

THE MAN WHO INVENTED GENDER

ENGAGING THE IDEAS OF JOHN MONEY

TERRY GOLDIE



UBC Press • Vancouver • Toronto

Sample Material © 2014 UBC Press

SEXUALITY STUDIES SERIES

This series focuses on original, provocative, scholarly research examining from a range of perspectives the complexity of human sexual practice, identity, community, and desire. Books in the series explore how sexuality interacts with other aspects of society, such as law, education, feminism, racial diversity, the family, policing, sport, government, religion, mass media, medicine, and employment. The series provides a broad public venue for nurturing debate, cultivating talent, and expanding knowledge of human sexual expression, past and present.

Other volumes in the series are:

Masculinities without Men? Female Masculinity in Twentieth-Century Fictions,
by Jean Bobby Noble

Every Inch a Woman: Phallic Possession, Femininity, and the Text, by Carellin
Brooks

Queer Youth in the Province of the "Severely Normal," by Gloria Filax

The Manly Modern: Masculinity in Postwar Canada, by Christopher Dummitt

Sexing the Teacher: School Sex Scandals and Queer Pedagogies, by Sheila L.
Cavanagh

Undercurrents: Queer Culture and Postcolonial Hong Kong, by Helen Hok-Sze
Leung

Sapphistries: A Global History of Love between Women, by Leila J. Rupp

The Canadian War on Queers: National Security as Sexual Regulation, by Gary
Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile

Awfully Devoted Women: Lesbian Lives in Canada, 1900-65, by Cameron Duder

Judging Homosexuals: A History of Gay Persecution in Quebec and France,
by Patrice Corriveau

Sex Work: Rethinking the Job, Respecting the Workers, by Colette Parent, Chris
Bruckert, Patrice Corriveau, Maria Nengeh Mensah, and Louise Toupin

Selling Sex: Experience, Advocacy, and Research on Sex Work in Canada, edited
by Emily van der Meulen, Elya M. Durisin, and Victoria Love

© UBC Press 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES CANADA CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION

Goldie, Terry, author

The man who invented gender: engaging the ideas of John Money / Terry Goldie.

(Sexuality studies series)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Issued in print and electronic formats.

ISBN 978-0-7748-2792-8 (bound). – ISBN 978-0-7748-2794-2 (pdf). –

ISBN 978-0-7748-2795-9 (epub)

1. Money, John, 1921-2006. 2. Sexology. 3. Sex (Biology). 4. Sex (Psychology).

I. Title. II. Series: Sexuality studies series

HQ60.G65 2014

306.7

C2014-902402-9

C2014-902403-7

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

www.ubcpress.ca

Sample Material © 2014 UBC Press

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments / ix

Introduction: Sexual Behaviour in the Human / 3

1 Once a Brethren Boy: The Early Years / 16

2 Fixing Sex: Intersex / 39

3 Lovemaps: The Relationship World / 67

4 Man and Woman, Boy and Girl: Transsexuality / 89

5 Gay, Straight, and In-Between: Homosexuality / 114

6 The Edge of the Alphabet: Neologisms / 134

7 What Wild Ecstasy: Sexual Liberation, Pedophilia, and Pornography / 151

8 As Nature Made Him: The Reimer Case / 174

Conclusion: Venuses Penuses / 194

Works Cited / 214

Index / 228

INTRODUCTION

Sexual Behaviour in the Human

Anyone interested enough to read this book will probably recognize the subtitle of this introduction: it refers to Kinsey's two volumes, *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* (1948) and *Behavior in the Human Female* (1953). Did the earth move? Yes, it did. But you will note also that I left off the last word of each volume's title. The earth had to wait for John Money to invent gender.

In 1993, feminist critic Camille Paglia said, "Dr. John Money was one of my principal intellectual influences when I was writing *Sexual Personae*. He is the leading sexologist in the world today." Although Paglia is certainly given to overstatement, she is not overstating the case here. In the 1970s and '80s, Money's presence was ubiquitous, from interviews in many mainstream magazines to numerous appearances on television and constant quotations in newspapers. His pleas for sexual liberation made him hot copy for journalists and a frequent target for the many conservatives who feared the idea of sexual freedom. His theories at the time were at the cutting edge of changing views on intersex, transsexuals, homosexuality, and all aspects of sex and gender.

