

Queer History of Belarus

in the second half of the 20th century:
a preliminary study



Minsk 2016

Content

Foreword	2
Past Centuries	5
In the Eyes of the Law: Criminal Prosecution for Homosexuality in the Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR)	11
A medical discourse on “sexual perversions” in the USSR	29
Daily life	41
The 1990s and the first half of the 2000s: the birth of the movement for LGBT rights	45
Afterword	54
Bibliography	55
List of illustrations	62
List of abbreviations	63

Foreword

There is a noticeably growing interest in recent LGBT history in Eastern Europe. On the one hand, this interest stems from the need over and over again to provide proof of the obvious: same-sex sexuality in our region is not some kind of 'import from the West'. It has been around for a long time, just as it has in any other society. On the other hand, the emergence and development of the LGBT community have aroused considerable interest among community members in 'their' history, culture and other methods of collective identity construction. In terms of the (progressive) academic world the history of (homo)sexuality is a fascinating topic, in which both the level of autonomy exercised by medicine and law, and the general level of tolerance in society can be traced. It also offers an opportunity to view the 'real socialism' of the 1960s - 1980s from a completely different perspective.

Academic research on LGBT history has recently appeared on Hungary (works by Judit Takács) and Czechoslovakia [Sokolova 2014]. Unfortunately, we had no opportunity to study them while preparing this text.

The English-language magazine *DIK Fagazine* in Poland devotes some of its issues to historic themes. It has covered the LGBT history of Czechoslovakia, Romania and other Eastern European countries, as well as Poland [*DIK Fagazine* №8; *DIK Fagazine* №9].

In Latvia the history of sexuality, including the history of homosexuality, is being studied by Ineta Lipša, a member of the Institute of History of Latvia. The journalist Rita Ruduša published a book in English translation called *Forced Underground: homosexuals in Soviet Latvia* [Ruduša 2014]. She has produced a series of descriptive essays about gays, lesbians and transsexual people in Latvia based (except for one) on actual interviews.

A journalistic approach prevails in Ukrainian publications dealing with the LGBT community since independence [Українське ЛГБТ-движення 2015]. Several pages are devoted to the characteristic features of the gay subculture of Kyiv (Kiev) in the 1970s and 1980s.

Some English-speaking researchers began to develop an interest in the Queer History of the USSR (Russia) as early as the beginning of the 1990s: Laurie Essig [Essig 1999], Dan Healey, Daniel Schluter [Schluter 2002], Francesca Stella [Стелла 2014; Stella 2015]. We mention them later, as their view is a view from the outside. Because of the language barrier their studies have not become as widely known as they could have. The only exception is the Russian translation of the book by Dan Healey [Хили 2008].

Because of the language barrier the author of this booklet was able to read only those articles by the French researcher Arthur Clech which have been translated into Russian [Клеш 2012; Клеш 2013].

In addition to works by historians, it is important to mention the work of the sociologist Igor Kon. His book on homosexuality [Кон 2001] includes a section on the history of the subject, and one of his works was completely devoted to the history of sexual culture in Russia and the USSR [Кон 2010]. Finally, Igor Kon's memoirs, written as a kind of intellectual autobiography, add greatly to our understanding of the history of Russian (Soviet) sexology [Кон 2008].

Eleven interviews were conducted with people who had been to a various extent involved in the homosexual (lesbian) subculture or relevant public organizations (clubs, movements) in the period between the second half of the 1980s to the beginning of 2000s. These interviews proved to be a significant source of material for the research. I personally conducted four of the eleven interviews, the rest were conducted by Tania Siacko, Kaciaryna Borsuk, Natallia Mańkoŭskaja and another researcher who wished to remain anonymous. The names of the respondents, their place of residence, age, and professional affiliation are not disclosed in the publication in order to ensure the protection of their privacy.

We also used crime statistics from the National Archives of the Republic of Belarus and the State Archive of the Russian Federation.¹

At first I was planning to fix the upper time limit of the study at 1994, when homosexuality in Belarus was decriminalized, but the younger members of the public demanded that the story should be continued to 2007 (the year when the "Gaybelarus" initiative was established). Oddly enough, the links between generations in the LGBT community in Belarus are so poor that many 18-20-year-old activists already view the first half of the 2000s as 'days of yore', about which the few surviving elders can write epic poems.

The study starts at 1945, as we were able to find archived statistics beginning with this year. However, it was only in the 1960s that criminalistics and sexopathology publications on homosexuality began to appear in the Soviet Union after the long break that resulted from Stalin's rule. The oral history evidence and media articles that we managed to collect refer to the times after 'restructuring' (*perestroika*) under Gorbachev in the 1980s.

At this point I should make a remark about methodology: I prefer a constructivist approach to identity, rather than an essentialist one. Accordingly, I am more inclined to write queer history than LGBT history. The material, however, resists my inclinations: in the second half of the twentieth century formal institutions (especially mental health ones) actively promoted the concept of 'homosexualists' or 'pederasts' as a social group. It is difficult to discern shades of queerness behind this common title, to see the whole variety of 'sexual

¹ A more detailed description of the sources is given in the part of the brochure devoted to criminal prosecution. The list and some characteristics of the printed sources can be found in the main text of the brochure.

dissidents'. In today's Belarus there is some admiration for identity politics among activists, and the word 'queer' is often used just as a synonym for 'LGBT'. Meanwhile, queer theory is aimed at undermining not only heteronormality but also homonormativity.

This publication is not meant to be academic research, so it is not based on a thoroughly developed methodology, but there are explanatory notes in the form of references and bibliography.

