

SOCIOLOGY OF HOMOSEXUALITY AND DANGEROUS BODIES? CRITICAL VIEW FROM HIV/AIDS DISCOURSE.

JOYDEB PATRA*

Abstract:

This paper study on the relationship between homophobia/homosexuality to HIV/AIDS. Gay men and their sexual orientation consider to be a 'homosexual', who are disproportionately burden by HIV/AIDS. where HIV/AIDS remain a pressing or representing as a public health issue to reintroduce as criminalization of homosexuality and their bodies categories as "dangerous", which might be untold damage to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention campaign. Thus, sociology has provided empirical tools in its examination of homosexual sub-cultural within cultural milieu. There has been independent emerged 'HIV/AIDS Discourse' is a body of research which showing a variety forms of institutionalized Homosexuality which embedded with power and ideology.

Keywords: sociology, Homosexuality, Dangerous Bodies, HIV/AIDS discourse.

*** UGC-JRF Doctoral Research Scholar, Department of Sociology, Vidyasagar University.**

Introduction

Homosexuality refers to sexual behaviors and desires between males or between females. Such definitions have run into major problems, and nowadays the concept “queer” is used to indicate the fluency of sexual practices and gender performances from Sociological perspective .. Since the 1970s, homosexuality has become the topic of an interdisciplinary specialization variously called gay and lesbian, queer or LGBT studies (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender to which sometimes are added QQI: Queer, Questioning and Intersexual). The field is far removed from traditional sexology that has its base in Sociology, psychology, medicine and biology, and is closely linked to what once were called minority (black and women’s) studies and now gender studies. Michel Foucault made a major imprint with the first volume of his *Histoire de la sexualité* (1976). Other major sociologists contributed to or supported the field, for example Pierre Bourdieu (1998), Michel Maffesoli (1982), Steven Seidman (1997, 1998). Notwithstanding its important intellectual proponents, the field has a very weak base in the universities and departments of sociology where few tenured staff have been nominated anywhere specifically for the field, not even for the sociology of sexuality. Most often tenured staff started to work on homosexual themes because of personal and social interests. Gay studies has kept a strong interdisciplinary quality, often with close cooperation between sociology, history, anthropology and cultural studies. The words homosexual and heterosexual were invented in 1868 and first put in print in 1869 by the Hungarian author Károly Mária Kertbeny (1824-1882). In 1864, the German lawyer Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (1825-1895) had come up with the words “uranism” and “uranian” to describe a similar social reality while “philopedia” was created by the French psychiatrist C.F. Michéa in 1849. These words no longer referred to sexual acts that were sins and crimes and were called sodomy, unnatural intercourse, pederasty and so forth, but to sexual identities and desires that were deeply imbedded in persons. Ulrichs and Kertbeny were predecessors of the gay rights movement and wrote mainly against criminalisation of sodomy. They spoke largely from personal experiences and historical examples. Most medical authors who started to use the new terminologies, discussed mainly the causes of such identities and desires and the question whether they were pathological or normal. They set the standards for the search of a biological basis that continues to this day (“gay gene”). Most physicians started to believe that homosexuality was an innate condition (but not the Freudians) and took the position that it was a disease or abnormality that should be healed and

prevented. The early research by psychiatrists was mainly based on case histories of what they called “perverts”. They not only began to discuss homosexuality, but other perversions as well that got new names such as masochism, sadism, fetichism, exhibitionism, necrophilia, zoophilia and so forth.

Most of the scholarly work on homosexuality remained focussed on psychiatry, both in Europe and the United States. The major sociological breakthrough came from Alfred Kinsey (1894-1956). Although he himself was a biologist specialized in wasps, Kinsey is generally considered to be the founder of the sociology of (homo)sexuality through his two enrich books on the sexual behavior of the US male and female (1948, 1953). Although these studies have been criticized for methodological weaknesses and the reduction of sexuality to only “outlets”, this work has been pivotal to put sexuality on the agenda of the social sciences. Kinsey offered a sociological instead of a psychological perspective on the topic. In his footsteps and in the wake of the nascent homosexual right movement in the US and the UK, sociologists Edward Sagarin and Michael Schofield (1965) started to write on homosexuality from a social perspective, using the pseudonyms Donald Webster Cory (1951, 1956) and Gordon Westwood (1960). Cory’s books gave an overview of what was known on the topic while Westwood interviewed 127 homosexuals on their sexual life. Especially Cory’s work had a wide readership among gay men. These works changed the focus from the aberrant homosexual who had gender identity problems or abused boys, to the society that discriminated against homosexuals and largely contributed to their problems (see Minton 2001 for an overview of early sociological research in the US).

