Prejudice*, psychologist and popular author Robert Lindner's semipopular 1956 *Must You Conform?*, and Theodore Newcomb's 1950 *Social Psychology* to draw parallels between racial minorities and male homosexuals.[58] Quoting from Kinsey's findings, she writes that the behavior she observed in her study sample of homosexuals more closely resembled that of members of racial and ethnic minorities than it did individuals with a shared diagnosis:

> Many of the other traits of which Allport speaks, such as the strengthening of in-group ties, protective clowning, or identification with the dominant group and hatred of himself and his own group, are found in the homosexual group as well as in other minorities. It would be strange indeed if all the traits due to victimization in minority groups were, in the homosexual, produced by inner dynamics of the personality, since he is also a member of an out-group which is subject to extreme penalties, involving according to Kinsey "cruelties (which) have not often been matched, except in religious and racial persecutions."[59]

Drawing on these writers and her experience working with homophile activists in the Los Angeles Mattachine Society, Hooker writes that homosexuals were "beginning to think of themselves as constituting a minority group."[60] This was a prescient claim about the politics of sexuality in the Cold War United States that very few social science researchers—and even fewer clinicians—were making in the mid-1950s. Hooker crossed disciplinary

[56] William Foote Whyte, *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943); Ernest W. Burgess, "The Sociologic Theory of Psychosexual Behavior," in *Psychosexual Development in Health and Disease* (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1949), 227–43.

[57] See Hooker, "Preliminary Analysis," 220; Donald Webster Cory, *The Homosexual in America: A Subjective Approach* (New York: Greenberg, 1951), 225; Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 246–52.

[58] Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1954); Robert Lindner, *Must You Conform?* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1956); Theodore Newcomb, *Social Psychology* (New York: Dryden, 1950).

[59] Hooker, "Preliminary Analysis," 219.

[60] See Hooker, 217.

boundaries in her work, generating new insights from her interdisciplinary training and traversals through distinct clinical, social scientific, and gay male lifeworlds. This was most pronounced in her publications during the 1960s.

In a 1960 article for the homophile *ONE Magazine* titled "Value-Conflict and Value-Congruence of a Homosexual Group in a Heterosexual Society," Hooker relied on the deviance frameworks of anthropologist Walter B. Miller and sociologist Harold Finestone, both trained at Chicago, to articulate a concept of "homosexual sub-culture" and the social means by which one might acquire or resist homosexual identification.[61] Hooker's article was published after she spent part of 1958 at the Institute for Sex Research at Indiana University at the invitation of psychologist Wardell Pomeroy, one of Kinsey's collaborators and coauthors.[62] This shows that she was drawing on concepts from clinical and social scientific research to work out a novel framework for understanding the subjectivities of her research subjects. Taken together, the 1956 and 1960 articles make clear that the epistemology of the Chicago school of sociology and the sociology of deviance was part of what motivated her highly influential clinical papers from the 1950s, in addition to the known influences of Kinsey, Allport, Mead, and Ford and Beach on her 1957 "Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual" article.[63]

Hooker's clinical research was influenced by deviance research and other social and behavioral science until the 1960s, when she shifted her focus entirely from clinical methods and projective techniques to ethnographic methods, interviews, and legal-historical analysis. However, even when she stopped employing clinical research methods, she also continued to engage with psychiatric research that designated homosexuality as a pathology, taking some of its claims quite seriously. For example, as I have mentioned, in a 1969 paper, she approvingly cited antigay psychiatrist Irving Bieber's theory that homosexuality could be caused by a "close-binding-intimate (CBI) mother and . . . hostile, detached father."[64] While she went out of her way not to endorse the Bieber position, Hooker called the validation of this theory by psychologist Ray B. Evans in a nonclinical sample of homosexual research subjects "a very important contribution to the further

[61] Evelyn Hooker, "Value-Conflict and Value-Congruence of a Homosexual Group in a Heterosexual Society," *ONE Magazine* 8, no. 4 (1960), 28–29, Bulk Records 1952–94, ONE Archives. In this paper, she drew on Walter B. Miller, "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," *Journal of Social Issues* 14, no. 3 (July 1958): 5–19; Harold Finestone, "Cats, Kicks, and Color," *Social Problems* 5, no. 1 (July 1957): 3–13.

[62] Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 326. See also six letters that indicate further extensive correspondence between Hooker and John Gagnon of the Institute for Sex Research from 1964 and 1965, folder 1, box 5, ECHP.

[63] Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 234; Bayer, *Homosexuality*, 49–53; Hooker, "Adjustment," 31.

[64] Hooker, "Parental Relations," 140.

clarification of the role of parental relationships in homosexuality."[65] This neglected aspect of Hooker's legacy demonstrates that her relationship to theories of homosexual etiology and/or cause is more complicated than her straightforward reputation as the great depathologizer would suggest.

Hooker also produced cross-disciplinary book reviews during the 1960s, traveled extensively, mentored graduate students, and was cited widely.[66] The week-at-a-glance datebooks she kept, which are archived in her papers at UCLA, reveal that she also began to attend Saturday meetings of the UCLA Gender Identity Research Clinic in the 1960s and continued these visits into the 1970s.[67] While this group was led by Robert Stoller, a psychiatrist, the group was very interdisciplinary and included social scientists. In addition to ethnographic descriptions of gay life in Los Angeles, her academic writing relied on references to the fictional or semiautobiographical work of her friends, gay writers Christopher Isherwood and John Rechy.[68] She also published a review of the authorized American edition of the Wolfenden Report, a major government report on homosexuality and sexual commerce in the United Kingdom that recommended the decriminalization of sodomy.[69]

Over the course of the 1960s—and primarily expressed in a series of papers discussed below—Hooker became even more deeply engaged with deviance sociology and with the symbolic interactionist literature produced by the so-called "second" Chicago school, which was made up of sociologists who were working in that department's tradition (but not necessarily

[65] Hooker, 140.

[66] Correspondence with graduate students, as well as many completed theses that were sent to her, are included in her papers at UCLA. For a sampling of her book reviews, see Evelyn Hooker, "The Caricature of Love by Hervey Cleckley," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* 52, no. 3 (October 1961): 312–13; Hooker, "The Sixth Man Falls Short?," *PsychCRITIQUES* 7, no. 3 (March 1962): 90–92; Hooker, "Public Crime or Private Sin?," *PsychCRITIQUES* 9, no. 1 (January 1964): 30–31; Hooker, "*Eros and Evil: The Psychopathology of Witchcraft* by R. E. L. Masters; *The Cradle of Erotica: A Study of Afro-Asian Sexual Expression and an Analysis of Erotic Freedom in Social Relationships* by Allen Edwardes; R. E. L. Masters," *American Sociological Review* 29, no. 1 (February 1964): 156–57.

[67] Hooker's archived papers include her datebooks from 1972 onward, which contain entries for the clinic's meetings. However, Harold Garfinkel's acknowledgment of Hooker in 1967 makes it clear that she had been in attendance at meetings of the UCLA Gender Identity Clinic since the 1960s. See Harold Garfinkel, *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1967), xi. Sexologist John Money also discusses her involvement with this clinic. See "The Conceptual Neutering of Gender and the Criminalization of Sex," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 14, no. 3 (June 1985): 282; and Money, "The Concept of Gender Identity Disorder in Childhood and Adolescence after 39 Years," *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy* 20, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 166.

[68] Evelyn Hooker, "The Homosexual Community," in *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Applied Psychology*, 4 vols. (Copenhagen, Denmark: Munksgaard, 1962) 2:56; and Hooker, "The Gay World" (book review), 5.

[69] Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution, *The Wolfenden Report: Report of the Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution* (New York: Stein and Day, 1963); Hooker, "Public Crime?," 30–31.

at the University of Chicago) after World War II.[70] From this cohort, she relied on sociologists Maurice Leznoff and William Westley's 1956 article "The Homosexual Community" and on Leznoff's 1954 master's thesis, "The Homosexual in Urban Society."[71] She also built on the insights of Al Reiss, who became one of the foremost deviance sociologists and who explicitly thanked Hooker in his 1961 article "The Social Integration of Queers and Peers."[72] Hooker's engagements with the Chicago school were deep and wide-ranging. She incorporated ideas from classic works such as Chicago sociologist Anselm Strauss's 1959 book *Mirrors and Masks*, sociologist of deviance Edwin M. Leimert's 1951 book *Social Pathology*, and Chicago sociologist Howard S. Becker's 1963 book *Outsiders* (a classic in the sociology of deviance).[73] However, she also cited more obscure work, such as a 1952 essay about compliant behavior by Chicago sociologist Reinhard Bendix.[74] Indeed, Hooker was in such close dialogue with the Chicago school cohort of the 1960s that she obtained and cited a copy of a 1959 student paper called "The 'Hustler' in Chicago" in the *Journal of Student Research* by a person called H. Lawrence Ross, who appears not to have published any other work.[75] She employed Chicago sociologist Tamotsu Shibutani's conceptualization of a "world" to describe how gay men created their own "'subculture,' 'society,' and 'community.'"[76] As I describe further below, Hooker and Erving Goffman (one of the most influential sociologists from the Chicago school tradition) were in close, ongoing conversation during the 1960s. Hooker's methodological chapter about male homosexuality in psychologist Norman L. Farberow's 1963 edited volume *Taboo Topics*—a volume that included clinical, behavioral, and social scientific perspectives—employs frameworks from many of the

[70] See Becker, "The Chicago School," 4.