When writing the chapter "In the Eyes of the Law" I used the article "Criminal persecution of male homosexuals in the Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic: previously unknown statistical data from archival sources" (Bel. "Крымінальны пераслед мужчын-гомасэксуалаў у БССР: невядомыя статыстычныя дадзеныя з архіўных крыніц") that had been written for the Białystok journal *Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne*. Likewise, for the writing of the chapter "A medical discourse on 'sexual perversions' in the USSR" the article "USSR Sexopathology about homosexuality and other 'deviations' from heteronormativity (1960s-1980s)" (Bel. "Сэксапаталогія СССР пра гомасэксуальнасць і іншыя "адхіленні" ад гетэранарматыўнасці (1960-1980-я гады)") was used; I had prepared it for the journal *Палітычная сфера (Political Sphere)*. Since the process of preparing an academic publication is time-consuming, the articles referred to are still work in progress. I hope the use of material from academic articles in this popular brochure will not interfere with the publishing of the former. The above-mentioned journals and this brochure appeal to very different audiences; moreover, the brochure has been translated into Russian and English, thereby expanding its potential readership.

In conclusion, I would like to express my gratitude to those who have offered me their help and advice on the topic of my research, shared literary sources, commented on the text. They are Ira Roldugina (Moscow), Tania Siacko (Minsk), Natallia Mańkoŭskaja (Minsk), Kaciaryna Borsuk (a citizen of the universe), Valery Sozayev (St. Petersburg), Elena G. Gusyatinskaya (Moscow), Dan Healey (Oxford), Francesca Stella (Glasgow), Dmitry Isaev (St. Petersburg), Alexander Kondakov (St. Petersburg), Slava Bortnik (Washington), Ihar Ivanoŭ (London), Uladzislaŭ Ivanoŭ (Vilnius), Nasta Mancevič (Minsk), Anastasiya Nekozakova (St. Petersburg), members of the Centre for Independent Social Research (St. Petersburg), Schwules Museum (Berlin) and IHLIA (Amsterdam). I apologize to those I have failed to name. The responsibility for all the shortcomings in the final text falls on the author himself, not on colleagues and the numerous consultants.

Past Centuries

Before proceeding to a consideration of the situation of non-heteronormative people in the BSSR in the second half of the twentieth century, I will briefly outline what happened in earlier centuries.

The Statute of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in 1588 did not regulate penalties for homosexual relations, either male or female [Статут 1989]. This means that they were submitted to religious courts for consideration.

The punishment for homosexuality prescribed by Orthodox canon law, was not too harsh. The most common punishment was penance and fines in favour of the church. For example, a handwritten missal (требник) of the sixteenth century ordered the excommunication of *'muzhelozhniki'* ('sodomites') from the Church for a period of five years. The same ecclesiastical punishment awaited men for masturbation or 'fornication' with a married woman [Сліж 2015: 293-294]. Moreover, according to secular law, for adultery both the lover and the wife were liable to capital punishment [Статут 1989: 344-345].

Even future priests could be forgiven for homosexual acts. The 16th-century (Orthodox) Book of the Pilot (Kormchaia) that was used on the Belarusian lands, stated that a man seeking holy orders could still enter the Church provided he committed homosexual acts in the 'active' position, but the one who performed the 'passive' role could not be admitted to the priesthood [Марзальюк 2001: 133-134].

Sexual relations between women in Orthodoxy were considered a sin, but not a very serious one (especially if the girls were still virgins) [Сліж 2015: 285]. Questions for women in missals were allocated separately. They mostly duplicated the questions for men, but in some ways were less detailed. For example, a 16th-17th-cent. missal now in the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Library asks if the parishioner has ever committed the 'fornication of Sodom' (one can only hazard a guess as to what was actually meant). The missal also considers the possibility of a woman's taking the initiative in extra-marital relationships, that is, being the active subjects of sexual life [Сліж 2015: 288]. However, in another document, the 16th-cent. Book of the Pilot in the collections of the Russian State Library, the question of lesbian relationships is asked [Марзальюк 2001: 135].

The attitude toward homosexuality in Eastern Europe stands in stark contrast with that in Western Europe. Neither in Muscovy nor in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania are there any traces of mass persecution of 'sodomites', although some capital punishment cases cannot be excluded.

The understanding of sex and gender by Belarusians in the past has still not been explored. Thus, Ihar Marzaliuk cites as a joke the following fragment from the Uniate book *Собрание припадков краткое, и духовным особом потребное* (*A Brief Collection of Special Instances Essential for the Clergy*, Supraśl, 1722), leaving practically no comment about it: "Can a Woman get married if she changes into a Man?" The answer is as follows:

There are many examples, especially in the Spanish lands, when Women who were married and had children changed into Males for some reasons not shown here, but the Male Sex cannot be changed into the Female Sex. In such situations, a Woman changed into a Man can leave her spouse and take a wife, as has happened in Spain on some occasions, where Women having children changed into Males and got married and brought up children with their wives [Марзалюк 2001: 129; Собрание припадков 1722].

Tomasz Nastulczyk and Piotr Oczko give a detailed account of a few examples of sources for the history of homosexuality in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in their book *Homoseksualność staropolska (Old Polish Homosexuality)* [Nastulczyk, Oczko 2012]. Most of these sources (Bible translations, fiction, polemical literature, etc.) give us an understanding of how same-sex relations were perceived in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but they mention hardly any real homosexuals with names and dates of life.