The major concept of the 1970s was HIV/AIDS related stigma. It fitted well with the change from psychology to sociology, from pathology to activism. Symbolic interactionism was added to urban sociology. What homosexual men suffered from, was not their innate abnormality or viciousness, but social rejection. At the time that activists asked for removal of homosexuality from psychiatric classifications such as DSM, and came out of the closets into the streets, sociologists started to discuss sexual stigma (Plummer 1975). A landmark study was *Sexual Conduct* (1973) by John Gagnon and William Simon who developed the concept of sexual script(ing). Their script was what others later named narrative or story (Plummer 1995). Gagnon and Simon wanted to turn away from biological and Freudian perspectives to a sociological one

that combined the social and the individual. Persons become sexual beings in an interaction between both. The major line of research became since the late 1970s historical-sociological. The major work were Michel Foucault's three volumes *Histoire de la sexualité* "History of Sexuality" (1976, 1984, 1984). The first volume *La volonté de savoir* was the founding work of "social constructionism", a word Foucault himself never used. In this work he remarks on the change from the legal concept of sodomy, an act, to the medical one of homosexuality, an identity that will be insistently researched as part of the politics of the body. His work is a strong critique of the idea of sexual liberation, then prominent on the social and scholarly agenda through the work of Wilhelm Reich and Herbert Marcuse. He showed how discourses of sexual liberation had been around since the eighteenth century and mainly contributed to stricter controls of sexuality. His theory of an omnipresent power that used such ideologies to get a firmer grip on sexual practices, spurred a new generation to engage with sexual history, also because sexuality was reconceived as something that changed over time and may in fact not have existed as a special social reality before the rise of sexual sciences. Movements of resistance that were included in his theory of power, played an ambivalent role as they largely contributed to the innovation of body politics. Although the work of Foucault deals with sexual culture in general, his leading theme may well be said to have been homosexuality (see Eribon 1989; Halperin 1995). His studies extended the realm of Gagnon and Simon from micro- to macrolevel and gave it a historical twist.

The Foucauldian approach came at the same time as the establishment of gay and lesbian studies and inspired the first international conference (Aerts 1983). Most new work was based on the idea of "the making of the homosexual" (Plummer 1981; Dannecker 1981). Social constructionism was opposed to essentialism that sees sexual preferences as innate. Few people in gay and lesbian studies defend that position while most of the biologists who research gay genes, brain parts and hormonal systems, are unaware of this critique. Stein (1990; 1999) and Lancaster (2003) analyzed the debates and the various positions. A main theme became the development of essentialist sexual sciences (Hekma 1987; Irvine 1990; Oosterhuis 2001).

Probably the most important secular domain for discussions of homosexuality was in medicine, including psychology. This discourse, in turn, linked up with considerations about the state and

its need for a growing population, good soldiers, and intact families marked by clearly defined gender roles. Doctors were called in by courts to examine sex crime defendants (Foucault, 1980; Greenberg, 1988). At the same time, the dramatic increase in school attendance rates and the average length of time spent in school, reduced transgenerational contact, and hence also the frequency of transgenerational sex. Same-sex relations between persons of roughly the same age became the norm.

Clearly the rise in the prestige of medicine resulted in part from the increasing ability of science to account for natural phenomena on the basis of mechanistic causation. The application of this viewpoint to humans led to accounts of sexuality as innate or biologically driven. The voluntarism of the medieval understanding of sodomy, that sodomites chose sin, gave way to the modern notion of homosexuality as a deep, unchosen characteristic of persons, regardless of whether they act upon that orientation. The idea of a ‘latent sodomite’ would not have made sense, yet under this new view it does make sense to speak of a person as a ‘latent homosexual.’ Instead of specific acts defining a person, as in the medieval view, an entire physical and mental makeup, usually portrayed as somehow defective or pathological, is ascribed to the modern category of ‘homosexual.’ Although there are historical precursors to these ideas (e.g., Aristotle gave a physiological explanation of passive homosexuality), medicine gave them greater public exposure and credibility (Greenberg, 1988, ch.15). The effects of these ideas cut in conflicting ways. Since homosexuality is, by this view, not chosen, it makes less sense to criminalize it. Persons are not choosing evil acts. Yet persons may be expressing a diseased or pathological mental state, and hence medical intervention for a cure is appropriate. Hence doctors, especially psychiatrists, campaigned for the repeal or reduction of criminal penalties for consensual homosexual sodomy, yet intervened to “rehabilitate” homosexuals.