Moving forward, both the importance of Money and today's popular negative assessment of his work are suggested by Jeffrey Eugenides's Pulitzer-prize-winning novel, *Middlesex* (2003). The protagonist, Cal, brought up as a girl, seems to be becoming male at puberty and so is brought to the clinic of Dr. Peter Luce, the world's most famous specialist on sex disorders. Luce,

a thinly disguised version of John Money, is obsessed with his own theories of gender malleability and is convinced that Cal should remain a girl. In a rather typical narrative flourish, Cal establishes his individuation by refusing the diagnosis and starting his new life as a man. In the end, the avant-garde theorist acclaimed by the world is refuted by the individual who understands his own biology.

Born in New Zealand, soon after the Second World War Money moved to the United States to do a PhD in psychology, writing a dissertation on intersex at Harvard. He accepted a position at Johns Hopkins University Hospital as a psychologist in the endocrinology clinic, where he remained until his death in 2006. This superficial, yet accurate, summary of his life is not the stuff of an interesting biography. His own bisexuality and penchant for constant travel were also not marks of an unusual life. Instead, for John Money, all aspects of his existence were funnelled into his professional life. His last published book was *A First Person History of Pediatric Psychoendocrinology* (2002a), and the implication of the title is apt: he was first and foremost a part of the area of expertise that he developed. The rest of his existence was secondary.

In an important way, this book begins with another: John Colapinto's *As Nature Made Him: The Boy Who Was Raised as a Girl*. Shortly after it was published in 2000, I heard a colleague give a talk on transsexuality in which John Money was presented as a source of evil. This rather surprised me. I had read a bit of Money's work, and, while far from an expert on him, I had thought of him as a central positive force in the move to accept the medical necessity of performing the surgery demanded by transsexuals. I asked my colleague why he felt this way, and he said, "Have you read *As Nature Made Him*?" I had not because, at the time, my immediate research was going in other directions. Then, when preparing my book *Queersexlife: Autobiographical Thoughts on Sexuality, Gender and Identity* (2008), I found myself reading much more by Money. When that research was finished, I finally read *As Nature Made Him*. And I was immediately incensed.

As Nature Made Him is an account of one man's encounter with gender reassignment. In 1965, an identical twin had his penis burned off in a circumcision accident and was raised as a girl under the influence and care of John Money. The case, in its anonymous guise, was called "John/Joan," but the man was later revealed to be David Reimer. As an adult, Reimer rejected the gender reassignment and lived the rest of his life as a male. From the time that Money started writing about it in the late 1960s, the case became central to changes

in beliefs about the relationship between the social construction of gender and biological sex. It also became central to his fame. Money's own publications consistently used the case as proof of a variety of ideas. But the assumption that he advocated "changing boys into girls" became central to many of the attacks on Money's theories.

According to Colapinto's book, the gender reassignment of Reimer never had any medical validity. In Colapinto's view, the procedure was instituted by Money to justify his ideas but had the consequence of destroying David Reimer. When it was revealed that "Joan" was once more "John" and that Reimer denied that he had ever felt any fit with his female identity, all the conservative views of biology and gender – and all the forces opposed to Money – came together in a "perfect storm." The power of that storm remains unabated – always interrupting, commenting on, and, perhaps, eventually defeating a fuller portrait of Money's work that the present book hopes to convey. Widely referred to in both popular and scholarly publications, *As Nature Made Him* is often used to justify the defeat of John Money's ideas.

Although Colapinto seems to be attacking Money's work as a clinician, he was more interested in attacking his theories, which is actually appropriate, as Money's influence was achieved through his writing rather than through his clinical work. Even in the Reimer case, his treatment of Reimer was of minor importance in comparison to the influence of his theories about the malleability of gender – theories that Reimer's parents actually embraced in response to Money's appearance on television and long before Money had any contact with Reimer. Money was very important to certain patients, but the actual number of patients he encountered was limited, considering his many years in the hospital. While most patients remember him fondly, as noted grudgingly by Colapinto in *As Nature Made Him*, his colleagues tended to find him difficult. Thus, he had less support from surgeons and other medical personnel that would have enabled him to develop broader contacts with patients. Some of his students and postdoctoral fellows, most notably internationally known researcher in gender and sexual development Anke Ehrhardt (professor of medical psychology at Columbia University) and psychologist Greg Lehne (assistant professor of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins), remained close to him throughout his career, but most of them did not stay close to him once their fellowships were over. At the beginning of his career, he did develop close relationships with mentors such as Lawson Wilkins, a pioneer of pediatric endocrinology, and colleagues such as Johns Hopkins endocrinologist Claude Migeon. However, for the most part, Money, whose professional