[71] Maurice Leznoff, "The Homosexual in Urban Society" (master's thesis, McGill University, 1954); and Maurice Leznoff and William Westley, "The Homosexual Community," *Social Problems* 3, no. 4 (April 1956): 257–63. See Evelyn Hooker, "Male Homosexuals and Their 'Worlds,'" in *Sexual Inversion: The Multiple Roots of Homosexuality*, ed. Judd Marmor (New York: Basic Books, 1965), 85–86.

[72] Albert Reiss, "The Social Integration of Queers and Peers," *Social Problems* 9, no. 2 (Autumn 1961): 102–20. See Evelyn Hooker, "An Empirical Study of Some Relations between Sexual Patterns and Gender Identity in Male Homosexuals," in *Sex Research: New Developments*, ed. John Money (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), 42–43; Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 85–86.

[73] Anselm Strauss, *Mirrors and Masks: The Search for Identity* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1959); Edwin M. Leimert, *Social Pathology: A Systematic Approach to the Theory of Sociopathic Behavior* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1951). See also Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 90–91; Howard Saul Becker, *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1963).

[74] Reinhard Bendix, "Compliant Behavior and Individual Personality," *American Journal of Sociology* 58, no. 3 (November 1952): 292–303. See also Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 86–87.

[75] H. Lawrence Ross, "The 'Hustler' in Chicago," *Journal of Student Research*, no. 1 (1959): 113–19. See also Hooker, "Empirical Study," 42–43.

[76] See Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 83.

aforementioned sociological authors to describe the social organization of gay male life.[77]

Hooker's uses of concepts from these scholars shows that she was deeply immersed in sociological conversations during the 1960s.[78] In her papers during this period, Hooker wrestled with these scholars' thoroughly sociological conceptualizations of social problems in tandem with psychological theories.[79] Her publications from the 1960s constitute the sorts of exercises in boundary shifting that I argue must be appreciated in order to understand how Hooker's contributions go beyond the depathologization of homosexuality. This is particularly the case when one accounts for both their content and their venues of publication and presentation in disciplinary communities that were often different from her own home field of psychology.

In 1960 Hooker presented a paper titled "Sequences of Homosexual Identification" at the American Sociological Association meeting, an indicator of her insider status among sociologists during this period.[80] I could not locate the text of this conference paper, but Hooker alluded to her findings in her chapter in a 1965 volume about homosexuality that was edited by Judd Marmor, writing that "at critical junctures in individual life histories, the determinants of involvement in patterns of action that will result in final commitment to a homosexual career are not only psychodynamic but also cultural and situational in character."[81] Hooker also used both deviance and symbolic interactionist frameworks in a 1965 paper about the gender identity and sexual patterns of male homosexuals.[82] She drew inspiration from her UCLA colleague Harold Garfinkel and relied on a variety of methods from deviance sociology, ethnomethodology, and psychology to pull apart stereotypes about gay male gender performance and preferred sexual acts.[83] She wrote:

> The perspective of the two-sexed heterosexual society has dominated all attempts to classify the patterned relationships between sexual performance and psychological gender in male homosexuals. Many male homosexuals, however, who develop working solutions to the problems with which they are confronted by virtue of their sexual object-choice, live in two worlds, the larger society and homosexual subcultures that are, in the main, one-sexed societies. I propose that, in the context of their subcultures in relation to the larger society, homosexuals develop working solutions to problems of sexual

[77] Hooker, "Male Homosexuality," 44–55.
[78] Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 90–91.
[79] Hooker, 89.
[80] Hooker, 90.
[81] Hooker, 90.
[82] Hooker, "Empirical Study," 30.
[83] Hooker, 30.

> performance and psychological gender which cannot be understood in the perspective of the two-sexed heterosexual world.[84]

The data for this 1965 paper came from two rounds of follow-up interviews with all thirty of her gay male study participants from her famous 1957 paper, in addition to other interviews and fieldwork.[85] She took detailed life histories and sexual histories that involved technical descriptions of insertive, receptive, and oral sexual behaviors in addition to other behaviors related to gender performance and identification. The paper includes a detailed discussion of nine participants who identified as feminine, eight of whom went through periods during which they dressed in women's clothing; this leads to a discussion of sexual practices of men in the sample in relation to their sense of masculinity and/or effeminacy through the conceptual lens of gender identity.[86] She concludes that, despite connotations of gay male effeminacy with passivity (anal receptivity) and masculinity with activity (penile insertion), for most in the sample, "the sexual pattern cannot be categorized in terms of a predominant role, and the consciousness of masculinity or femininity appears to bear no clear relation to particular sexual patterns."[87] These and other insights in the paper, such as the effect of gay subcultures and social cliques on specific research subjects, were only possible because of the distinctive ways in which Hooker crossed boundaries from social science and psychology, and they reflect her continuous access to study participants' daily lives, as well as periodic reinterviews.[88] Indeed, the retention of contact to all thirty homosexual participants from the original study that produced Hooker's most influential 1957 paper is remarkable, and attributable to the fact that many of the participants were both her friends and part of organized gay political life through the Los Angeles Mattachine Society. She writes that "over the course of the years, many of them have come to see me not only as a friend rather than a detached scientist—and correctly so—but also as a person with knowledge of psychiatric, legal, and other expert resources in the community from which assistance in times of trouble can be obtained."[89]

In sum, Hooker—known to the historical record overwhelmingly as a clinical psychologist—was actively using concepts from sociology to frame and conceptualize a range of issues in her clinical and nonclinical studies of male homosexuality and gender from the 1950s through the 1960s. She drew particularly heavily from deviance sociology and the Chicago school. Many of the researchers from whom Hooker drew conceptual tools were

[84] Hooker, 26.
[85] Hooker, 27.
[86] Hooker, 26–27, 35–41.
[87] Hooker, 42.
[88] Hooker, 42–45.
[89] Hooker, 28.

students of Burgess and Whyte. Goffman studied under Strauss.[90] Becker, Leimert, and Reiss would all serve as presidents of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, whose journal, *Social Problems,* was the main venue of publication for deviance research.[91] Hooker was a reader of *Social Problems* and was thanked by Al Reiss for her "suggestions and encouragement" along with several Chicago sociologists in the acknowledgments of "The Social Integration of Queers and Peers," published in *Social Problems* in 1961.[92] Hooker also corresponded with Mary McIntosh as McIntosh composed what would become "The Homosexual Role," published in *Social Problems* in 1968.[93]

In the 1960s Hooker employed concepts such as "minstrelization" from deviance sociologist Erving Goffman's highly significant book *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, first published in 1963.[94] Earlier in the decade, Hooker had helped Goffman arrive at several of the core concepts that he proposes in that book. In *Stigma*, Goffman cites conversations with Hooker and quotes from a 1962 paper that she wrote, titled "The Homosexual Community," of which he received an advance copy.[95] While this paper was first delivered as an address at a conference in Denmark in 1961 and then published in conference proceedings in 1962,[96] it only reached a wide audience when it was reprinted five years later in *Sexual Deviance,* edited by Institute for Sex Research staff members and Chicago-trained sociologists John Gagnon and William Simon.[97] In that paper, Hooker relies on Goffman's concept of minstrelization to describe the social function of "camping," which she defines—with an offhanded

[90] Erving Goffman, "Communication Conduct in an Island Community" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1953), 1.

[91] "The Society for the Study of Social Problems | Past Presidents, Vice-Presidents & Editors," https://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/m/527/Past_Presidents,_Vice_Presidents,_and_Editors/.

[92] Reiss, "Social Integration," 102.