In the 20th century sexual roles were redefined once again. For a variety of reasons, premarital intercourse slowly became more common and eventually acceptable. With the decline of prohibitions against sex for the sake of pleasure even outside of marriage, it became more difficult to argue against gay sex. These trends were especially strong in the 1960's, and it was in this context that the gay liberation movement took off.

Socio-Historiographical Debates :

Broader currents in society have influenced the ways in which scholars and activists have approached research into sexuality and same-sex attraction. Some early 20th century researchers and equality advocates, seeking to vindicate same-sex relations in societies that disparaged and criminalized it, put forward lists of famous historical figures attracted to persons of the same sex. Such lists implied a common historical entity underlying sexual attraction, whether one called it 'inversion' or 'homosexuality.' This approach (or perhaps closely related family of approaches) is commonly called essentialism. Historians and researchers sympathetic to the gay liberation movement of the late 1960s and 1970s produced a number of books that implicitly relied on an essentialist approach. In the 1970s and 1980s John Boswell raised it to a new level of methodological and historical sophistication, although his position shifted over time to one of virtual agnosticism between essentialists and their critics. Crompton's work (2003) is a notable contemporary example of an essentialist methodology.

Essentialists claim that categories of sexual attraction are observed rather than created. For example, while ancient Greece did not have terms that correspond to the heterosexual/homosexual division, persons did note men who were only attracted to person of a specific sex. Through history and across cultures there are consistent features, albeit with meaningful variety over time and space, in sexual attraction to the point that it makes sense of speak of specific sexual orientations. According to this view, homosexuality is a specific, natural kind rather than a cultural or historical product. Essentialists allow that there are cultural differences in how homosexuality is expressed and interpreted, but they emphasize that this does not prevent it from being a universal category of human sexual expression.

In contrast, in the 1970s and since a number of researchers, often influenced by Mary McIntosh or Michel Foucault, argued that class relations, the human sciences, and other historically constructed forces create sexual categories and the personal identities associated with them. For advocates of this view, such as David Halperin, how sex is organized in a given cultural and historical setting is irreducibly particular (Halperin, 2002). The emphasis on the social creation of sexual experience and expression led to the labeling of the viewpoint as social constructionism, although more recently several of its proponents have preferred the term

‘historicism.’ Thus homosexuality, as a specific sexual construction, is best understood as a solely modern, Western concept and role. Prior to the development of this construction, persons were not really ‘homosexual’ even when they were only attracted to persons of the same sex. The differences between, say, ancient Greece, with its emphasis on pederasty, role in the sex act, and social status, and the contemporary Western role of ‘gay’ or ‘homosexual’ are simply too great to collapse into one category.

In this regards, social constructionists argue that specific social constructs produce sexual ways of being. There is no given mode of sexuality that is independent of culture; even the concept and experience of sexual orientation itself are products of history. For advocates of this view, the range of historical sexual diversity, and the fluidity of human possibility, is simply too varied to be adequately captured by any specific conceptual scheme.

Social constructionists argue that essentialism is the weaker position politically for at least two reasons. First, by accepting a basic heterosexual/homosexual organizing dichotomy, essentialism wrongly concedes that heterosexuality is the norm and that homosexuality is, strictly speaking, abnormal and the basis for a permanent minority. Second, social constructionists argue that an important goal of historical investigations should be to put into question contemporary organizing schemas about sexuality. The acceptance of the contemporary heterosexual/homosexual dichotomy is conservative, perhaps even reactionary, and forecloses the exploration of new possibilities. (There are related queer theory criticisms of the essentialist position, discussed below.) In contrast, essentialists argue that a historicist approach forecloses the very possibility of a ‘gay history.’ Instead, the field of investigation becomes other social forces and how they ‘produce’ a distinct form or forms of sexuality. Only an essentialist approach can maintain the project of gay history, and minority histories in general, as a force for liberation.

Natural law theory, at present, has made significant concessions to mainstream liberal thought. In contrast certainly to its medieval formulation, most contemporary natural law theorists argue for limited governmental power, and do not believe that the state has an interest in attempting to prevent all moral wrongdoing. Still, they do argue against homosexuality, and against legal

protections for gays and lesbians in terms of employment and housing, even to the point of serving as expert witnesses in court cases or helping in the writing of *amicus curae* briefs. They also argue against same sex marriage (Bradley, 2001; George, 1999b).