qualification was “clinical psychologist,” could be categorized as a somewhat isolated thinker. Throughout his career, what Money did on a day-to-day basis seems to have had limited effect, regardless of what he or others said about his actions. On the other hand, his ideas, and the way they were expressed in many books and articles he wrote, had great impact. That is what I concentrate on in this book.

Money certainly considered himself to be the source of the concept of “gender.” As my discussion shows, however, Money might have just popularized a usage that already existed, at least in some small way. Still, this book suggests many much wider issues. Feminism would soon embrace *gender* as a term for the social construction of masculinity and femininity, as opposed to the biological term *sex*. Much of feminist thought, particularly in the 1970s, treated gender as completely independent of biology, as though the history of an almost universal force called the patriarchy had compelled the division of humans into male and female, with all aspects of our cultures the products of that compulsory separation. This was not Money’s view of gender, but it continues to define much of the usage. Thus, it must be somewhat surprising that this term could be attributed to a man. On the one hand, this justifies Money’s not-small claims to being a feminist. Some have gone so far as to depict Money as opposed to masculinity, which was far from the case. On the other hand, Money’s “invention” reflects the power and even arrogance of his approach to science. He tended to assume his own originality or at least innovation in every endeavour. He was certainly a dominant male, and in his interactions with his colleagues he had all the assurance of the stereotypical medical doctor of the time, regardless of the fact that he was a psychologist. While Money’s writing often asserted that a medical “truth” can have a brief life, and his manner with his patients was benevolently paternal rather than dogmatically patriarchal, his colleagues and subordinates have many tales that show he did not suffer disagreement and could be verbally abusive in opposition. *Imperious* might be an appropriate adjective.

EXPRESSING GENDER: LANGUAGE AND INVENTION

This book is not a biography, and, in the second chapter, I address some of the difficulties facing anyone attempting to write a biography of the man John Money. Suffice it to say here that a biography about the inventor would likely be a very slim one. In contrast, his “inventions” have a range that animates a

fascinating narrative of all aspects of sexuality and gender that dominated discussion in the last half of the twentieth century. From intersex through transsexuality, homosexuality, and sexual liberation, Money's ideas were central. The term *invented* might seem to reach too far, especially given the word *gender* already existed. Yet the definition of *invention* in the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED Online)* suggests some of the applicable nuances. To invent is "to come upon, find; to find out, discover." Money's new definition of the word *gender* was but one early example of his lifelong attempts at discovery. He might have "come upon" rather than created the concept of gender, but he certainly discovered or uncovered its possibility and easily convinced many people that it was his word. A second definition of *invent* is "to find out or produce by mental activity." Money's great source of power was his incessant brilliance, but the process of his working life shows that his mental activity could produce too much and led to theories that caused him and others great pain.

For Colapinto, Money's analysis of the Reimer case fit another definition of invention: "To devise something false or fictitious; to fabricate, feign, 'make up.'" And Colapinto would certainly consider that Money was fulfilling another meaning, now apparently obsolete, "to plan, plot." But for Money, the hope of "inventing gender" would have followed our usual contemporary definition of the word: "To find out in the way of original contrivance; to create, produce, or construct by original thought or ingenuity; to devise first, originate (a new method of action, kind of instrument, etc.)." All of Money's theoretical developments, all of his neologisms, show the energy of that aspiration to "original thought or ingenuity; to devise first, originate." All his pride in the ubiquity of the word *gender* showed that glee of origination. And even if he was not truly the founder of the word, he certainly fulfilled another obsolete definition of *to invent*: "To originate, introduce, or bring into use formally or by authority; to found, establish, institute, appoint." Whether he originated *gender*, he certainly used his authority to institute and appoint it.