[93] Mary McIntosh, "The Homosexual Role," *Social Problems* 16, no. 2 (Autumn 1968): 187–88, 192. On Hooker and McIntosh's correspondence, including a discussion of the advice that Hooker gave McIntosh before McIntosh wrote "The Homosexual Role," see Hubbard, *Queer Ink*, 115–18. Among other guidance, Hooker encouraged McIntosh to read Hooker's published work and papers from *Social Problems*, including Leznoff and Westley, "The Homosexual Community," 257–63.

[94] Hooker, "Community," 56.

[95] Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1963), 98, 143–44.

[96] Hooker, "Community," 40–59.

[97] On the influence of Simon and Gagnon's edited volume, see Rubin, "Geologies of Queer Studies," 322, discussing William Simon and John H. Gagnon, eds., *Sexual Deviance* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967). Hooker had extensive correspondence with Gagnon during the 1960s that included questions about publishing "Community," staffing at the Institute for Sex Research, invitations for Hooker to visit, and requests that she review NIMH grant applications and draft publications. Hooker and Gagnon had a meeting on these topics in Los Angeles in 1965. See folder 1, box 5, ECHP.

reference to her friend Christopher Isherwood—as "usually describing some aspect of the feminine, dramatically displayed in gesture or speech—whether in serious or caricatured form."[98] Hooker's work was thus not only shaped by approaches from sociology; she was also a direct influence on some of the most influential sociologists of her time, including Goffman, whose *Stigma* became part of the canon of deviance sociology and is one of the most influential sociological texts of the second half of the twentieth century, particularly in the United States.[99] Hooker directly contributed to the formation of key sociological concepts, was a social theorist in her own right, and was acknowledged as such by leading social scientists. Her contributions to social scientific fields helped solidify her reputation and status as a boundary shifter in the liminal and cross-disciplinary zone of US sex research in the 1960s and 1970s.

Hooker's engagements with the social and behavioral sciences also extended to economic theory, economic sociology, and other methods with vocabularies and methods for analytically linking individual personality dynamics and larger social structures. Historians of sexuality have paid little attention to the impact of these fields on understandings of sexual identity and behavior. Hooker relied on economist Karl Polanyi's theory of the "market mentality" and sociologist David Riesman's expansion on it in *The Lonely Crowd*—a 1950 academic book that gained widespread popularity—to discuss the sexual economies of gay bars.[100] Harold Garfinkel—the progenitor of ethnomethodology, a style of conversation analysis within sociology—thanks Hooker for her insights in his seminal 1967 book *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, a chapter of which was written by Garfinkel as part of his ongoing engagement with the UCLA Gender Identity Research Clinic, led by Stoller (a psychiatrist), which both Garfinkel and Hooker regularly attended.[101] Notably, the UCLA Gender Identity Clinic is now the subject of several sustained critiques from survivors of both Stoller's and psychiatrist Richard Green's studies of transgender people and young effeminate boys.[102] I have not found evidence that Hooker objected to these programs of research.

Hooker cited conversations with Goffman and Garfinkel in her 1965 paper on homosexual worlds, noting that an idea about sexual exchange

[98] Hooker, "Community," 56.

[99] A. Javier Treviño, ed., *Goffman's Legacy*, Legacies of Social Thought (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

[100] Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 97. She was citing David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1950).

[101] Week-at-a-Glance notebooks, box 8, ECHP.

[102] For overviews of this scandal, see Sé Sullivan, "Conversion Therapy Ground Zero: Interrogating the Production of Gender as a Pathology in the United States" (PhD diss., California Institute of Integral Studies, 2017), 22–33; Karl Bryant, "Making Gender Identity Disorder of Childhood: Historical Lessons for Contemporary Debates," *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 3, no. 3 (September 2006): 23–39.

in gay bars was "suggested by Erving Goffman, in conversation," and that she "borrowed" Garfinkel's notion of "common understandings" to theorize how gay men are socialized into bar culture.[103] Hooker also drew from sociologists Dennis H. Wrong's and Neil J. Smelser's work on social systems and the individual personality in order to push back against psychiatric reductionism while also centering personality dynamics to theorize about the social and psychological origins of gay identities and cultures.[104] Her mid-1960s writing contains remarkable ethnographic passages about the organization of gay male life during this period, including discussions of gay "marriages," "the leather set," and homosexual subdivisions in Los Angeles, which her interlocutors referred to as the "swish alps" or "boys town."[105] In this period, Hooker was elaborating an approach to studying sexual identifications and subcultures in the context of larger social systems in a very original way, bringing together insights from her training and research in clinical psychology, social theory, gay literature written by her friends John Rechy and Christopher Isherwood, activist discourses from the Mattachine Society, and ethnographic methods. Hooker's was a world not only of blurred scholarly boundaries but also of access to communities that remained closed to colleagues such as Goffman and Garfinkel. Her simultaneous status as social scientist and clinician allowed her to pass through different intellectual and gay social worlds in physically and methodologically distinctive ways. Hooker would continue operating in this fashion into the 1960s, shifting boundaries as she moved between worlds, conducted research, and wrote about her life with her gay friends and research subjects using clinical epistemologies while also engaging in the practice of rigorous social science research.

Mixing Social Scientific and Clinical Epistemologies in the 1960s

As Hooker developed her credentials as a social scientist during the 1960s, she continued to be in conversation with clinical researchers and practitioners who were developing novel approaches to sex, gender, and sexuality in medical fields. She was regarded as an insider by both this cohort of clinical sex researchers and by the social scientists just discussed. The circumstances surrounding her publications, book reviews, and others' citations of her work reveal how Hooker's engagement with the social scientific literature directly contributed to the insights she offered communities of clinicians. So does her correspondence in the 1960s with an interdisciplinary range

[103] Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 98, 100, 105. Hooker cites Harold Garfinkel, "Studies of the Routine Grounds of Everyday Activities," *Social Problems* 11, no. 3 (January 1964): 225–50.

[104] Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 106–7, citing Dennis H. Wrong, "The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology," *American Sociological Review* 26 (1961): 183–93; and Neil J. Smelser and W. T. Smelser, eds., *Personality and Social Systems* (New York: Wiley, 1963).

[105] Hooker, "Community," 44; Hooker, "'Worlds,'" 93.

of individuals such as endocrinologist Harry Benjamin, sociologist John Gagnon of the Institute for Sex Research, psychiatrist Judd Marmor, and others. Because of her position in psychology, which provided her with methodological flexibility spanning social scientific and clinical approaches, and because of her clinical background, Hooker could act as an insider within biomedical communities in ways that social scientists simply could not, even after she was no longer engaged in clinical research. During the 1960s she actively translated insights from her social scientific papers to other clinical researchers' scientific enterprises and was influential as a disciplinary boundary shifter.

Hooker corresponded extensively with Gagnon throughout the 1950s and the 1960s, and she visited the Institute for Sex Research in 1958.[106] She and Gagnon had a meeting during a trip that he took to Los Angeles in 1964, and they exchanged letters about the possibility of writing a grant proposal together. It was during this correspondence that Gagnon solicited Hooker's contribution for the 1967 volume *Sexual Deviance*, which he was then compiling with William Simon, also of the Institute for Sex Research. Gagnon also sent her several of his and Simon's papers and other papers of interest, and in a letter dated 6 October 1964, he implored Hooker to visit the institute again: "If you ever wish to visit the ISR for a long period of time, we would certainly welcome your presence. I am afraid that sex research is a lonely business wherever you do it given the fact that the responsible colleagueship probably only numbers around twenty people. Perhaps I could expand that number if I included the animal researchers, but in terms of people who are interested in humans—THUD."[107] While Simon and Gagnon were trained as sociologists, the Institute for Sex Research frequently brought together clinical and nonclinical researchers, and Hooker was part of this ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue. Further, as I will now show, during this period, Hooker was in close conversation with and influenced some of the most prominent clinicians working on sexuality research at that time in a variety of medical subfields. While her influence on clinical epistemologies is generally attributed to her 1957 "Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual" paper, it is clear that her social science research on gay male communities also shaped the development of clinical sex and gender research in the 1960s.

On more than one occasion, the controversial clinical sexologist John Money—a psychologist by training who worked closely with surgeons and other clinicians on gender reassignment surgeries and helped developed the contemporary sex/gender distinction—retrospectively credited Hooker

[106] Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 326.