Queer Theory and the Social Construction of Homosexuality:

With the rise of the gay liberation movement in the post-Stonewall era, overtly gay and lesbian perspectives began to be put forward in politics, philosophy and literary theory. Initially these often were overtly linked to feminist analyses of patriarchy (e.g., Rich, 1980) or other, earlier approaches to theory. Yet in the late 1980's and early 1990's queer theory was developed, although there are obviously important antecedents which make it difficult to date it precisely. There are a number of ways in which queer theory differed from earlier gay liberation theory, but an important initial difference can be gotten at by examining the reasons for opting for the term 'queer' as opposed to 'gay and lesbian.' Some versions of, for example, lesbian theory portrayed the essence of lesbian identity and sexuality in very specific terms: non-hierarchical, consensual, and, specifically in terms of sexuality, as not necessarily focused upon genitalia (e.g., Faderman, 1985). Lesbians arguing from this framework, for example, could very well criticize natural law theorists as inscribing into the very "law of nature" an essentially masculine sexuality, focused upon the genitals, penetration, and the status of the male orgasm (natural law theorists rarely mention female orgasms).

This approach, based upon characterizations of 'lesbian' and 'gay' identity and sexuality, however, suffered from three difficulties. First, it appeared even though the goal was to critique a heterosexist regime for its exclusion and marginalization of those whose sexuality is different, any specific or "essentialist" account of gay or lesbian sexuality had the same effect. Sticking with the example used above, of a specific conceptualization of lesbian identity, it denigrates women who are sexually and emotionally attracted to other women, yet who do not fit the description. Sado-masochists and butch/fem lesbians arguably do not fit this ideal of 'equality' offered. A second problem was that by placing such an emphasis upon the gender of one's sexual partner(s), other possible important sources of identity are marginalized, such as race and ethnicity. Many gays and lesbians of color attacked this approach, accusing it of re-inscribing an essentially white identity into the heart of gay or lesbian identity (Jagose, 1996).

The third and final problem for the gay liberationist approach was that it often took this category of 'identity' itself as unproblematic and unhistorical. Such a view, however, largely because of arguments developed within post-structuralism, seemed increasingly untenable. The key figure in the attack upon identity as ahistorical is Michel Foucault. In a series of works he set out to analyze the history of sexuality from ancient Greece to the modern era (1980, 1985, 1986). One of the reasons for the historical review above is that it helps to give some background for understanding the claim that sexuality is socially constructed, rather than given by nature. Moreover, in order to not prejudge the issue of social constructionism versus essentialism, I avoided applying the term 'homosexual' to the ancient or medieval eras. In ancient Greece the gender of one's partner(s) was not important, but instead whether one took the active or passive role. In the medieval view, a 'sodomite' was a person who succumbed to temptation and engaged in certain non-procreative sex acts. Although the gender of the partner was more important than in the ancient view, the broader theological framework placed the emphasis upon a sin versus refraining-from-sin dichotomy. With the rise of the notion of 'homosexuality' in the modern era, a person is placed into a specific category even if one does not act upon those inclinations. What is the common, natural sexuality expressed across these three very different cultures? The social constructionist answer is that there is no 'natural' sexuality; all sexual understandings are constructed within and mediated by cultural understandings. Yet the contemporary understanding of homosexuality divides the sexual domain in two, heterosexual and homosexual, and most heterosexuals cannot respond erotically to their own sex.

In saying that sexuality is a social construct, these theorists are not saying that these understandings are not real. Since persons are also constructs of their culture (in this view), we are made into those categories. Hence today persons of course understand themselves as straight or gay (or perhaps bisexual), and it is very difficult to step outside of these categories, even once one comes to see them as the historical constructs they are.

Gay and lesbian theory was thus faced with three significant problems, all of which involved difficulties with the notion of 'identity.' Queer theory thus arose in large part as an attempt to overcome them. How queer theory does so can be seen by looking at the term 'queer' itself. In contrast to gay or lesbian, 'queer,' it is argued, does not refer to an essence, whether of a sexual

nature or not. Instead it is purely relational, standing as an undefined term that gets its meaning precisely by being that which is outside of the norm, however that norm itself may be defined. As one of the most articulate queer theorists puts it: “Queer is ... *whatever* is at odds with the normal, the legitimate, the dominant. *There is nothing in particular to which it necessarily refers.* It is an identity without an essence” (Halperin, 1995, 62, original emphasis). By lacking any essence, queer does not marginalize those whose sexuality is outside of any gay or lesbian norm, such as sado-masochists. Since specific conceptualizations of sexuality are avoided, and hence not put at the center of any definition of queer, it allows more freedom for self-identification for, say, black lesbians to identify as much or more with their race (or any other trait, such as involvement in an S & M subculture) than with lesbianism. Finally, it incorporates the insights of poststructuralism about the difficulties in ascribing any essence or non-historical aspect to identity.