Money's exploration of intersex in the early 1950s was not the first psychological overview of the topic, but it helped to establish a field that really did not exist before Money arrived to work at Johns Hopkins. Before this time, urologists and endocrinologists worked on what were called "pseudohermaphrodites" and "true hermaphrodites," and there was seldom a general consideration of the psychological and social issues associated with them as persons. Money was also instrumental in establishing the clinic for transsexuals at Johns Hopkins, at a time when there was no other location in the

United States that declared itself a centre for gender reassignment surgery. Beyond his status as faculty at Johns Hopkins, his comments on sexual liberation, paraphilias, homosexuality, and sexual and love relationships in general earned him a reputation as what Paglia (1993) describes as the default source for any questions about sex and gender. He became the expert on sexuality – whether in the popular press in such publications as *Time* or *Playboy* or in the courts. In 1977, the *Johns Hopkins News-Letter* proclaimed that when “Doctor Money Speaks, the Whole World Listens.”

Whether one regards Money positively or negatively, his theories of bodies – primarily intersex and transsexual – are his legacy, and so too are his theories of the gender expressions and sexuality of all human bodies. Words and language were a central component of Money’s understanding and of his emphatic, at times dogmatic, expressions of that understanding. Even Money’s PhD on the psychosocial adaptations of intersex individuals, the expertise on which his entire career rested, was only slightly about his own work with patients, and that part consisted primarily of a record of interviews. The rest was his analysis of the texts of various clinical records. And as has often been said, our ideas must be expressed in language. Thus, Money’s obsession with his achievement in establishing that word, *gender*, was about the importance of language in our understanding of bodies and sexuality.

Money here illustrates yet another “obsolete” definition of *invention*: “To compose as a work of imagination or literary art; to treat in the way of literary or artistic composition.” While his purpose was always to support research and clinical treatment rather than “art,” he was well aware of the importance of creativity in literary presentation. He recognized that both theory and polemic were dependent on rhetoric. Or, perhaps, *inventio*. Plato, in the *Gorgias*, suggests that the various aspects of classical rhetoric are mere mechanics and often deceitful. *Inventio* – the discovery of arguments – might be one of the worst culprits in its love of innovative language. But the word *discovery* suggests the importance of appropriate choice in creating a convincing presentation. There are various points in this book where I question Money’s *inventio*, especially when he created arguments that go beyond what the evidence can justify. This is particularly an issue when he draws on his limited knowledge of Australian Aboriginal culture to support his theories of sexual education. But this is also the case for Colapinto’s *inventio* in *As Nature Made Him*. The many attacks on Money were based on what happened to David Reimer – a person, a human being – but it is the *inventio* in *As Nature Made Him* – the form of the argument – that created the impression of John Money as some kind of mad scientist.

SEXOLOGY AND SCIENCE: THEORIES AND EXPERTISE

What does it mean to label Money a “sexologist?” He usually referred to his own work as “sexology.” Although he certainly liked the scientific flamboyance of the term *pediatric psychoendocrinologist*, during most of his career he seemed less happy with the broad category of “psychologist” than with the broad – and often undefined – category of “sexologist.”

The first usage of *sexology*, according to the *OED*, occurred in 1867 in *Sexology as the Philosophy of Life: Implying Social Organization and Government*, by Elizabeth Osgood Goodrich Willard. In this book, Willard expresses the Christian fear that sexual activity destroys the self, the family, and everything else – exactly the attitude Money so vociferously attacked in *The Destroying Angel* (1985b). Willard’s comments tend to the global and censorious: “I am of the opinion that a man who uses tobacco is not fit to be a husband or a father” (1867, 390). William H. Walling’s *Sexology* (1902) is not that different, although Walling, a physician, wrote the book ostensibly to offer medical help. An early example of what has been called the “marriage manual,” it begins with pages of praise and endorsements from clergymen. Although less freewheeling than Willard’s book, the attitudes are similar: “In describing the evils of sexual excesses and unnatural practices, we point with the finger of authority which they dare not despise, at the deplorable consequences involved, consequences which none may escape” (1902, i).