[107] Hooker corresponded extensively with Gagnon from 1964 to 1966, including about the reprinting of her 1961 "Homosexual Community" paper in his 1967 *Sexual Deviance* edited volume with William Simon. The letter quoted here is from Gagnon to Hooker, October 6, 1964. Some of their correspondence is in folder 1, box 5, ECHP.

with inventing the term "gender identity" in the 1960s.[108] While it is impossible to prove definitively that Hooker provided the first contemporary articulation of the hugely important concept of gender identity as it was taken up by Money and others, and while the emergence of the term is as attributable to social movements related to gender as it is to any development in academia, it is highly significant that Money assigns Hooker a central position in conversations in clinical sex research in the 1960s, the period after Hooker had abandoned clinical methods. Money's comments indicate Hooker's continued insider status among clinicians and show that she was actively engaged in the transportation of insights from her ethnographic work with gay men and dialogues with social scientists into communities of clinical researchers and practitioners.

In the tumultuous 1960s (a time of great social transformation in regard to the politics of gender), clinical sex research was not organized into disciplinary departments but proceeded via publications, at formalized institutes and centers, and at occasional meetings that were largely interdisciplinary and also often included social scientists in addition to clinicians. Examples of institutionalized centers for research on sexuality included the UCLA Gender Identity Research Clinic; the Institute for Sex Research; the experimental laboratory in St. Louis run by gynecologist William Masters and his spouse and coinvestigator, Virginia Johnson (to which Hooker was invited in 1962); and others.[109] In 1967 Hooker received a letter from an individual seeking a female-to-male sexual confirmation surgery and referred them to endocrinologist Harry Benjamin and his eponymous foundation, which would eventually become the World Professional Association for Transgender Health.[110] Benjamin sent Hooker a copy of his 1966 book *The Transsexual Phenomenon*, along with a pamphlet advertising his newly

[108] Money published this claim on at least two separate occasions: Money, "Conceptual Neutering," 282; Money, "The Concept," 166. On the controversies surrounding his research, see Lisa Downing, Iain Morland, and Nikki Sullivan, eds., *Fuckology: Critical Essays on John Money's Diagnostic Concepts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014). On Money's influence on the creation of the notion of the "sex/gender system," see Gayle Rubin, introduction to *Deviations*, 14.

[109] On Hooker's involvement with the Institute for Sex Research between the 1950s and 1990s, see Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 326; and Evelyn Hooker and Mary Ziemba-Davis, epilogue in *Homosexuality/Heterosexuality: Concepts of Sexual Orientation*, ed. David P. McWhirter, Stephanie A. Sanders, and June Machover Reinisch, Kinsey Institute Series, vol. 2 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 399–402. Hooker also provided cover blurbs for Institute for Sex Research director June M. Reinisch's books and clearly visited the institute in the late 1980s; see box 13, ECHP. On the invitation to the Masters and Johnson lab, see Christopher Isherwood, *Diaries: Volume 2, The Sixties, 1960–1969*, ed. Don Bachardy (New York: Harper, 2010), 206.

[110] Letter to Hooker, December 31, 1966, from an individual asking, "Is it possible to have an operation to change the sex from female to male in the United States?" along with a range of other questions. The letter contains a note at the top, presumably written by Hooker, that reads, "As, Jan 7, 67' / Referral to Dr Benjamin." Folder 8, box 4, ECHP.

formed foundation.[111] She corresponded with Benjamin following the release of the book; according to letters they exchanged during August 1966, Hooker and Benjamin planned to meet in Los Angeles when he was traveling there later that year.[112] In sum, Hooker consistently dialogued with social scientists and clinicians well into the 1960s, doing so as a peer in both communities and acting as a boundary shifter.

As I have noted, many scholarly conferences on the subject of sexuality during this time were quite interdisciplinary, owing at least in part to sex research not being evenly institutionalized or departmentalized but rather organized unevenly across different universities, departments, and semi-independent institutes such as Benjamin's then-nascent foundation. For example, Hooker's 1965 book chapter, which I have discussed previously, titled "An Empirical Study of Some Relations between Sexual Patterns and Gender Identity in Male Homosexuals," was published in *Sex Research: New Developments*, a 1965 volume edited by Money after a 1963 meeting of the New England Psychological Association.[113] This meeting was attended by, among others, Hooker, Masters and Johnson, psychologists, primatologists, and the neuroscientist Paul MacLean, some of whom published versions of their contributions in Money's *Sex Research* volume.[114] Hooker was also the only psychologist and one of only three nonphysicians to publish in psychiatrist Judd Marmor's influential 1965 edited volume, *Sexual Inversion*. She chaired the NIMH Task Force on Homosexuality from 1967 to 69, which was itself very interdisciplinary. Members included Marmor, Money, sociologist Edwin Schur, Ford, the then-director of the Institute for Sex Research Paul Gebhard (who was trained as an anthropologist), as well as several psychotherapists, jurists, and theologians.[115] In almost in all periods of her career, Hooker worked in an interdisciplinary world, and—owing to her credentials as a clinical and social scientific researcher—existed as an insider within different clinical and nonclinical disciplinary spheres and to shift boundaries between them.

A coherent constructionist mentality in sexuality research was beginning to emerge in the social sciences during the 1970s, but it did not solidify widely until the late 1970s and early 1980s, mostly in the emergent fields of

[111] Harry Benjamin, *The Transsexual Phenomenon* (New York: Ace Publishing, 1966).

[112] Letter from Benjamin to Hooker indicating that they had recently met in person, August 27, 1966, including a brochure for his eponymous foundation, folder 8, box 4, ECHP; Hooker's copy of *The Transsexual Phenomenon* is also in her papers, box 10, ECHP; letter from the ONE Institute inviting Hooker to attend a talk by Harry Benjamin, May 2, 1966, along with an additional letter between Hooker and the staff of ONE indicating that the lecture was eventually postponed, Evelyn Hooker Subject File, ONE Archives.

[113] Hooker, "Empirical Study," 24–52.

[114] Money, *Sex Research*, v–x.

[115] NIMH Task Force on Homosexuality, "National Institute of Mental Health Task Force on Homosexuality," 1–7.

the history of sexuality and gay studies.[116] Hooker was somewhat ahead of this curve. Indeed, there are hints of historical forms of social construction in her 1968 entry on homosexuality for the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*.[117] This essay pairs a critique of the history of homosexuality's medicalization in the nineteenth century with the findings of empirical social science in the 1960s, drawing especially on sociologist Mary McIntosh's 1968 *Social Problems* article, "The Homosexual Role."[118] That article is a classic in the social construction of sexuality and cites Hooker heavily, in two lengthy footnotes about Hooker and her work.[119]

The methodological ingenuity of Hooker's 1968 encyclopedia entry on homosexuality is almost totally neglected in the literature about Hooker and is worthy of some extended consideration.[120] In this piece, Hooker writes about the history of homosexuality in a manner that appears to be historically prescient as well as out of joint or out of place among her contemporaries. She makes claims about the medical origins of contemporary forms of homosexuality almost ten years before this argument is generally acknowledged as having emerged in historical scholarship during the late 1970s and 1980s.[121] In this piece, Hooker differentiates between homosexual acts and medicalized forms of homosexuality, describing the development of homosexuality as an etiological and clinical category in medicine during the nineteenth century. She elaborates the practice and social function of the emergence of clinical and social inquiries into homosexuality in the nineteenth century in ways that are canonically attributed as the original insights of constructionist historians of sexuality writing in the 1970s and 1980s, primarily Jeffrey Weeks and Michel

[116] On the concept of a "mentality" as a scientific research paradigm, see Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality*, 91–92. For several discussions of the historical emergence of the social constructionist mentality in sexuality research in the social sciences, see Rubin, "Geologies of Queer Studies," 347–56; Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 310–46; Gayle Rubin, "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," in *Deviations*, 145–46; Irvine, "The Sociologist as Voyeur," 429–56; Epstein, "A Queer Encounter," 188–202; Stephen Molldrem and Mitali Thakor, "Genealogies and Futures of Queer STS: Issues in Theory, Method, and Institutionalization," *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience* 3, no. 1 (2017); Donald E. Hall and Annamarie Jagose, introduction to *The Routledge Queer Studies Reader*, ed. Donald E. Hall and Annamarie Jagose (London: Routledge, 2012), xiv–xx; John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940–197*0 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 141–47.

[117] Evelyn Hooker, "Homosexuality," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 1:222–33.

[118] McIntosh, "The Homosexual Role," 187, 192.

[119] For a discussion of McIntosh's career that briefly mentions her relationship with Hooker, see Hubbard, *Queer Ink*, 109–18.

[120] This encyclopedia article is mentioned by Bayer as part of a list of her publications in *Homosexuality* (1981), 53. It is also cited by Minton in *Departing from Deviance*, 325, but is not discussed in the text of the book.