This central move by queer theorists, the claim that the categories through which identity is understood are all social constructs rather than given to us by nature, opens up a number of analytical possibilities. For example, queer theorists examine how fundamental notions of gender and sex which seem so natural and self-evident to persons in the modern West are in fact constructed and reinforced through everyday actions, and that this occurs in ways that privilege heterosexuality (Butler, 1990, 1993). Also examined are medical categories which are themselves socially constructed (Fausto-Sterling, 2000) , is an erudite example of this, although she is not ultimately a queer theorist). Others examine how language and especially divisions between what is said and what is not said, corresponding to the dichotomy between ‘closeted’ and ‘out,’ especially in regards to the modern division of heterosexual/homosexual, structure much of modern thought. That is, it is argued that when we look at dichotomies such as natural/artificial, or masculine/feminine, we find in the background an implicit reliance upon a very recent, and arbitrary, understanding of the sexual world as split into two species (Sedgwick, 1990). The fluidity of categories created through queer theory even opens the possibility of new sorts of histories that examine previously silent types of affections and relationships (Carter, 2005).

Another critical perspective opened up by a queer approach, although certainly implicit in those just referred to, is especially important. Since most anti-gay and lesbian arguments rely upon the alleged naturalness of heterosexuality, queer theorists attempt to show how these categories are themselves deeply social constructs. An example helps to illustrate the approach. In an essay against gay marriage, chosen because it is very representative, James Q. Wilson (1996) contends that gay men have a “great tendency” to be promiscuous. In contrast, he puts forward loving, monogamous marriage as the natural condition of heterosexuality. Heterosexuality, in his argument, is an odd combination of something completely natural yet simultaneously endangered. One is born straight, yet this natural condition can be subverted by such things as the presence of gay couples, gay teachers, or even excessive talk about homosexuality. Wilson's argument requires a radical disjunction between heterosexuality and homosexuality. If gayness is radically different, it is legitimate to suppress it. Wilson has the courage to be forthright about this element of his argument; he comes out against “the political imposition of tolerance” towards gays and lesbians (Wilson, 1996, 35).

It is a common move in queer theory to bracket, at least temporarily, issues of truth and falsity (Halperin, 1995). Instead, the analysis focuses on the social function of discourse. Questions of who counts as an expert and why, and concerns about the effects of the expert's discourse are given equal status to questions of the verity of what is said. This approach reveals that hidden underneath Wilson's (and other anti-gay) work is an important epistemological move. Since heterosexuality is the natural condition, it is a place that is spoken from but not inquired into. In contrast, homosexuality is the aberration and hence it needs to be studied but it is not an authoritative place from which one can speak. By virtue of this heterosexual privilege, Wilson is allowed the voice of the impartial, fair-minded expert. Yet, as the history section above shows, there are striking discontinuities in understandings of sexuality, and this is true to the point that, according to queer theorists, we should not think of sexuality as having any particular nature at all. Through undoing our infatuation with any specific conception of sexuality, the queer theorist opens space for marginalized forms.

The insistence that we must investigate the ways in which categories such as sexuality and orientation are created and given power through science and other cultural mechanisms has made

queer theory appealing to scholars in a variety of disciplines. Historians and sociologists have drawn on it, which is perhaps unsurprising given the role of historical claims about the social construction of sexuality. Queer theory has been especially influential in literary studies and feminist theory, even though the dividing lines between the latter and queer thinking is contested (see Jagose, 2009; Marinucci, 2010). One of the most prominent scholars working in the area of gay and lesbian issues in constitutional law has also drawn on queer theory to advance his interrogation of the ways that US law privileges heterosexuality (Eskridge, 1999). Scholars in postcolonial and racial analyses, ethnography, American studies, and other fields have drawn on the conceptual tools provided by queer theory.

Despite its roots in postmodernism and Foucault's work in particular, queer theory's reception in France was initially hostile (see Eribon, 2004). The core texts from the first 'wave' of queer theory were slow to appear in French translation, such as Judith Butler's and Eve Sedgwick's central works not coming out until a decade and a half after their original publication. Doubtless the French republican self-understanding, which is universalist and often hostile to movements that are multicultural in their bent, was a factor in the slow and often strenuously resisted importation of queer theoretical insights. Similarly, queer theory has also been on the margins in German philosophy and political philosophy. In sum, it is fair to say that queer theory has had a greater impact in the Anglo-American world.