In other words, the term *sexology* began with a pejorative connotation that today seems somewhat odd. Yet, by 1913, the term *sexologist* was used more or less as it is today. The *OED* provides the following citation: “1913 W.J. Robinson *Pract. Treat. Causes, Symptoms & Treatm. Sexual Impotence* xiii. 93. Some sexologists claim that in the strict sense of the term there is no such thing as a physiologic pollution.” It is interesting to note, however, that the early sexologists – from Krafft-Ebing to Hirschfeld through to Havelock Ellis and Freud – were physicians. From the beginning, the field had a clear medical emphasis, although the sexologist almost invariably researched psychology or psychiatry. By the time Money entered the field in the 1950s, however, medical certification was less and less the qualification of the sexologist. For example, very few urologists who work on sexuality today would call themselves sexologists. Instead, the term came to be embraced primarily by psychologists or others whose qualification is in some sense psychology, such as educators and social workers. This has been important both to the field and to Money. Although the absence of physicians made sexology more open, it also made it seem less prestigious and less precisely scientific. At meetings

of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, for example, there is often an undercurrent of yearning for prestige and scientific respectability. And a general absence of medical doctors.

Money's own approach to his work was both personal and distant. He had enormous personal investment in all aspects of his professional life, and yet, throughout his writing, he tried to maintain an air of scientific detachment. This is most evident in the contrast between his own representation of the Reimer case and that provided by Colapinto. To Colapinto, Money was a medical demon, manipulating all around him to his own benefit. However, Money's many references to the case offer little suggestion that he was involved as anything other than a keen observer. Returning to the title of his book, *A First Person History of Pediatric Psychoendocrinology*, mentioned earlier, rather than employing *first person* as a narrative stance – a reflective subjectivity watching – Money presented himself as a person who was there first and thus best able to provide an account of this field with the very medical, multisyllabic name. For Money the thought process was as it is for the stereotypical scientist: the thinking produces the knowledge, but it is the knowledge, rather than the thinking, that counts.

Just as Money the psychologist-sexologist represents a change from the early sexologists, so too does he represent a change, in various ways, from his more immediate precursors. In the field of intersex, one might look to a urologist such as Hugh Hampton Young or an endocrinologist such as Lawson Wilkins, but neither pursued the general category of intersex in the manner that Money did. Albert Ellis, another psychologist who wrote paeans to sexual freedom, wrote an article that provided a general and generous look at intersex in 1945, but he never built on it. While Harry Benjamin was more of an activist in transsexuality than Money, he lacked the entrepreneurial skills that allowed Money to set up the Johns Hopkins clinic. Kinsey's group certainly did much more methodical and extensive research on human sexuality than Money. Although Money laboured ardently to maintain longitudinal studies on the intersex children who came to Johns Hopkins, most of his theories on sexuality and gender were based on very limited clinical data. His ideas tended to be rather inductive and were then checked out via the literature. The concepts were not predominantly from work with his own patients. On the other hand, he was ready to make general theories on all aspects of sexuality and gender. Some of his most brilliant and perceptive ideas were produced on sparse experience, which makes him, in a sense, an anti-Kinsey, given that Kinsey tended to see his own primary contribution more in acquiring and arranging data than in theorizing from those data.

Money is similarly different from William H. Masters and Virginia E. Johnson, or, as they are forever known, “Masters and Johnson,” who were first and foremost clinicians and therapists with extensive laboratory studies. Their published work tended to emphasize aspects of behaviour and physiology that needed either change or reinforcement. Money’s work in similar areas, most obviously in his theorization of the lovemap, used little or no laboratory information and had limited interest in physiology. Instead, Money was primarily concerned with the ideas that he gleaned from studies that emphasized psychology. One might go so far as to suggest that he presented a philosophical response to issues of gender and sex. This approach might seem similar to the later work of Albert Ellis, but, although Ellis certainly had claims to the category of sexologist, his publications might be better seen as theorizations in the aid of psychotherapy, with a concentration on sex. Ellis was never as general or even as flamboyant as Money. While Ellis was controversial and far from retiring in presenting his views on subjects such as his rational emotive behaviour therapy, Money’s canvas was larger. He ardently pursued a role as a sex liberationist and was forever in search of a public venue for his ideas. Another academic similarly obsessed with science might have found it off-putting to attempt to place those ideas in a form that would appeal to the popular press, but Money leapt in where other angels of the medical world would quite sensibly have feared to tread. The obvious comparison would be with someone such as Havelock Ellis, who clearly wished to further the liberation of the various sexual possibilities and yet constantly retrenched partly because of fear of censorship but also because of a concern that his ideas not be rejected by the voices for propriety. Money, on the other hand, seemed to believe that, once he established his expertise and bona fides, he should be allowed to say whatever he pleased. And then he need only wait until the world was convinced.