A mention of homosexuality among the magnates (highest ranking nobility) can sometimes be found in memoir literature. Prince Janusz Aleksander Sanguszko (1712-1775), Court Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, was one such magnate. He lived in his residence in Dubno (today – a city in the Rivne region of Ukraine) and was the heir on his mother's side to the Ostroh *ordynacja* (fee tail). Prince Janusz lived on such a grand scale that in 1753 he broke up his *ordynacja* and gave it away to his creditors and favorites. The scandal was caused not by Prince Sanguszko's homosexuality but by the partition of the Ostroh *ordynacja*. Those magnate families who did not get anything at the partition, tried to abolish it (there was some legal basis for this). At the same time the gossip was being spread that Janusz Sanguszko did not live with his wife Konstancja Kolumba of the House of Denhoff (1716-1791), which explains why they had no children, but that he lived with male lovers [Nastulczyk, Oczko 2012: 213-216]. As the priest Jędrzej Kitowicz (1727 or 1728 – 1804) writes in his memoirs about Sanguszko "... the human eye could not see him performing his duty. Immersed in idleness, debauchery and drinking, he did not like to engage even in the matters of his own estates ... "[Kitowicz 1882: 26]. We can therefore assume that this particular public servant appeared in the lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania only occasionally (for example, at the sessions of the Sejm held in Hrodna). But the case of the partition of the *ordynacja* was widely discussed in Belarusian memoir literature, including some written in Polish. In *The Diary of My Life* Marcin Matuszewicz, Castellan of Brest (1714-1773), writes:

After Prince Paweł Sanguszko, the great Court Marshal of the G[rand] D[uchy] of Lith[uania], died, his son Prince Janusz Sanguszko, first Sword-bearer of Lith[uania], and then Court Marshal of Lith[uania], plunged into dissipation – especially had affairs with men, and abandoned his beautiful wife of the House of Denhoff, the daughter of

the voivode of Polack - and all sorts of waste. Enwreathed by the flattery of Crown Chancellor Małachowski and the Czartoryski Princes, he signed authentic donations in Kolbuszowa to give away all the estates of the Ostroh *ordynacja* to different people, taking from them miserable amounts and wasting them [Matuszewicz 1986: 428].

Then Matuszewicz dwells for several pages on the details of the legal, economic and political circumstances of the case. The case should therefore be attributed to the history of Belarus, as well as of Poland and Ukraine.

Wincenty Tyszkiewicz, Count of Lahojsk and Śvislač (1757-1816), liked to dress up as a woman. His wife, Maria Teresa Poniatowska (1760-1834), obtained a divorce (a rare case for the eighteenth century) on the grounds that her husband "had a physical defect" [Nastulczyk, Oczko 2012: 91]. Julian Ursyn Niemcewicz (1757-1841), the famous son of the Brest region, writer and politician, wrote about the Tyszkiewiczzes in his *Memories of my time*:

One of our memorable visits was to Śvislač. It was the home of Wincenty Tyszkiewicz, Referendary of Lithuania, who married the niece of the King, the daughter of the Austrian general Prince Poniatowski. Apparently, the world had never seen a couple like this. Tyszkewicz, fat both in mind and body, but kind and caring as a host, had weird and amusing tastes. His greatest happiness, his profoundest joy was to serve at mass in the morning, and to dress up like a woman in the evening. He always had something to wear for these two changes of clothes. His wife, on the contrary, had a vivid imagination, was romantic, lively, beautiful, with a man's courage, nothing attracted her so much as horses, sporting competitions and male entertainment. Once the couple arrived in Śvislač from Warsaw the husband would immediately don a skirt or cassock, and his wife - trousers, a riding coat and a hat. While the host spent his mornings at mass, and his evenings - on a couch in a cap and mantle, fanning himself, ordering visitors to kiss his hand and accepting young people's favours, the hostess would be racing through fields and across ditches on horseback, and galloping along on her mare. Many of us found this amusing; still, we preferred horseback riding with the woman in a riding coat to flirting with fatty Tyszkiewicz.

[cited from: Nastulczyk, Oczko 2012: 333]

As a result of the partition of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (1772-1795) all the lands of Belarus were incorporated into the Russian Empire. At that time in the Russian Empire criminal responsibility for *muzhelozhstvo*² (anal sex between men,

² Throughout this text the Russian term '*muzhelozhstvo*' is used; it is not to be confused with 'sodomy'. Usually '*muzhelozhstvo*' is translated into English as 'sodomy', but in Russian the word '*sodomiya*' also exists, but with a rather different meaning. Traditionally the term 'sodomy' was used to describe almost any kind of deviation from heteronormativity; most often it referred to bestiality. By contrast, the meaning of '*muzhelozhstvo*' was very narrow,

literally ‘man lying with man’) already existed. It had been introduced in the Military Regulations of 1716. Despite the name, the document applied not only to the army and navy, but also to civilians.³ In 1835 a new Code of criminal law was introduced, which contained article 677 (*‘muzhelozhstvo’*). The article was not used very often, and quite selectively. As a rule, representatives of the upper social class avoided punishment [Healey, 2008: 100-124].

By the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries many lawyers in the Russian Empire had begun to advocate the decriminalization of voluntary sex between men. Among them was a lawyer named Barys Piatnicki from Mahilioŭ. In his book *Sexual Perversion and Criminal Law* he devoted a large section to ‘pederasty’ and another – a smaller one – to lesbianism (which was not prohibited by law in the Russian Empire). The author writes:

It is clear that in cases of pederasty by mutual consent, in the absence of proof that a crime has been committed there is no legal basis for punishment. By preserving it, criminal codes defeat their own object: they acknowledge that a legally capable adult person’s consent in any other act of lewdness justifies the act and thereby excludes punishment, but when they prosecute pederasts, they depart from the straight, clear path indicated by logic. This point of view is becoming increasingly prevalent in the legal profession, both in theory and practice [Пятницкий 1910: 32].