[121] Rubin, "Thinking Sex," 146.

Foucault.[122] I quote the opening of Hooker's 1968 encyclopedia entry now at some length not because it is analytically superb by contemporary methodological standards in the history of sexuality but because the passage appears as historically aberrant. It makes arguments about the history of sexuality before historical analyses of the emergence of the "medical model" of homosexuality in the nineteenth century would be articulated clearly and rigorously by Jeffrey Weeks and Michel Foucault, who were writing in the late 1970s.[123] This is particularly true in Hooker's differentiation between *homosexual acts* and *homosexual identities*—put otherwise, between homosexual practices and medically produced forms of homosexuality as a diagnostic category—with Hooker treating the introduction of the clinical gaze as a defining historical rupture in the history of homosexuality. She opens the entry thusly:

> Homosexual practices are among the most ancient manifestations of human sexuality. Abundant evidence for this fact is found in both the religious and the secular literature of the oldest civilizations and in their graphic art as well. Social attitudes in different cultures apparently varied then, as now, from strong condemnation of all homosexual practices to tolerance of permissiveness for some. From the beginning of the Christian era in western Europe ecclesiastical and secular law sought to prevent, control, and eradicate homosexuality by means of severe moral and legal condemnation. By the late nineteenth century, legal penalties were less severe as a result of humanitarian reform, but moral and religious censure had not diminished. That the scientific study of homosexuality began in this period of western European history, and in this cultural climate, is a tribute to the scientific and humanitarian interests of physicians, particularly such pioneers as Richard von Krafft-Ebing, Sigmund Freud, Havelock Ellis, and Magnus Hirschfeld. Their theories were largely concerned with etiology and were based on clinical observations and influenced by developments in the biological sciences, including evolutionary theory. Although by this time cross-cultural observations of homosexuality were also accumulating, together with the rudiments of a general theory, they had little effect on the mainstream research, which continued to focus on the etiology of homosexuality among individuals of Western culture.[124]

[122] Scholars often refer to this passage in volume 1 of *The History of Sexuality*, where Foucault describes psychiatric epistemologies and procedures that he calls the "incorporation of perversions" and "specification of individuals," thus leading to the homosexual becoming a kind of "species" along with "all those minor perverts whom nineteenth-century psychiatrists entomologized by giving them strange baptismal names" (*The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 41–44). See also Weeks, *Coming Out*, 23–32.

[123] Weeks, *Coming Out*, 23–32; Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*, 41–44.

[124] Hooker, "Homosexuality," 222.

In the passage—presented in Hooker's last major academic essay—she demonstrated that she (like her friends in the Mattachine Society) had spent time studying the long history of sexual science.[125] Her words, published in 1968, are notable for their prescience, and it is worth reiterating that this essay was published nearly a full decade before historical studies of sexuality that used constructionist methods from the history of science and medicine—such as Weeks's *Coming Out* and volume 1 of Foucault's *History of Sexuality*—would emerge.

Following her breakdown in 1969, Hooker stopped actively publishing. In the historical literature about her, despite her social scientific publications, she has overwhelmingly been characterized as a clinical psychologist who was key to the depathologization of homosexuality and its removal from the *DSM*. However, I have shown that she clearly influenced the emergence of social constructionist approaches to sexuality in disciplines such as sociology, anthropology, and social psychology. It is notable that many of the scholars whom writers such as anthropologist Gayle Rubin and sociologist Steven Epstein cite as contributors to the development of the social construction of sexuality either cited Hooker as an influence or personally knew her.[126] This includes closeted psychiatrist turned ethnographer Martin Hoffman in his 1968 *The Gay World*, in which Hooker receives thanks in the acknowledgments; she also reviewed the book and was given an inscribed copy.[127] Deviance sociologist Edwin Schur cites Hooker in his 1965 book *Crimes without Victims*, as does anthropologist David Sonenschein in his 1966 article "Homosexuality as a Subject of Anthropological Inquiry."[128] Hooker was thanked and cited by Laud Humphreys in his 1968 dissertation, "The Tearoom Trade," which later became a landmark book of the same title published in 1970, in which he drew on Hooker's work extensively; Hooker was thus in conversation with and influencing Humphreys—a very influential sociologist of sexuality—for many years.[129] Anthropologist Esther Newton also cites Hooker in *Mother Camp*, her classic 1972 ethnography of drag queens in Kansas City, as does sociologist Carol A. B. Warren in

[125] For a discussion of the Mattachine Society's uses of the sexological corpus to produce historical analyses, see Rubin, "Geologies of Queer Studies," 350–54.

[126] Compare, for example, Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 310–46; Epstein, "A Queer Encounter," 188–202.

[127] Evelyn Hooker, "The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil," book review, *Tangents*, October 1, 1968; Hooker's copy of Hoffman's book is in box 12, ECHP. See Martin Hoffman, *The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil* (New York: Basic Books, 1968), ix.

[128] Edwin M. Schur, *Crimes without Victims: Deviant Behavior and Public Policy; Abortion, Homosexuality, Drug Addiction* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965), 73–74; David Sonenschein, "Homosexuality as a Subject of Anthropological Inquiry," *Anthropological Quarterly* 39 (January 1966): 73–82.

[129] Laud Humphreys, "The Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places" (PhD diss., Washington University in St. Louis, 1968), iii; Humphreys, *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places* (New York: Aldine, 1970), x–xvii, 17, 30, 51–52, 104, 109.

Identity and Community in the Gay World (1974).[130] Psychologist Clarence A. Tripp sent her an advance copy of *The Homosexual Matrix*, first published in 1975.[131] Her contributions to social science are also cited by sociologist Kenneth Plummer in his 1975 symbolic interactionist book *Sexual Stigma* and by sociologists Joseph Harry and William B. Devall in the 1978 book *The Social Organization of Gay Males.*[132] Pioneering sociologist of gay male sexuality (and later of HIV/AIDS) Martin P. Levine cites Hooker in his 1979 essay "The Gay Ghetto," a seminal essay at the intersection of urban sociology and the sociology of sexualities.[133]

In a slippage that is telling about Hooker's status as a boundary shifter between clinical and social sciences (and which is also telling about Hooker's status as a disciplinary insider in both worlds), Weeks cites Hooker not as a psychologist but as a "sociologist" in *Coming Out*, his paradigm-defining 1977 book in the history of sexuality.[134] Weeks cites not Hooker's clinical work but her 1962 article "The Homosexual Community," as it was reprinted in Simon and Gagnon's 1967 *Sexual Deviance* volume.[135] Weeks's argument about how the "medical model" of homosexuality developed in nineteenth-century England would become a key part of the basis for constructionist approaches in the history of sexuality.[136] Weeks's citation of Hooker as a sociologist in the book where he first advanced the argument about the medical model of homosexuality is quite meaningful because Weeks places her in his own intellectual genealogy as a social scientist working within both history and sociology during the long emergence of the social constructionist thesis rather than simply framing Hooker as an object of historical interest as an important clinical researcher.[137] This

[130] Esther Newton, *Mother Camp: Female Impersonators in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 2. Hooker's inscribed copy of the book can be found in box 13, ECHP; Carol B. Warren, *Identity and Community in the Gay World* (New York: Wiley, 1974), 24.

[131] A letter to Hooker from Frederic W. Hills, editor in chief of McGraw-Hill, that accompanied her advance copy of the book, along with the review itself, can be found in folder 11, box 5, ECHP; Clarence A. Tripp, *The Homosexual Matrix* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

[132] Kenneth Plummer, *Sexual Stigma: An Interactionist Account*, International Library of Sociology (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 4, 91, 155, 123, 212, 220–25; and Joseph Harry and William B. DeVall, *The Social Organization of Gay Males* (New York: Praeger, 1978), 123, 152, 208.

[133] Martin P. Levine, "The Gay Ghetto," in *Gay Men: The Sociology of Male Homosexuality*, ed. Martin P. Levine (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), 195.

[134] Jeffrey Weeks, *Coming Out: Homosexual Politics in Britain from the Nineteenth Century to the Present* (New York: Quartet Books, 1977), 39.

[135] In previous citations I have referred to the original publication from the *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Applied Psychology.* The reprint is Evelyn Hooker, "The Homosexual Community," in *Sexual Deviance*, ed. William Simon and John H. Gagnon (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 167–84.

[136] Rubin, "Thinking Sex," 146.