Money was very much a man of his time. His first published words could not have appeared other than immediately after the Second World War, and his last writings, at the end of the twentieth century, were too late, in that they both theoretically and temperamentally harked back to the earlier rise of sexual liberation and a rather freewheeling sexual science. Both of the latter had seemed, in the 1970s, to be an inevitably expanding part of the future, and yet, by the 1990s, a new conservatism had overcome the liberation and was turning the science into a restrained form of analysis that had no room for Money’s creative generalizations. The rise of AIDS was not central to any of Money’s primary areas of interest, but it had helped to sponsor, or at least coincided with, a repressive morality that had no interest in sexology other

than as part of disease prevention. Such a time of restraint was not conducive to Money's theories or to Money's mode of operation. While Money constantly extended and developed his theories in all his areas of endeavour, he seldom changed them significantly. Part of the reason his ideas might seem avant-garde in the 1950s and out of date in the 1990s is that they are much the same in both periods. Having dwelled on his writings for a number of years, I am struck by how consistent he was. In some ways, this is positive in that he developed theories and then worked within them, but it is also negative: there is little suggestion that the research of others or social transformations did much to change his mind. Thus, while the present study always takes note of the date of publication, there is no attempt to follow chronology. Rather, the process in each chapter is to trace the variety of nuances in Money's thought on the subject at hand. The dates are most notable for how little they reveal about his ideas.

This book examines John Money's thoughts on and achievements in his major fields: intersex, transsexuality, homosexuality, and sexual liberation. It does not attempt to trace the fields more than to suggest how his ideas fit within them. While I am always aware of the larger contexts, this book is very much about one man's thoughts rather than about the overall developments in sexology. For overviews of intersex or transsexuality, the reader must look elsewhere, particularly Katrina Karkazis's *Fixing Sex: Intersex, Medical Authority, and Lived Experience* (2008) and Joanne J. Meyerowitz's *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality* (2002). However, Money was a central figure in each of the areas considered here. In some of them, for a time, he was the central figure. In all, he offered theories and made claims that have changed lives and created controversy. He could not have been who he was in another period. The immediate post-Kinsey era of the 1970s and '80s enabled him to operate as a sexologist in ways that Kinsey himself would have thought impossible, such as his many appearances in the popular press. But sexology also would have been a very different field without Money. To become what it has become required his intelligence and imagination as well as his arrogance and often extraordinary hubris.

That hubris might be one reason why most sexologists have given Money slim recognition. Then again, Money seldom referred to the work of others. One exception was his embrace of the word *limerence*, as developed by Dorothy Tennov (1979), which he used often. It was a rarity for Money to take a concept and word created by another researcher and use it so happily. For the most part, when Money mentioned a colleague's work, it was to attack

it in letters or reviews. While Money's ideas are important simply because of what they say about sexuality and gender, they cannot be said to be a part of a coalescing of thought that developed through a number of theorists and researchers. Money was forever alone. Those who today extol his achievements are few partly because of that solitude: he did not have many intimate co-researchers and followers who might further his ideas and reputation.

This is ultimately a book about texts. The texts develop from, shape, and comment on something very material – the human body – but they are texts. I often quote Money at length to give full space to his argument, and then I dissect the quotation to show the insights and lacunae as he himself considered the aspects of sex and gender that most compelled his interests and arguably most compelled the interests of his society. References to personal communications with some of Money's patients, colleagues, and friends, as well as my various personal reflections, are used to aid my interpretation of the texts. In my personal reflections, I supplement my knowledge as an academic with what could be called a more general response, something akin to what a literary critic might call the view of an average reader. In some instances, my comments present the specific understanding of a sixty-three-year-old gay man whose life experience has been bisexual. I have found that presenting the views of someone such as Money without reflection makes it difficult to assess those views. My hope here is to consider Money's ideas as carefully and as fully as I can. In contrast with *As Nature Made Him*, which claims to present an objective portrait of a controversial subject and merely uses this to hide an extremely subjective point of view, I have often placed my subjectivity at the fore.

