

# THESES ON HOMOSEXUALITY

9/29/2023

1.

For heterosexuals throughout history, there has been a dialectical unity between marriage and prostitution, in which the former is intended for the passage of inheritance to progeny and the latter for men to exploit the bodies of women (usually). In pre-capitalist societies, sexual exploitation of youths in particular was common and socially sanctioned within patron-client hierarchies: that between teacher and student, master and apprentice, general and soldier, etc. For much of history, those with an interest in same-sex eros have mostly only had the latter pole of this relationship, that of prostitution and sexual exploitation, because an institution for passing on inheritance to progeny (marriage, family) would be superfluous, because opportunities for enduring same-sex romance were exceptional, and because the hierarchical polarization of same-sex relations made the “passive” role socially taboo for a man of equal or greater status to participate in. Enduring associations between homosexuality and pederasty — as well as stigma for same-sex relations in general — are thus a vestige of a time when pederasty and prostitution were the dominant forms of same-sex eros. More precisely, homosexuality is singled out as *uniquely pedophilic* or depraved compared to heterosexuality only because heterosexual sexual exploitation has historically been counterbalanced by the institution of marriage and by the moral hypocrisy of the ruling class which denies and downplays its involvement in such “perversions” and “depravities.”

2. Contemporary pederasty, like *all* forms of pedophilia and prostitution (that is, regardless of sexual orientation), is indeed a vestige of less developed social forms, and is destined to die out. Just as professional prostitution developed out of ancient hetaerism, and hetaerism out of group marriage, so too does modern abuse of children develop out of these ancient patron-client relationships. And just as prostitution is still practiced today without being socially sanctioned, men of power still prey upon children under their purview, whether as fathers, teachers, clergy, johns, or politicians. The hypocritical practice of condemning the sin of same-sex eros in public while indulging in it in secret is a time-honored tradition maintained today by our contemporary bourgeoisie and high-status men. In similar fashion, the fascist who has an equal obsession with drawn pedophilia (“loli hentai”) or with youthful feminized males (“femboys”) can also be seen as a continuation of this primitive, pederastic psychopathology, which finds its roots in misogyny and a desire for power over the vulnerable. The fascist and bourgeois alike then project their own sadistic vice on the innocent homosexual, who becomes reviled as a scapegoat. When these pedophilic reactionaries proclaim that we must protect traditional family values from LGBT “degeneracy,” one must understand what tradition they really have in mind: The sexual exploitation of women and children.

3. The modern homosexual, by contrast with the “traditional” pederast, desires enduring romantic partnerships with a mutually consenting partner, and further desires a productive social role in society. Consensual same-sex love in the social form of homosexuality is a *negation* of the earlier form of same-sex eros, and not vestigial of any earlier period in history. The embryo of this modern erotic form can be found in ancient societies, but, in general, only as a minor and subordinate form. This embryo developed within capitalist society as urbanization brought higher density and more opportunities for private affairs and as capitalist relations increasingly atomized and dissolved traditional familial bonds. And yet it is prevented from reaching its highest pitch by the continued domination of patriarchal society and the reactionaries who stand to gain by preserving it.
4. These two forms of same-sex eros require careful, distinct analyses. While there may be social conditions which can influence a person to engage in the *acts* of pederasty or sodomy, there are *no social conditions* which will determine someone’s sexual identity as hetero- or homo-sexual.
5. Reactionaries hate and oppose the institution of gay marriage predominantly because it exposes their institution of heterosexual marriage as a “mere money relation.” In a word, they believe that gay marriage will lead to the abolition of marriage in general. On this score we may say: *they are right, and good riddance!* Gay marriage is historically progressive for the very fact that it openly reveals the class character of heterosexual marriage, and, thereby, contains the possibility for the deinstitutionalization of romantic connections altogether.
6. The Communist principle that relationships be based *only* on the freedom of love, and that woman’s status as a mere instrument of production be abolished, entails that such relationships must not be specifically founded *on the intent or ability to procreate*. The abolition of the “money relations” governing marriage in capitalist society, and hence the abolition of partnership as a civic institution, will simultaneously allow the heterosexual proletarian to seek love freely and establish the conditions that will allow the homosexual proletarian to assimilate fully into socialist society.
7. In the future communist society where the rearing of children becomes a social responsibility, it naturally follows that those who either can’t or won’t reproduce nevertheless have a role in raising the next generation of people.
8. It further follows that contributing to the social reproduction of society without prioritizing one’s own progeny is, perhaps, *the highest expression of socialist values*.
9. What endows sex (ie, consensual sex) with a social character — with relevance to the state and community — is its potential to create new life, to be involved in the reproduction of life and society. It follows from the contrapositive that *if a sexual relationship is non-procreative, then it bears a strictly private character*. That is to say,

there is no scientific or materialist basis for the socialist state to police these private sexual affairs.