Further on, the author provides a list of individual lawyers and professional groups who voted against punishing ‘pederasty’ during the discussion of the 1903 Criminal Code (Уголовное уложение 1903 года). Officials of the Polack District Court were also among them. Unfortunately, only scant information about Barys Piatnicki could be found. It is known that in 1904 a Barys Piatnicki (it is not known if that was the one mentioned here) completed the full course in the Mahilioŭ gymnasium [Созонов 1909: 172]. In 1917 a Barys I. Piatnicki, who lived in Mahilioŭ, ran for election to the Constituent Assembly from Mahilioŭ district on the list of the People’s Freedom Party (the Cadets) [Воробьев 2010: 47].

High-ranking officials have always been in full view of the public, so their personal life has never been a secret. Count Nikolai P. Rumiantsev (1754–1826), whose greatest career achievement was the position of State Chancellor, was well-known for his inclination towards same-sex love [Кон 2001: 162; Кирсанов 2005: 19-28]. Rumiantsev was famous as a generous patron and collector: under his supervision and for his money a large quantity of documents on Eastern European history was brought together and published; his collections of books and manuscripts make up an essential part of today’s Russian State Library. One of the volumes of documents, edited by

it was used to describe specifically anal sex between men. Other kinds of sexual encounters between man were not referred to as *‘muzhelozhstvo’*.

³ According to information supplied by Irina Roldugina, based on archival data.

archpriest Iaan Hryharovič and published in 1824 at Rumiantsev's expense was called "Белорусский архив древних грамот" ("The Belarusian Archive of Ancient Charters") and contained 57 documents from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries on the history of Eastern Belarus. In 1796, after his father's death, Nikolai Rumiantsev inherited the Homiel estate. At that time it was a privately owned town in Mahilioŭ province. Homiel was being actively built up in Rumiantsev's time, including some of the most remarkable buildings of the city, such as St. Peter and Paul's Cathedral. Count Rumiantsev was buried in that Cathedral in accordance with his will.

In recent years the Homiel authorities have got into the habit of praising the former owners of the town – specifically, the Paskeviches and Rumiantsevs. Streets are being named after them, monuments in their honour are being erected. So it is that the oppressor of the 1830-31 rebellion Ivan Paskevich has been heaped with praise. Nikolai Rumiantsev has also had his share of fame. In 1996 a monument to him was put up in the park near the Rumiantsev Palace. The Homiel authorities did not realize that with their own hands they were creating a gathering spot for a hypothetical Homiel gay pride. Although Homiel does not yet have a gay pride, the monument makes a good background for a "theme"⁴ photograph.

It is amusing to see the historian Tatiana Solovyova trying 'to clear' Nikolai Rumiantsev's name from any suspicion of homosexuality. In her understanding Nikolai Rumiantsev "was devoted to the service of his country – Russia – throughout his life, left behind a unique collection of works on Russian history and the good name of a faithful servant of the Fatherland" [Соловьева 2007: 44]. But a 'faithful servant of the Fatherland' cannot be homosexual in Russia today. Therefore Solovyova focuses on Rumiantsev's close relationship with the Grand Duchess, and then the Empress Maria Feodorovna (1759 - 1828), the wife of Paul I. There is no evidence of the relationship being erotic, but the St. Petersburg historian is eager to report that Rumiantsev had a lifelong love for the Empress, which explains why he never married and had no children. Even more ridiculous: to prove the 'integrity' of the state chancellor Solovyova quotes some favourable descriptions of N. Rumiantsev from the memoirs of the famous homosexual Filipp Vigel (1786-1856); the commitment of the latter to men is mentioned in a famous poem by Alexander Pushkin.

Homosexuality was widespread not only among Russian officials, but also among the polonized nobility. We cannot say for sure if the Polish-speaking writer Maria Rodziewicz (1864–1944) was a lesbian, but she definitely violated heteronorms. Maria Rodziewicz was born on the Pianiucha estate not far from Hrodna. Maria's parents were deported to Siberia for their participation in the uprising of 1863-1864. This had an evident effect on the future writer (for a few years before her parents' return, Maria was brought up by some relatives). She spent most of her life on the Hrušava estate (now a village in the Kobryn district of Belarus). Her literary work is

⁴ "Theme" (Russian and Belarusian *tema*) – a non-gendered collective term for non-heterosexuals.

fairly conventional, dedicated to how important it is 'to keep the land in Polish hands'. But the figure of the writer herself does not fit into the conventions. She ran the estate household on her own, she never married or had a child, there were no men in her private life at all. The writer shared her house in Hrušava with women: with Helena Wejchert for several years, and then for a long time (before the Second World War started) with Jadwiga Skirmunt, a distant relative of hers. Since Maria Rodziewicz carefully protected her privacy, no written declarations of her love for a woman were preserved. But there are some photos of the writer, in which she is always dressed like a man with close-cropped hair, without any makeup. Józef Puzyna wrote about the 60-year-old Maria Rodziewicz: "She gave the impression of being a priest rather than a woman". Against this background, Maria Rodziewicz's political views can be rather shocking: training camps of the extreme right pro-military Camp of Great Poland (Obóz Wielkiej Polski, existed 1926-1933) were held in Hrušava, and in 1937 she joined the pro-governmental and extremely anti-Semitic Camp of National Unity (Obóz Zjednoczenia Narodowego) [Tomasik 2014: 56-77].

Krzysztof Tomasik also writes about the homosexuality of Jerzy Giedroyc and Józef Czapski [Tomasik 2014: 8].

Jerzy Giedroyc (1906-2000) was born in Minsk, and lived there until 1916. His father, born to an impoverished noble family, worked as a pharmacist. He became known in the post-war Polish emigration as editor of the Paris-based Polish-language journal *Kultura* (published 1947-2000). Giedroyc advocated the establishment of good relations between Poland, Ukraine, Belarus and Lithuania; this caused Polish nationalists to hate for him. He never married and had no children. A street in Minsk has been named after him (in the Brylewičy district), as has a Literary Award for Belarusian writers, founded by the Polish Embassy in Minsk. Here are two more 'sites of memory' for Belarusian homosexuals. We just need to wait until a writer who stands for queer emancipation receives the Jerzy Giedroyc Literary Award.