INVENTING AN ORDER: THE CHAPTERS

The order of the chapters in this book attempts to follow a logical accretion as each chapter provides information that is necessary to understand fully the subsequent chapters. The subtitle of these few opening pages modifies Kinsey's, but the titles of the other chapters are taken directly from other texts. Most are books written by Money himself, but some are by others that in some sense provide a context for Money and his work. Thus, the second chapter, about Money's early years, is titled "Once a Brethren Boy," taken from Noel Virtue's 1996 memoir of the same title about growing up in New Zealand. This chapter shows the formation of what Money would later

become. Chapter 3, “Fixing Sex,” from Karkazis’s title, traces Money’s theories of and work with individuals with intersex conditions – his first professional experience and always the core of his views of sex and gender. The fourth chapter, “Lovemaps,” uses a term Money created for his theory of how sexuality and gender combine in all humans; the term also appears in the titles of three of his books. This theory developed out of Money’s intersex studies, but it represents his attempts to create theories applicable to all human conditions and provides an overview of his methods. As his colleague Greg Lehne has said, understanding lovemaps is a key both to recognizing the sources of Money’s ideas and to seeing why they took the shapes they did. The fifth chapter, which is about transsexuality, is called “Man and Woman, Boy and Girl,” after Money’s most famous book, which he wrote with his then student Anke Ehrhardt. Money’s work on transsexuality includes his greatest early professional success – the creation of the Gender Identity Clinic at Johns Hopkins – and one of his earliest sources of professional despair – its closing. Chapter 6, on homosexuality, is called “Gay, Straight, and In-Between” – the title of the book by Money that is most specifically about homosexuality. Money originally thought that homosexuality would be the topic of his dissertation; he arguably made his greatest personal investment in this area, although he seldom acknowledged this. Homosexuality was never more than a tangential interest in his career, but it is the one field in which he had not just professional experience. The chapter on Money’s various attempts at neologisms, Chapter 7, is called “The Edge of the Alphabet,” the title of a 1962 novel by Janet Frame. This chapter might seem like the orange among the apples, but as was asserted earlier language was always a key to Money’s understanding. Chapter 8, on sexual liberation, takes its title from John Heidenry’s history of the 1960s and ’70s, *What Wild Ecstasy* (1997). As Money became a spokesman for sexual freedom, he used all of his professional expertise in all these areas to justify a highly developed public persona as he went from sexologist to proselytizer of sex. Chapter 9, “As Nature Made Him,” the title of which is borrowed from Colapinto’s book, focuses on the David Reimer case. Arguably, this case has had the most significant influence on Money’s reputation, but it is far from the progenitor of Money’s many ideas. It is, rather, the result of them, for good and ill. To understand why Colapinto’s book is wrong in so many ways requires a broad knowledge of what Money had written in the other areas. The Conclusion, “Venuses Penuses,” is again a title from Money; *Venuses Penuses* is a compendium of his articles, published in 1986. Everything about that book, including its extraordinary title, suggests Money’s ultimate successes and failures.

Almost thirty years ago, I wrote a book titled *Fear and Temptation* (1989), which prompted a colleague to remark, “Ah, yes, the inevitable autobiographical title.” I am not “the man who invented gender,” although some of the discussions in my undergraduate classroom make me feel as though I am. When I present my ideas, inevitable and even timeworn, the audience often finds them novel and even offensive. This is a common reaction to issues of sexuality. Some forty years ago, a television program called *The Larry Solway Show* was cancelled because of sexually explicit discussions. Solway wrote a book about it titled *The Day I Invented Sex* (1971). As Solway said, sex had been around a long time, and it seemed unlikely that he had been responsible for any of it, but those around him acted as though it had lain dormant before his program. Perhaps sex and gender are available to be invented again and again and again.

One note about this book and about John Money: often in the text, multiple-authored texts are attributed just to John Money, although the full authorship is given in the Works Cited. This might seem both unfair and inaccurate, but years of working with Money’s writing have shown me that anything attributed to “Money and ...” was written by Money, as Money often asserted. Co-authors had to submit themselves to an iron will, and an iron will with an often idiosyncratic writing style, full of neologisms, scientific jargon, and arbitrary analogies to anything that might come to his mind. The exceptions are the co-authored books *Man and Woman*, *Boy and Girl* and *Sexual Signatures*, which clearly show the presence of Anke Ehrhardt and Patricia Tucker, respectively. Whether in ideas or words, Money was at his best when he listened to the modifications suggested by others. For the most part, he did not. This increased the flamboyance and innovation of both theories and language, but it also led to extremes in both that would forever damage what he attempted to do.