[137] On Week's long-term relationship with the practice of both sociology and history and how he has moved between them, see Jackie Jones, "A Long Journey: An Interview with Jeffrey Weeks," *Equal Opportunities International*, March 27, 2009, 220.

is one demonstration of how Hooker's publications were received differently by scholars in the social sciences. For example, one can compare Weeks's and McIntosh's uses of Hooker's social science research to aid in their own theory-building work to how historians John D'Emilio and Jennifer Terry cite Hooker: as an important clinical researcher whose work primarily played a role in the depathologization of homosexuality.[138] In contrast, citations of Hooker's social scientific papers—as in Weeks's 1977 *Coming Out*—often have very little do with the question of homosexual pathology or her contributions to the depathologization of homosexuality and much more to do with conceptualizing the organization of gay male life and identity.

Indeed, one of Hooker's most personally and intellectually intimate relationships was with a social scientist: anthropologist Joseph M. Carrier, who received one of the first PhDs in social sciences (anthropology) issued by the University of California, Irvine (UCI). Through her appointment at UCLA, Hooker served as an outside committee member for Carrier's dissertation committee at UCI.[139] Carrier became one of Hooker's best friends and later served as the executor of her estate. Hooker's research alerted him to the fact that he would not find homosexuality as he had experienced it in his own life as a gay American when he went to do his dissertation research in Mexico.[140] This became the impetus for his study, which focused on *activo* and *pasivo* identifications among queer Mexican men. Hooker had initially encouraged Carrier to study homosexuality in Los Angeles's Black and Chicano communities because of the lack of knowledge about those populations. However, gaining access to these communities proved impossible for him, so Carrier instead opted to pursue fieldwork with the gay community in Guadalajara.[141]

Hooker continued to actively engage with sexuality researchers in the social sciences and clinical fields in the 1970s. A changing publication landscape in sexuality research also meant that social scientists were being exposed to developments in clinical and biomedical sex research and vice-versa. Major new publication venues for sexuality research that were founded in the 1970s were intentionally interdisciplinary, and Hooker was involved

[138] See Weeks, *Coming Out*, 39; McIntosh, "The Homosexual Role," 187–92; Terry, *An American Obsession*, 356–57, 373; and D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 73–74, 141–44. D'Emilio does mention Hooker's ethnographic work once, but her influence on social science is not discussed; rather, her contributions are framed through her clinical work that propelled fights over the depathologization of homosexuality in the 1960s and 1970s. Terry does not discuss Hooker's social science publications at all, only citing Hooker's most influential 1957 paper, "The Adjustment of the Male Overt Homosexual." In contrast, Weeks and McIntosh both draw on Hooker's ethnographic papers to develop new social theory through describing the social organization of gay life.

[139] Joseph M. Carrier, *De los Otros: Intimacy and Homosexuality among Mexican Men, between Men—between Women* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), x.

[140] Correspondence with the author and Carrier, summer 2014.

[141] Correspondence with the author and Carrier, summer 2014.

in their establishment. She served on the editorial boards of the *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, started by psychiatrist Richard Green (Hooker's colleague at UCLA), and of the *Journal of Homosexuality*, launched in 1971 and 1974, respectively. Both journals were explicitly committed to publishing clinical, biomedical, social scientific, behavioral, and humanistic research.[142]

Despite Hooker's continued influence on both social scientists and clinicians in the 1960s and 1970s—and her reception by some social scientists as a social scientist in her own right—her position in these literatures changed after constructionist understandings of sexuality began to ascend toward dominance in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Clinical practitioners, psychologists, and psychiatrists focused on her role as what I have called the "great depathologizer" of homosexuality, and she became something of a "mother" figure for researchers in these fields.[143] However, social scientists who were becoming interested in the social construction of sexual identity rarely cited her at all.[144] By the early 1980s, the great depathologizer narrative had solidified across the disciplines, and Hooker was rarely cited as a social scientist.

The great depathologizer narrative perhaps found its most material manifestation when a center in Hooker's name was established at the University of Chicago Medical School's Department of Psychiatry in 1992, led by professor of psychiatry Andrew Boxer with assistance from anthropologist Gilbert Herdt.[145] An advertisement for the center declared: "Before Evelyn Hooker, Our Only Right Was to Be 'Cured.'"[146] A brochure reified the great depathologizer narrative, stating that "the Evelyn Hooker Center for Gay and Lesbian Mental Health is an idea whose time has come. Named for the influential psychologist, Evelyn Hooker, whose pioneering research in the 1950s led to the declassification of homosexuality as a mental illness in 1973, the Center is designed to enhance knowledge and understanding of the lives of lesbians and gay men."[147] As I have argued and will now demonstrate further, this "great depathologizer" characterization of Hooker would continue to solidify until the end of her life and beyond.

[142] Richard Green, "A Statement of Purpose," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 1, no. 1 (1971): 1; Charles Silverstein, "Editorial," *Journal of Homosexuality* 1, no. 1 (1974): 5–7.

[143] For this characterization and quotation, see especially Kimmel and Garnets, "What a Light It Shed," 31–33.

[144] See, for example, Epstein, "A Queer Encounter," 193.

[145] Andrew M. Boxer and Joseph M. Carrier, "Evelyn Hooker," *Journal of Homosexuality* 36, no. 1 (1998): 1–17; and a letter from Andrew Boxer to Evelyn Hooker, April 19, 1993, folder 8, box 4, ECHP.

[146] Magazine advertisement for the Evelyn Hooker Center for Gay and Lesbian Mental Health, *Outlines*, February 1993, Evelyn Hooker Subject File, ONE Archives.

[147] Evelyn Hooker Center for Gay and Lesbian Mental Health promotional flyer for the 1992–93 academic year, unprocessed file 2, Joseph M. Carrier Papers, ONE National Gay and Lesbian Archives.

Solidifying the Great Depathologizer Narrative at the Dawn of the Social Construction of Sexuality

Foregrounding how Evelyn Hooker influenced both social scientific studies of sexuality and biomedical inquiries into sexuality opens an alternative route into understanding her contributions not only to clinical sexual science in medical fields but also to the epistemological and disciplinary origins of social constructionist approaches to sexuality research in the social sciences. This alternative narrative situates some of the epistemic and disciplinary origins of the social constructionist paradigm within biomedical, clinical, behavioral, and therapeutic sciences rather than strictly in the social sciences and humanities. Anthropologist Gayle Rubin reflects on the politics of sexuality and sexual knowledge in the 1970s and 1980s in her essay "Blood under the Bridge," a note from which explains how the social construction of sexuality "paradigm shift happened across a broad swath of researchers more or less simultaneously" in the late 1970s.[148] Rubin cites social scientists associated with this turn: anthropologist Carole Vance, historians Judith Walkowitz and Daniel Walkowitz, classicist Robert Padgug, historian of science Bert Hansen, and Michel Foucault. Sociologist of sexuality Steven Epstein similarly attributes the rise of the social constructionist paradigm in the early 1980s to the work of sociologists, anthropologists, and Marxist and feminist theorists and particularly to the work of Foucault.[149] These and other reflections on the emergence of the social construction of sexuality pay little attention to the role of clinical epistemologies in the development of the constructionist thesis in sexuality studies.[150] In excluding clinical voices in the social constructionist moment, these retellings unfortunately overlook aspects of the richness and interdisciplinarity of many conversations that laid the groundwork for this historical moment in sex research. They also miss Hooker's role in that milieu as a boundary shifter.[151]

[148] Gayle Rubin, "Blood under the Bridge: Reflections on 'Thinking Sex,'" in *Deviations*, 396.

[149] Epstein, "A Queer Encounter," 192–93.

[150] See also Irvine, "The Sociologist as Voyeur," 429–56.

[151] One exception to the tendency to exclude clinical epistemologies from the social constructionist moment (but which discusses Stoller and Money, not Hooker) is Rubin, introduction, 14–15, citing Jennifer Germon, *Gender: A Genealogy of an Idea*, 1st ed. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009). However, this discussion is primarily in regard to the role of clinical epistemologies in the development of feminist theories of the sex/gender distinction in the late 1960s and early 1970s rather than about the role of clinical epistemologies in the emergence of the social construction of sexuality, which would take place several years later during the late 1970s and early 1980s. The influence of clinical epistemologies is more evident in Rubin's "Thinking Sex"—a foundational text in the social construction of sexuality—particularly in her attention to the role of the *DSM* in producing new sexual subjectivities and her articulation of "benign sexual variation," a concept drawn from biology and also derived from the archives of technical, descriptive, nonpathologizing sexological research (see 137, 154). See also Rostom Mesli, "Gayle Rubin's Concept of 'Benign Sexual Variation': A Critical Concept for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 114, no. 4 (October 2015): 803–26, and particularly 806.