Józef Czapski (1896-1993) was a close friend and a colleague of Jerzy Giedroyc. Józef spent his childhood on the family estate of Pryluki near Minsk, in the interwar period he received training as an artist in Kraków and Paris. Czapski was one of the 450 officers of the Polish army who escaped execution in the Starobielsk concentration camp, and his reminiscences of Soviet captivity became widely known. In 1942 Czapski managed to reach General Anders' army, and after World War II he stayed in the West. He was very important for the journal *Kultura*, and also became known as a painter. Like Giedroyc, Czapski remained a childless bachelor.

It is evident that only very little information can be gathered about the situation in earlier centuries, due to the paucity of research findings on the history of sexuality in Belarus. Such information as is available often relates to the lives of famous people, primarily from the upper classes of society. We hope that things will improve, and that Belarusian historians who research both the medieval and modern periods will please us with their findings and analysis of already known documents.

In the Eyes of the Law: Criminal Prosecution for Homosexuality in the Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR)

Writing a history of homosexuality often turns into writing a history of homophobia. Information sources on the criminal prosecution of homosexuals are in many cases easily accessible and numerous enough to be the starting point for studying the history of homosexuality of virtually any period in any country in Europe. Our research on the history of homosexuality in Belarus in the second half of the twentieth century could therefore not avoid studying and interpreting the sources that deal with the criminal prosecution of men for same-sex sexual activities.

Criminal Legislation of the USSR and Homosexuals

After the October revolution of 1917, the Bolsheviks at a stroke abolished the legal system of the Russian Empire, and the article providing punishment for same-sex sexual activities was no longer in force. There was no such article in the 1922 Criminal Code of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR). Neither was there one in the 1926 RSFSR Criminal Code. The public rhetoric of those days shows that this was no coincidence, but a consistent stand of the majority of Bolshevik legal and medical professionals [Жили 2008: 143-171]. On 1 July 1922 the RSFSR Criminal Code came in force in the BSSR. Work was begun on drafting a BSSR Criminal Code in 1925. The BSSR Criminal Code came into force on 15 November 1938 [Круталевич, Юхо 2000: 172]. It too contained no articles providing punishment for homosexual relationships [Кримінальні кодекси 1929].

Nevertheless, some cases are known (for instance, in Odessa) where homosexuals were prosecuted in compliance with other articles of the Criminal Code [Ролдугина 2016: 203-204].

In neighbouring Poland (and hence in Western Belarus) homosexuality was decriminalized in 1932. In the USSR, by contrast, the situation was changing in the opposite direction.

From June to October 1933 the Plenipotentiary Representative office of the OGPU⁵ in the Leningrad Military District carried out mass arrests of Leningrad homosexuals. At least 198 people were arrested in total, the majority of them were further convicted of counter-revolutionary agitation and propaganda (Article 58¹⁰ of the RSFSR Criminal Code). The criminal case in 8 volumes is kept in the archives of the Federal Security Service office for St. Petersburg and Leningrad Oblast. The first to publish an article based on the criminal case papers was Viktor Ivanov, a professor of St. Petersburg State University, who, however, was unable to refrain from homophobic commentaries [Иванов 2013].

⁵ OGPU (Unified State Political Administration, Объединённое государственное политическое управление, ОГПУ) – political police/secret service of the USSR in 1924-1934.

On 13 December 1933 the OGPU Deputy Chairman Genrikh Yagoda sent a note to Joseph Stalin (whose title at the time was General Secretary of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party [Bolsheviks]). In the note he suggested that 'pederasty' should be recriminalized. Stalin reacted positively to the note, and on 16 December the Politburo⁶ adopted a resolution called "On criminal prosecution for pederasty" ["Примерно наказать..." 1993].

On 7 March 1934 the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union adopted a resolution "On criminal responsibility for *muzhelozhstvo*" in which, when compared with the original draft, the wording and the minimum measure of punishment were changed. The resolution was obligatory for execution by the Executive Committees of all the Union Republics [Хили 2008: 223-230].

The corresponding article, Article 235¹, was introduced into the Criminal Code of the BSSR on 30 April 1934. It reads as follows:

A male homosexual act (*muzhelozhstvo*) is punishable by imprisonment for a term of between three and five years.

A male homosexual act (*muzhelozhstvo*) committed with the use of physical violence or with the use of the dependent status of the victim is punishable by imprisonment for a term of between five and eight years.

[Кримінальний кодекс 1935: 57].

Between 1960 and 1961 the Criminal Codes of all the Union Republics were changed. In the BSSR Criminal Code that came into force on 1 April 1961, the article was reformulated and renumbered. It also abolished the minimum punishment measure:

Article 119. Male Homosexual Act (*muzhelozhstvo*)

A male homosexual act (*muzhelozhstvo*) shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of up to five years.

A male homosexual act (*muzhelozhstvo*) committed with the use of physical violence, threats or in relation to a minor or with the use of the dependent status of the victim shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of up to eight years.

[Кримінальний кодекс 1961: 46].

Soviet criminologists argued whether the age of consent was 18 or 16 years (it is 16 in present-day Belarus). The legislation did not specify it, but it was implied that in accordance with the article, only anal male sex (*coitus per anum*) could be punished. Mutual masturbation and oral sex acts were nominally legal.

The sanction could vary depending on the Soviet Republic. For instance, the first part of Article 118 in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic (ESSR) provided for imprisonment for two years, while the second part of Article 118 provided for

⁶ Politburo, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) – the supreme policy-making body of the Communist Party.

deprivation of freedom for between two and six years with exile for up to three years or without exile [Veispak 1991: 111].