Queer theory, however, has been criticized in a myriad of ways (Jagose, 1996). One set of criticisms comes from theorists who are sympathetic to gay liberation conceived as a project of radical social change. An initial criticism is that precisely because 'queer' does not refer to any specific sexual status or gender object choice, for example Halperin (1995) allows that straight persons may be 'queer,' it robs gays and lesbians of the distinctiveness of what makes them marginal. It desexualizes identity, when the issue is precisely about a sexual identity (Jagose, 1996). A related criticism is that queer theory, since it refuses any essence or reference to standard ideas of normality, cannot make crucial distinctions. For instance, queer theorists usually argue that one of the advantages of the term 'queer' is that it thereby includes transsexuals, sado-masochists, and other marginalized sexualities. How far does this extend? Is transgenerational sex (e.g., pedophilia) permissible or not? Are there any limits upon the forms

of acceptable sado-masochism or fetishism? While some queer theorists specifically disallow pedophilia, it is an open question whether the theory has the resources to support such a distinction. Furthermore, some queer theorists overtly refuse to rule out pedophiles as ‘queer’ (Halperin, 1995, 62) Another criticism is that queer theory, in part because it typically has recourse to a very technical jargon, is written by a narrow elite for that narrow elite. It is therefore class biased and also, in practice, only really referred to at universities and colleges (Malinowitz, 1993).

Queer theory is also criticized by those who reject the desirability of radical social change. For example, centrist and conservative gays and lesbians have criticized a queer approach by arguing that it will be “disastrously counter-productive” (Bawer, 1996, xii). If ‘queer’ keeps its connotation of something perverse and at odds with mainstream society, which is precisely what most queer theorists want, it would seem to only validate the attacks upon gays and lesbians made by conservatives. Sullivan (1996) also criticizes queer theorists for relying upon Foucault's account of power, which he argues does not allow for meaningful resistance. It seems likely, however, that Sullivan's understanding of Foucault's notions of power and resistance are misguided.

II

In general, homosexuality is a way of life by which the new kind of social network or fabric created by the interweaving of the diverse personalities traits who have come to define and identify themselves as a homosexual. Simultaneously , homosexuality represents the ‘archetypal deviant ‘ living on the fringes of normal cultures and social control and is the perfect scapegoat around with them which society can , and does , unite in condemnation as a form of social control(South, 1999). Words of Jock Young (1999:133) , ‘every folk devil sharpness the image of the normal person in the street : in these instances the normal family and the ‘normal’ and the normal way of life” . socially constructed concept of dangerousness or dangerous body are central to the operation of social categories based on differentiation between the self as ‘Us’ and the others as ‘them’ . the distinction between us and them mentality that underpins the stigma and discrimination which involves delineation of the boundaries between safety(us) and danger(them) . This has long been reflected in the in the characterizations of homosexual as

coming from excluded members of the ‘dangerous category’, or more recently the vulnerable or risk class.

The social construction of the ‘dangerous bodies’ is linked to the emergence of the ‘science of psychiatry and criminology with medical sociology’ (Cohen, 1985). In this regards, Foucault’s analysis illustrated how the medical gaze ‘become integrated with the surveillance and intervention of the homosexual. The construction of dangerous bodies provided the leverage for medical sociology and psychiatry to penetrate to portrayed criminal, and as a consequences punishment shift from the social perception of the mind to the body of the homosexual (Mason, and Marcer, 1999). As the medicalization of social control of homosexual gained ascendancy, the medical gaze not only fell not only upon perpetrator of the homosexual but also act or way of life committing to more indiscretions, so the dangerous body became an ever expanding category. With the pathologization of offending behavior there was a shift in focus from the criminal acts to social disobedience acts, the dangerous bodies. In Foucault interpretation the deviance associated with the dangerous bodies’ is based on not on the behavior but upon ‘what he/she is by nature, according to his constitution, character traits or his/her pathological variables, (Foucault, 1978:17-18).