Indeed, at the time when the social constructionist thesis was becoming dominant in sexuality studies, Evelyn Hooker had a somewhat different perspective on the constitution of constructionism in sex research. In a 1978 interview of Hooker by sociologist of sexuality Laud Humphreys, they discuss the history of postwar research on homosexuality in three temporal blocks. The first block is an early group of disaggregated researchers consisting of Kinsey, Ford and Beach, and Hooker (one could also include Margaret Mead, some Chicago schoolers, and others). The second block is what Humphreys calls "a second generation of researchers [who] were producing empirical data and developing a body of sociological theory that corresponded with Hooker's nonpathological paradigm" in the 1960s and early 1970s, including Simon and Gagnon, Hoffman, Schur, and Humphreys (others such as Newton, Weeks, Plummer, and Foucault could be added). The third and final block is an emergent and undefined paradigm described by Humphreys near the close of the 1970s as "the third generation of the new, much more sociological paradigm."[152] From the contemporary vantage, this "third generation" emerging in the late 1970s might be expected to reference the literature cited by Rubin and Epstein as the foundational authors of the social constructionist approach to sexuality studies. However, in her reply to Humphreys's question about this "third generation," Hooker ignored the social scientists normally placed at the center of this moment in the history of constructionist sex research; she instead mentioned the work of psychologists John DeCecco and Stephen Morin.[153]

While DeCecco and Morin were working in a social constructionist and gay liberationist milieu in San Francisco during the 1970s and early 1980s, they had ambitions that were somewhat different from those of the scholars who are classically associated with the solidification of the social constructionist thesis during this period, such as Foucault, Weeks, D'Emilio, Rubin, and Walkowitz. Unlike these scholars, all of whom were social scientists and/or humanists, DeCecco, Morin, and their colleague Michael Shively published papers that were simultaneously clinical, social, and behavioral in their methodological orientations and goals. They aimed to synthesize many different disciplines—from sociobiology to gay-affirming cultural anthropology—and to merge these fields' distinct epistemologies.[154] This is

[152] Laud Humphreys, "An Interview with Evelyn Hooker," *Alternative Lifestyles* 1, no. 2 (1978): 191–206.

[153] Humphreys, 203–5. Hooker was specially referring to John DeCecco, "Studying Violations of Civil Liberties of Homosexual Men and Women," *Journal of Homosexuality* 2, no. 4 (Summer 1977): 315–22; and Stephen F. Morin, "Heterosexual Bias in Psychological Research on Lesbianism and Male Homosexuality," *American Psychologist* 32, no. 8 (August 1977): 629–37.

[154] See, for example, these two articles discussed by Hooker in her interview with Humphreys: Stephen F. Morin, "Heterosexual Bias in Psychological Research on Lesbianism and Male Homosexuality," *American Psychologist* 32, no. 8 (August 1977): 629–37; John

a distinct intellectual project from the cohort associated most closely with the emergence of social constructionist sexuality research, particularly since these scholars had aims that were both clinical and social scientific. It is thus perhaps unsurprising that Hooker—who herself had worked within, moved between, and codeployed social scientific and clinical methods from the 1950s to the 1970s—would see this form of synthetic cross-disciplinary inquiry as representing the most promising frontiers of sexuality research in 1978, on the eve of social construction's dominance in sexuality research in the social sciences. Indeed, it is unclear if Hooker was even aware of Weeks, Foucault, and other early constructionists; yet, as I have shown, both her clinical and social scientific research undoubtedly contributed to the conditions that allowed for the development of constructionist approaches, and she spoke ably about other emergent paradigms in this area. Her oeuvre and her comments in the 1978 interview with Humphreys suggest alternative canons of sexual constructionism at the intersection of clinical and nonclinical disciplines that is yet to be written.[155] Discoveries such as this in the history of sex research raise the pressing question of what other neglected intellectual genealogies of constructionist inquiry exist in the archives of sexology, awaiting further excavation by historians of sexuality working in history departments and other fields such as anthropology, sociology, literary historicism, area studies, philosophy of science, and even psychology—all of which have much to contribute to the history of sexuality as an academic field with a pluralist intellectual heritage.[156]

DeCecco, "Studying Violations of Civil Liberties of Homosexual Men and Women," *Journal of Homosexuality* 2, no. 4 (Summer 1977): 315–22. See also this article, which includes discussions of much of the literature cited here and concludes with advocacy for a "potentialist" view of human sexuality by drawing together multiple threads of constructivist clinical and nonclinical research: John DeCecco and Michael G. Shively, "From Sexual Identity to Sexual Relationships: A Contextual Shift," *Journal of Homosexuality* 9, no. 2/3 (1984/1983): 1–26. Hooker was also in dialogue with Shively as he composed his master's thesis, on which this work is partly based, having been sent an inscribed copy upon its completion in 1977. See folder 6, box 6, ECHP.

[155] One might look to the work of scholars such as Sari van Anders and Patrick Grzanka—both of whom straddle clinical psychology and nonclinical forms of interdisciplinary social science research—as a starting point for a genealogical investigation along these lines. See Patrick R. Grzanka, "Queer Survey Research and the Ontological Dimensions of Heterosexism," *Women's Studies Quarterly* 44, no. 3/4 (Fall 2016): 131–49; and Sari M. van Anders, "Beyond Sexual Orientation: Integrating Gender/Sex and Diverse Sexualities via Sexual Configurations Theory," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 44, no. 5 (July 2015): 1177–1213.

[156] As a reminder to readers, the metaphor of "excavation" in studying the history of sex research comes from anthropologist Gayle Rubin's work in this area. See Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 310–46; and Rubin, "Geologies of Queer Studies," 353–54. For other key examples of methodological innovation in the history of sexuality that inform my own discourse here, I direct readers to Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Vol. 1*; Davidson, *The Emergence of Sexuality*; Weeks, *Coming Out*; Halperin, "How to Do the History"; and Robert Padgug, "Sexual Matters: On Conceptualizing Sexuality in History," *Radical History Review*, no. 20 (April 1979): 3–23.

I have drawn on several distinct approaches from within and outside the history of sexuality to show that dialogues that led to the solidification of the social construction of sexuality were anything but disciplinarily segregated well into the 1970s and the early 1980s. As Hooker's archived papers and uses of other scholars' concepts in her papers show, she remained active in multiple distinct but overlapping epistemic communities in this milieu, mentoring and dialoguing with researchers across disciplines and often translating insights between fields, functioning as a boundary shifter. Her contributions went well beyond her widely recognized contribution to bringing about the official depathologization of homosexuality by institutions such as the American Psychiatric Association and the American Psychological Association in the 1970s.[157] She was also a direct influence on the development of the social constructionist paradigm as it was expressed not only in psychology but also in sociology and even anthropology. She acted as a boundary shifter, uniquely situated at the intersection of gay activist communities and academia, with a distinctive combination of clinical and social scientific credentials that allowed her to speak and work within the disciplinary idioms of multiple epistemic communities.

However, as I have also shown, the overwhelming tendency in historical writing about Hooker and in scholars' reflections on her contributions to clinical and social scientific disciplines has been to relegate her contributions to sexual science to battles over homosexuality's depathologization in the realm of clinical practice. After the early 1980s, Hooker is generally held up as (or, perhaps, limited to being) what I have characterized as the "great depathologizer" of homosexuality. She reinforced this narrative herself in speeches to many organizations in the 1980s and 1990s, usually upon receiving an award recognizing her contributions to depathologization campaigns, many of which are archived in her papers at UCLA.[158] Some of these speeches, along with her later writings, are quite moralistic when compared to her technical and descriptive main body of work published during the 1950s and 1960s. This is particularly the case in her statements to groups such as the Gay Academic Union about gay love, promiscuity, and monogamy during the AIDS epidemic, which she attributed in part to what she perceived as the excesses of the sexual revolution.[159] The great depathologizer narrative is best captured in the 1992 Oscar-nominated biographical documentary film directed by Richard Schmiechen titled *Changing Our Minds* and in her address to the American Psychological Association

[157] Hooker, "Reflections," 452.

[158] Speech to the Gay Academic Union in 1984, folder 3, box 2, ECHP; Hooker, Invited Speech to the American Psychological Association, "The Changing Status of Lesbians and Gays," August 24, 1985, unprocessed file 2, Carrier Papers.