Expert View on Legislative Regulations

Belarusian legal experts tried to refrain from any comments on Article 119 of the BSSR Criminal Code. For instance, the explanation of the article offered in a Belarusian criminal law manual for law students, was reduced to simply citing the Criminal Code. The meaning of the term '*muzhelozhstvo*' was explained by means of synonyms like 'homosexuality' and 'pederasty' and also through a definition: "*muzhelozhstvo* is sexual intercourse between two males" [Горелик, Ефимов и Тишкевич 1971: 148]. The authors of the manual were even afraid to use the Latin term *coitus per anum* (or, perhaps, they were simply unaware of it). Correspondingly, BSSR law students were unable to realize what exactly was being prosecuted under the Criminal Code.

In Russia, however, some legal experts openly supported the abolition of the article on '*muzhelozhstvo*' and offered extensive argumentation in favour of abolition. For instance, two members of the Criminal Law Department of Leningrad University, Professor Mikhail Shargorodsky and Associate Professor Pavel Osipov, insisted on the "expediency of excluding the *corpus delicti* of *muzhelozhstvo* by mutual consent between adults from existing legislation" and argued at length in favour of removing the first part of Article 121 of the RSFSR Criminal Code. They wrote:

Hardly any attempt has been made in Soviet legal literature to give strong scientific grounds for the criminal prosecution of *muzhelozhstvo* by mutual consent. The only argument that is usually produced in favour of criminal prosecution (moral corruption and violation of Socialist morality) cannot be regarded as consistent, because negative personal qualities cannot be considered a basis for criminal liability, and in addition the immorality of the act provides insufficient grounds for it to be criminalized.

[Шаргородский, Осипов 1973: 647]

Among the arguments made by Shargorodsky and Osipov was a reference to the decriminalization of homosexuality in the 'people's democracies' (German Democratic Republic [GDR], Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Poland).

Earlier Pavel Osipov had advocated the decriminalization of "*muzhelozhstvo* by mutual consent between adult males" in his candidate's thesis, the fact that becomes obvious from the summary of the thesis [Осипов 1967: 11]. Moreover, Pavel Osipov widely criticized "amendments to the system of constituent elements of sexual crimes introduced in the 30s".

The monograph *Sexual Offences* by Yakov Yakovlev, an associate professor of law at the Tajik State University in Dushanbe and a former officer of the OGPU, contains an extensive section on "*Muzhelozhstvo*" [Яковлев 1969: 303-343]. On the

one hand, Yakovlev was one of the supporters of the decriminalization of voluntary male homosexual behaviour [Яковлев 1969: 323, 342]. On the other hand, he recommended that the police should keep records of homosexuals:

For the prevention of sexual offences it is extremely important for the police to carry out operational procedures to identify individuals capable of committing sexual offences in order to register them in the police criminal records and undertake preventive work. Among such individuals there are persons suffering from sexual deviations, including those suspected of homosexual inclinations; [...]. To identify such individuals it is necessary to use special means and methods available to the police (criminal records, individual investigation, observation, etc.) [Яковлев 1969: 414].

One of those who consistently advocated the decriminalization of homosexuality was Alexey Ignatov, Doctor of Law, from Moscow. In his book *Responsibility for crimes against morality* he discreetly wrote, “the idea that the criminalization of *muzhelozhstvo* by mutual consent is irrational has often been expressed in legal literature” [Игнатов 1966: 182]. He went on to cite the works of Russian law experts of the 1920s. In the book *Qualification of sexual offences* published eight years later, Ignatov offers extensive argumentation in favour of the decriminalization of homosexuality:

...The efficacy of the criminalization of voluntary homosexual relationships between adults gives rise to serious doubts.

In the vast legal and medical literature on the subject, both Soviet and foreign, it has been demonstrated that such homosexual relationships neither pose a threat to society, nor cause damage to a state. Moreover, it has been shown that to fight homosexuality by means of criminal persecution is ineffective: it is useless in cases of pathology, while in some cases the incarceration of a homosexual with people of the same sex can only strengthen homosexual tendencies [Игнатов 1974: 233-234].

To prove this statement, the author referred not only to the literature of the 1920s, but also to the pre-revolutionary literature published in Russia. He also cited the resolution of the 9th Congress of the International Association of Penal Law (The Hague, 1964), which recommended that voluntary homosexual relationships between adults should not be forbidden. Finally, Ignatov referred to legal policy in other countries, both capitalist states and allies of the USSR: “At present, not a single European state beside the USSR prescribes criminal responsibility for voluntary homosexual relations” [Игнатов 1974: 234]. It is important to point out here that in Albania male homosexuality was prosecuted until 1995. In Romania, both male and female homosexuality was decriminalized only in 1996. At the time of publication of Ignatov’s *Qualification of sexual offences*, criminal prosecution of

homosexuals existed across the whole of Yugoslavia (in 1977 decriminalization came into force in Slovenia, Croatia, Montenegro, and Vojvodina). Albania was a self-isolated country at that time and as early as the 60s had left the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the Warsaw Treaty Organization (the Warsaw Pact). Yugoslavia was never a member of the Warsaw Pact and had observer country status at the CMEA. Finally, Romania remained a member of both the Warsaw Pact and CMEA, but Nicolae Ceaușescu tried to minimize dependence on the USSR and pursued an independent foreign policy in relation to the capitalist countries and China. It is no wonder, therefore, that Albania, Romania, and Yugoslavia escaped Ignatov's attention; still, he did notice Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

The books of A. Ignatov and Y. Yakovlev published in the Soviet era were marked 'for administrative use', i. e. they were not for general distribution. This limitation has still not been lifted in Russia even now, so there are certain difficulties in gaining access to the books in Russian state libraries. At the same time, one private company in Moscow openly sells copies and scanned pages from Ignatov's *Qualification of sexual offences*, while in some former Soviet republics the books have long been publicly available. For instance, it is possible to have a look at Ignatov's *Qualification of sexual offences* in Tartu University Library (Estonia), while Yakovlev's *Sexual offences* is available to the public in the library of Vilnius University (Lithuania). The legal status of the books in Belarus is not clear, because they are not included in the catalogues of public libraries.