Contemporary culture and the mainstream patriarchy imbedded journalism capitalized upon and further perpetuate the public horror and anxiety with fear which is associated with the ‘dangerous bodies’. This collective fear of deviant behaviours and the obsessions with pathological deviant has lead to the dangerous behaviors’ becoming the personification of badness and evil acts for society. A focus upon how the ‘dangerous bodies responds to their notoriety and maintains a sense of self-identity thus provides a useful exemplar of the personal challenge to the stigmatized status. The words of homosexual very much conformed to the stereotype of the dangerous bodies and express the full of negative attitudes towards them as follows by, **Herek**, who established the Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men Scale in psychology, states:

The ATLG and its subscales are consistently correlated with other theoretically relevant constructs. Higher scores (more negative attitudes) correlate significantly with high religiosity, lack of contact with gay men and lesbians, adherence to traditional sex-role attitudes, belief in a traditional family ideology, and high levels of dogmatism.

III

"... a critical study of AIDS discourse with its intertextual awareness is not only a legitimate concern, but needs to be seen as an essential dimension of AIDS research. It contributes towards a more caring and informed society, deepening the democratic project and the struggle to achieve greater sexual "equality" to uphold human rights and human dignity" (Seidel, 1990:79).

From the earliest work in this field, writings on "the problem of AIDS" typically were prefaced by "high-risk groups"(homosexual) were most vulnerable to infection by HIV. Thus, in the early literature, originating largely from the United States, HIV/AIDS was depicted predominantly as a disease of male homosexuals, intravenous drug-users and sex workers. This was accompanied by a powerful and dominant stigmatising and "othering" discourse which saw the virus associated with deviant and promiscuous behaviour of minorities, giving rise to moral panic, blaming of others and denial of risk among the general public (Treichler, 1987; Plummer, 1988). However, it soon became apparent that HIV infection was not restricted to such others and biomedical research into the causes and progression of the virus increased dramatically. Medicalising discourses of HIV/AIDS provided images of an invisible and silent epidemic, invariably leading to a painful and drawn-out death, undetectable without sophisticated medical tests, and with no known prevention or cure (Young, 1987; Sontag, 1988; Patton, 1990). The slowness of other disciplines in responding to the initial impact of HIV/AIDS gave room to medical and behavioural perspectives to become the predominant discourses on AIDS (van Eerdewijk 2007:36) and, consequently, on research on sexuality (Parker 2001. Given that medical perspectives dominated the initial enthusiasm in dealing with HIV/AIDS and its effects (Packard and Epstein 1991; Parker 1995:260; Schoepf 1995:41). According to Vance (1999:47),

"AIDS encourages biomedical approaches to sexuality through the repeated association of sexuality with disease. And this is the basis of the hegemonic medical discourse, which is, basically, concerned with symptoms, with depersonalised 'seropositives'. ... Medical discourse has shaped the cultural agenda of AIDS in which the person with AIDS, as a full human person, is absent. ... To think in terms of exclusive, fixed categories, of a fixed relationship between sex and gender, and to advance monocausal explanations for extremely complex social phenomena, is to be blind to the flexibility of sexual behaviours and to the interrelatedness of risk. ...

The hegemonic medical paradigm has been deaf to women's voices (from feminine discourse) and altogether reductionist (Seidel 1993:176). With the categorisations of HIV infection in terms of Patterns, "dangerous bodies" (Seidel 1993; Patton 1997), Pattern One referring to Europe and North America where most infections occur through drug injection and homosexual contacts, and Pattern Two referring to Africa where HIV is mainly transmitted through heterosexual sex, there was "invention of African AIDS" (Patton 1997), and the eventual struggle to explain the phenomenon. With the limited knowledge of African cultures and societies based on colonial literature which was ethnocentric and evolutionist (Packard and Epstein 1991; Stillwaggon 2003; Lyons and Lyons 2004), higher levels of sexual promiscuity were put as an explanation for the AIDS. Caldwell, Caldwell and Quiggin (1989), with the "homosexual permissive thesis", became an important point of reference to explain high HIV rates from a distinct homosexuality that is characterised by high rates of partner change and sexual networking. In brief, their argument is: "there is a distinct and internally coherent system embracing sexuality, marriage and much else" (Caldwell et al 1989:187), whereby Western Europe developed into a system with "a proper and stable marriage to a person of the same social class, and its ensuring by controlling pre-marital and extra-marital sexuality. Sexual behaviour, especially the lesbian sexual behaviour, moved to centre stage in morality and theology" (Ibid.: 192). All this was geared towards controlling property. In the situation was different: instead of controlling property, it was about control of people, a system named "wealth in people" (Bledsoe and Cohen 1993:70-71), whereby fertility and reproduction become important, with weaker marriage bonds than lineage links. Since non-marital births or marriage dissolution are not greatly feared, there is little need to control sexuality and the sexual act. From the permissive sexuality thesis, it is therefore implied that

Sexual promiscuity, particularly among women, is the name of norms, and that the lack of "control" of women's sexuality is the key to the AIDS epidemic in that region (Le Blanc, Meintel and Piché 1991:501).