[159] Other similar speeches are distributed throughout Hooker's papers at UCLA. Examples include an undated speech to a "gay physicians group" titled "Gay Health Crisis—AIDS lecture," where she discusses the sexual revolution in negative terms and equates monogamy with love. Folder 9, box 2, ECHP.

upon receiving that organization's Distinguished Contribution in the Public Interest Award in 1992.[160] In these pieces and in the many obituaries and tributes written about her, Hooker is presented (or presents herself) as a psychologist whose contributions were to psychiatry and psychology and thus to the well-being of gays and lesbians generally.[161] Her influence on other, nonclinical disciplines such as sociology and on the emergence of epistemologies or research mentalities such as the social construction of sexuality is not emphasized.

The way that Hooker was cited by social scientists in the 1980s generally followed this shift. The change in how Weeks cited Hooker in his work of the mid-1970s and the mid-1980s is demonstrative. In the 1977 book *Coming Out*, Weeks cites her as an "American sociologist."[162] However, in *Sexuality and Its Discontents*, published in 1985, Weeks cites Hooker as a "clinical psychologist" in a list that includes John Money and other clinicians.[163] Similarly, other constructionist historians of sexuality in the 1980s who do cite her, such as John D'Emilio and Allan Bérubé, refer to her as a psychologist of great importance rather than as someone who had a direct effect on their own scholarship.[164] The same is true of later historians of sexuality such as Jennifer Terry, Margot Canaday, and even historian of psychology Henry Minton, who devotes a section to Hooker in his book *Departing from Deviance* titled "Evelyn Hooker, Frank Kameny, and Depathologizing Homosexuality, 1957–73."[165] Minton describes Hooker's social scientific articles in some detail but frames them as contributing primarily to the project of depathologizing homosexuality within the medical professions—and particularly within psychiatry and psychology—rather than as constituting serious contributions to the development of novel approaches to studying sexuality within the social sciences. One recent exception to this trend is Heather Love's discussion of Hooker within the lineage of deviance sociology. Love draws attention to Hooker's descriptive approach to characterizing gay male life along with a number of Hooker's contemporaries, including deviance sociologists such as Erving Goffman.[166]

[160] Schmiechen, *Changing Our Minds*; Hooker, "Reflections."

[161] For an emergent, alternative narrative of the history of gay and lesbian psychiatry activism that focuses on antipsychiatric tendencies, see Abram J. Lewis, "'We Are Certain of Our Own Insanity': Antipsychiatry and the Gay Liberation Movement, 1968–1980," *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 25, no. 1 (January 2016): 83–113.

[162] Weeks, *Coming Out*, 39.

[163] Jeffrey Weeks, *Sexuality and Its Discontents: Meaning, Myths, & Modern Sexualities* (London: Routledge, 1985), 194.

[164] D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics*, 73–118, 141–43; and Allan Berube, *Coming Out under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War Two* (New York: Free Press, 1990), 260.

[165] Terry, *An American Obsession*, 357; Margot Canaday, *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), 243; and Minton, *Departing from Deviance*, 219–64.

[166] Love, "Doing Being Deviant," 74–95. See also, Rubin, "Studying Sexual Subcultures," 315–24, 340.

Despite her influence on early writing in the social construction of sexuality in the 1970s, Hooker is also not cited in a range of texts that are commonly referred to as some of the key early volumes in the social construction of sexuality that were published in the 1980s and into the 1990s. This marks a shift away from interpreting Hooker as a social scientist in her own right. Hooker does not appear in any essays in *Pleasure and Danger*, the 1984 volume in which Gayle Rubin's foundational "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality" first appeared. Hooker does not appear in any of the essays in the 1989 history of sexuality volume *Passion and Power*; the 1991 special issue of the feminist journal *differences*, which helped to inaugurate queer theory; or the 1993 *Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, which contains an extensive reference bibliography.[167] Nor is Hooker cited in *Out in the Field*, the seminal 1996 text on gay and lesbian anthropology.[168] She *is* cited in Weeks's early work on the history of male prostitution and in his contribution to *Hidden from History*—a major early contribution to the history of sexuality published in 1989. However, Week's essay in that volume, titled "Inverts, Perverts, and Mary-Annes: Male Prostitution and the Regulation of Homosexuality in England in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," was first published nearly a decade earlier, in 1981, in the *Journal of Homosexuality*—a different moment in the history of sex research, in between the publication of *Coming Out* in 1977 (where he cites Hooker as a sociologist) and *Sexuality and Its Discontents* in 1985 (where he cites her as a clinical psychologist).[169] In "Inverts, Perverts, and Mary-Annes," Weeks characterizes Hooker as a social scientist, as he does in *Coming Out*, arguing that her characterization of gay bars as free markets in 1960s Los Angeles was not very different from his own findings about urban sexual marketplaces in nineteenth-century England.[170]

[167] Kathy Lee Peiss, Christina Simmons, and Robert A. Padgug, eds., *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History*, Critical Perspectives on the Past (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989); Teresa de Lauretis, ed., *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 3, no. 2 (1991), special issue, "Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities"; Henry Abelove, Michèle Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin, eds., *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

[168] Ellen Lewin and William Leap, eds., *Out in the Field: Reflections of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1996).

[169] Carol Vance, ed., *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality* (Boston: Routledge, 1984); Kathy Lee Peiss, Christina Simmons, and Robert A. Padgug, eds., *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989); de Lauretis, special issue, "Queer Theory"; Abelove, Barale, and Halperin, *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*; Lewin and Leap, *Out in the Field*; Martin Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey, eds., *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (New York: Meridian, 1989); Jeffrey Weeks, "Inverts, Perverts, and Mary-Annes: Male Prostitution and the Regulation of Homosexuality in England in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries," in Duberman, Vicinus, and Chauncey, *Hidden from History*, 195–211.

[170] Weeks, "Inverts, Perverts," 120.

From the late 1970s to the mid-1990s, Hooker was weighing in on the state of sex research in literatures that included social scientists but that were largely focused on clinical concerns. For example, she wrote forewords or epilogues for several interdisciplinary journal issues, edited volumes, and others' books until her death, which reproduced the great depathologizer narrative.[171] The effective excision of Hooker from the social science literature and into the clinical literature in the 1980s and 1990s by both historians of sexuality and scholars working in these fields is puzzling when one realizes how influential she was among social scientists in the early to mid-1970s, just a few years before much of the foundational work in the social construction of sexuality was published.

I have shown that Evelyn Hooker has generally been characterized as what I call the "great depathologizer" of homosexuality in academic texts and popular biographies and that she also saw and characterized herself this way, particularly in the later years of her life. In my effort to revise this one-dimensional narrative, I have proposed that Hooker be reinterpreted as a "boundary shifter" in mid-twentieth-century sexuality research in the United States: someone who was uniquely situated at the intersection of multiple liminal social and intellectual lifeworlds and who drew on methodological training and forms of insider access that her peers did not share, thus enabling her to translate insights between very different academic arenas where sexual knowledge was being made.[172] Through these boundary shifts, Hooker helped to induce transformations in multiple fields as she moved across their borders and the social worlds of her peers, friends, and research subjects. Future scholars of the history of sexuality can proactively work to uncover other similar boundary shifters. Doing so could potentially enrich the collective understanding of the production of sexual knowledge in the history of sexuality.

About the Author

Stephen Molldrem is a UC President's Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of California, Irvine, in the Department of Anthropology. He

[171] These short writings include Evelyn Hooker, epilogue to *Journal of Social Issues* 34, no. 3 (1978): 131–35; Hooker, introduction to *Positively Gay*, by Betty Burzon (Milbrae, CA: Celestial Arts, 1979); Hooker, foreword to *Journal of Homosexuality* 14, no. 1/2 (1987): xiii, special issue, "Psychotherapy with Homosexual Men and Women: Integrated Identity Approaches for Clinical Practice"; Evelyn Hooker and Mary Ziemba-Davis, epilogue to *Homosexuality/Heterosexuality: Concepts of Sexual Orientation*, ed. David P. McWhirter, Stephanie A. Sanders, and June Machover Reinisch, vol. 2 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 399–402; and Hooker, epilogue to *Textbook of Homosexuality and Mental Health*, ed. Robert P. Casey and Terry S. Stein (Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, 1996), 917–19.

[172] On the concept of "boundary shifter," see Pinch and Trocco, *Analog Days*, 313–14; and Pinch, "Technology and Institutions," 478–79.

received his PhD in American culture with a certificate of graduate studies in science, technology, and society from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. His interests in the history of sexuality are focused on the institutionalization of sexuality research in the American university system, with an emphasis on cross-disciplinary exchanges between scholars working in the clinical, social, behavioral, and computational sciences.