So what have the censors been hiding from the general public? Ignatov's books do not dwell on the solving of crimes, either real or imaginary, that could still be considered confidential information. As its name implies, *Qualification of sexual offences* deals with the juridical qualification of criminal acts by the investigative and judicial authorities and also with certain aspects of criminal procedure. It is most probable that it was marked 'for administrative use' in Soviet times because it contained statistics on some types of crime. In any case, Ignatov's belief in the necessity of abolition of the article on '*muzhelozhstvo*' was not publicly available either. It was first openly published in an article in the journal *Sovetskaya yustitsiya* (*Soviet Justice*) in 1988 [Игнатов 1988].

It is known that Ignatov not only advocated the decriminalization of homosexuality in his books but also tried to raise the question with the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs (but without success) [Кон 2001: 196].

The sociologist Igor Kon also tried to promote the decriminalization of homosexuality in the press. He wrote an article on this topic at the suggestion of Mikhail Piskotin, editor-in-chief of the journal *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo* (*Soviet State and Law*) in 1982. The article received positive feedback from well-known experts: the sexopathologist Georgy Vasilchenko and the psychiatrist Dmitry M. Isaev. However, the article failed to pass review by the editorial board, and was not

approved by the Communist Party Central Committee's Administration Department. Kon describes the attempt to publish the article in his autobiography [Кон 2008: 334-336]. Again, Kon's point of view became accessible to a wide audience only in the years of *perestroika*.

It became possible for statements in favour of the decriminalization of male homosexuality to appear in the 60s and 70s as a result of the sexual liberalization processes that were taking place in the USSR. For instance, in 1955 abortions became legal, while the year 1968 saw the democratization of the legislation on marriage and the family. Besides, some changes in sexual behavior were taking place in society 'from the bottom up'. The USSR sexual revolution of the second half of the 1980s, when information on sexuality and contraception became widely available, found fertile ground. Written autobiographies and verbal interviews with inhabitants of St. Petersburg collected by a group of Russian and Finnish sociologists in the 1990s reveal significantly higher levels of sexual liberation in Leningrad in the 1960s and 1970s than it could have been expected, given the official concealment of issues connected with sexuality. Against this background, the above-mentioned expert statements seem to be not merely lonely eccentric voices, but expressions of subtle social changes [Роткирх 2011: 31-38, 192-195, 268, 284].

Forensic medicine specialists 'developed' the subject in their own way. They did not express support for the decriminalization. The first such specialist to devote a page of his forensic medicine textbook to the forensic investigation of '*muzhelozhstvo*' was Mikhail Avdeev, an expert of the USSR Ministry of Defence. His point of view was often cited when it was necessary to define which particular actions could be identified as '*muzhelozhstvo*'. Avdeev wrote, "One may talk of *muzhelozhstvo* only if penile penetration of the anus took place" [Авдеев 1959: 500].

A separate article on the subject, "Forensic expertise with regard to *muzhelozhstvo*", was written by Nikolay Shalaev, an associate professor of the Medical University in Gorky (now Nizhni Novgorod). The article is saturated with technical details. The author emphasized:

Persons suspected of *muzhelozhstvo* remove traces of the perverted sexual relationship: they wash their genitals, wash away faeces and semen stains off their clothes. A forensic expertise examination should therefore be carried out as a matter of urgency [Шалаев 1966: 31].

The most detailed account of the anatomical peculiarities of homosexuals was provided by I. Blyumin, an official of the Bureau of Forensic Medical Expertise for Moscow and the Moscow region. He produced a quite detailed guide on the "expert examination of homosexuality" [Блюмин 1967: 48-59] and even defended a thesis totally devoted to the forensic medical expert examination of '*muzhelozhstvo*'. The thesis bore the covert title "Materials for the expert examination of sexual conditions". 'Depravity' is ritually stigmatized at the beginning of the thesis summary:

“Judged by the degree of danger that it poses to society and the difficulties which beset its investigation, *muzhelozhstvo* (homosexuality, pederasty) holds a specific place among sexual offences.

In capitalist countries this type of sexual perversion is now widespread [...].

The situation is different in the USSR. As a result of the abolition of prostitution and the ban on pornographic literature (both of which encourage various sexual perversions), the general improvements in the healthy lifestyle of the Soviet people, and our moral code, cases of homosexual behaviour and other criminal sexual offences in the Soviet Union are now rarely encountered. Nevertheless, they pose a certain threat to society” [Блюмин 1970: 3].

Blyumin referred to authors of the second half of the nineteenth century (Ambroise Tardieu, Johann Casper, etc.) and expressed regrets over the fact that forensic experts had still not produced “focused research on this question”. Blyumin turned a blind eye to the fact that by the time he defended his thesis homosexuality had been decriminalized in most European countries.

The methods of investigation of ‘*muzhelozhstvo*’ cases were briefly described by Georgiy Karnovich and Mikhail Korshik in the 1950s [Карнович и Коршик 1958: 76-79].

These methods were presented in more detail by Mikhail Khlyntsov, an associate professor of Saratov Law Institute [Хлынцов 1965: 141-157]. The following extended quote gives some idea of how criminal cases involving ‘*muzhelozhstvo*’ were initiated in the Russian provinces (Saratov, Kuibyshev and other regions).