And Van Eerdewijk (2007:38) argues that The conclusions of the Caldwells is that the high degree of permissiveness and little morality on sexuality in a whole which allow for multiple partnership and high rates of partner change, and that this level of sexual networking makes it

easy for HIV to spread. This paper would not like to get into a discussion on the criticisms about this homosexual point of view. According to Arnfred (2004b:67), need to be more a revitalisation of these age-old images fed by homosexual anxieties and fears than an introduction of something new. It is all there: the unbridled black female sexuality, excessive, threatening and contagious, carrying a deadly disease. This is an expression of the Homosexual as the "social Other" in a form of a myth of hyper-sexualised as opposed to idealised Normal sexuality or normativity (Lyons and Lyons 2004 Basically, the HIV/AIDS Discourse has resulted into behavioural paradigms to deal with HIV/AIDS. The paradigm has focused on identifying cultural aspects of sexuality that could contribute to the spread of HIV/ AIDS. Gausset (2001) mentions some of them as polygamy, adultery, premarital sex, wife-sharing, widow inheritance, circumcision and scarification rituals, dry sex and witchcraft beliefs. The problem is that a good number of these practices were taken out of their contexts, exaggerated, distorted or invented (Treichler 1992:390) and, in so doing, lost their meanings, importance and embedment in cultural, social, economic and political contexts (Van Eerdewijk 2007:41). This section has presented the dominant HIV/AIDS discourse as based on the Homosexual permissiveness theory, expressed in the biomedical and behavioural-oriented interventions. Some important conclusions may be drawn from the preceding, in light of the assessment of the dominant HIV/AIDS discourse from homosexual orientation.

IV

Conclusion:

The debates about homosexuality, in part because they often involve categories dangerous bodies and HIV/AIDS, tend to be sharply politicizing issues. We have academically and politically conceive and convinced that we know and redefined to deconstruct the phenomenon of homosexuality than ever before. With this infringe our intellectual movement shift away from an exclusive dependence on psychiatric perspective to sociological understanding. While, sociology of homosexuality, will offer explanatory to synthetic description of the homosexual as a way of life.

Those most concerned with homosexuality, positively or negatively, are also those most engaged, with natural law theorists arguing for homosexual having a reduced legal status to

social conformity and queer theorists engaged in critique and deconstruction of what they see as a heterosexist regime. Yet the two do not talk much to one another, but rather ignore or talk past one another. There are some theorists in the middle. For example, Michael Sandel takes an Aristotelian approach from which he argues that gay and lesbian relationships can realize the same goods that heterosexual relationships do (Sandel, 1995). He largely shares the account of important human goods that natural law theorists have, yet in his evaluation of the worth of same-sex relationships, he is clearly sympathetic to gay and lesbian concerns. Similarly, Bruce Bawer (1993) and Andrew Sullivan (1995) have written eloquent defenses of full legal equality for gays and lesbians, including marriage rights. Yet neither argue for any systematic reform of broader American culture or politics. In this they are essentially conservative. With the onset of AIDS, this already fractured collective was confronted by a new set of pressures. The popular discourses that misrepresented AIDS as a gay disease contributed to renewed homophobia and necessitated a review of assimilationist strategies. Acceptance was all too quickly revealed to be tolerance, which was swiftly becoming intolerance. This led, in turn, to a renewed but decentralized radicalism in gay and lesbian politics.

References:

- [1] Butler, Judith, *Gender Trouble: feminism and the subversion of Identity*, Routledge ; London, 1990.
- [2] Jagose, Annamarie , *Queer Theory* , Melbourne University Press , Melbourne , 1996.
- [3] Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*, penguin Harmondsworth , 1984.
- [4] D, Cory , *The Homosexual Outlooks* . London: Neville 1953.
- [5] Hauser, R , *the Homosexual Society* . London: mayflower-Bell .1962.
- [6] Matza, D. *Becoming Deviant*, LONDON: Wiley and sons, 1969.
- [7] Schar, E . *Sociological factors in Homosexual Behavior* . Working Paper of Hooker Report , Unpublished .1969.
- [8] Warnner , Michael , (ed) *Fear of a Queer Planet : Queer Politics and social Theory* . University of Minnesota Press , London .1993.
- [9] Wetwood , G. *Society and the Homosexual* . London : Gollanez .1960 .