Cases of *muzhelozhstvo* are extremely rare in investigative practice. This is largely connected with the difficulty of uncovering such crimes. [...] The special feature of the investigation of cases involving *muzhelozhstvo* is that there are almost no witnesses to such crimes, while the participants in the crime (if the act is committed by mutual consent of the parties) are not inclined to give publicity to their actions. [...] The majority of criminal cases are initiated on the basis of reports made by individuals who learnt about an act of *muzhelozhstvo* from a certain source, or noticed unusual relations between two males, their strange behaviour, suspicious inclinations and habits, or actually caught the criminals at the crime scene. Sometimes such reports are made by individuals who were propositioned to engage in an act of *muzhelozhstvo*, or whose acquaintances were similarly propositioned [Хлынцов 1965: 145-146].

The important role that watchful neighbours play in initiating criminal cases is once again underlined on the next page of his work:

It is not uncommon that, having noticed the suspicious behavior of some individuals, the informers themselves start investigating the circumstances of their meetings, especially if the suspected individuals have nothing in common, and immediately report such meetings to the proper authorities that sometimes helps to catch the criminals in the act [Хлынцов 1965: 147].

Crime Statistics: archival sources for the number of people convicted of ‘muzhelozhstvo’

It is well-known that in the Soviet Union most statistics were kept secret. That goes for criminal statistics as well. There are no published data on the total number of convictions, but censorship allowed it to be announced that over the period between 1961-1973 convictions under article 119 in the BSSR ranged from 0.02% to 0.7% of those convicted of crimes against the person [Горелик, Тишкевич 1976: 14].

Statistics of convictions under the ‘muzhelozhstvo’ article were published by Teet Veispak in 1991 – probably for the very first time in the history of the USSR. The figures related only to Estonia, covered only the years 1960-1989 and came from the archive of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Estonia [Veispak 1991: 112].

In the Russian translation of Dan Healey’s book *Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia* there is a small supplement called "How many victims of the law against *muzhelozhstvo* were there?" [Хили 2008: 311-316]. In this supplement Healey gives archival statistical data on the number of convictions for ‘muzhelozhstvo’ in the RSFSR for 1935-1950 (this information is fragmentary and incomplete), and the number of convictions for ‘muzhelozhstvo’ in the USSR and the RSFSR for 1961-1982. Healey also reprints James Riordan’s information concerning convictions in the Soviet Union in 1987-1990 and in the Russian Federation in 1991 (the accuracy of this information is discussed below).

Dan Healey primarily used the statistics of the Ministry of Justice of the USSR. In our study we followed the same path and looked into the statistics of the Ministry of Justice of the BSSR, which are stored in the National Archives of the Republic of Belarus (hereinafter referred to as NARB). The crime statistics of the BSSR were declassified only up to and including 1960. The pre-war records of the People's Commissariat of Justice were preserved very fragmentally, and the pre-war statistics were not preserved at all. Information on the number of convictions under various articles of the Criminal Code can be obtained from the completed forms №10. On these forms, which were made in Moscow and were the same for the entire Soviet Union, there was a separate column for article 154a of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR and the corresponding articles of the criminal codes of the other republics. Quarterly reports from the regions are stored in the records of the

Ministry of Justice of the BSSR. In each region (Rus. область), reports were submitted by the courts of first instance ('People's Courts') and separate reports were submitted by the regional court. They were put together by the Ministry of Justice in quarterly reports and then in annual Republican reports, which were sent to the Ministry of Justice of the USSR in Moscow (copies were kept in Minsk). In the reports on form №10 it is possible to see the quarter and the region where people were convicted (or acquitted, or the proceedings against them that were discontinued) under whatever article. Moreover, in form №10 there is information about sentences, the social origin and age of the convicts and the place of the "crime" (city or village).

The statistics do not distinguish between prisoners convicted under the first and second parts of article 235¹ of the Criminal Code of the BSSR. In most cases, however, one can ascertain the number of convicts under the first and the second parts of the article indirectly, by the length of the sentence.

The statistics of the first post-war years are not correct –clerks from provincial departments of Justice often confused the numbers of articles or have entered the number of convicts under one article in the column of convicts under another article. In the statistical forms №10 that were distributed by the People's Commissariat (from 1946 – the Ministry) of Justice of the USSR, there was a separate column for prisoners under the '*muzhelozhstvo*' article. In the printed forms there was the number of the article of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, and the number of the relevant article of the Criminal Code of the particular Soviet republic had to be added by hand. Article 235¹ of the Criminal Code of the BSSR is the one that is relevant to article 154a of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR. However, we often find that articles 235, 235a, 236, or some other article have been entered on the form instead of article 235¹ of the Criminal Code of the BSSR. Accordingly, convictions under article 235¹ could fall under "other crimes against the person".

One way or another, the number of convictions remained very low in 1945-1960. It is noteworthy that in some cases the length of the sentence was below the lower threshold for article 235¹ (three years). It is likely that article 51 of the Criminal Code of the BSSR was applied in these instances:

If the court finds it appropriate to assign a measure of social protection below the lower limit set by the corresponding article of this Code, or choose another less severe measure not listed in this article, the court may do so, but only by setting out the motives for mitigation of sentence.

[Кримінальний кодекс 1957: 14]

Probably this was the rule applied in 1958, when under the second part of article 235¹ two people were sentenced by the Homiel Regional Court to less than five years in prison.

It is evident that in most cases the ‘crimes’ were committed in towns and workers' settlements, rather than rural areas (the majority of people in Belarus still lived in the countryside). This can be attributed to a greater noticeable presence of homosexuality in urban areas (availability of meeting places for gays, the dawn of a subculture).

In several cases, article 235¹ was applied to prisoners. This is evident from the documents of form №11 ("Conviction for certain types of crimes in the sectors of the national economy and public administration"), in which the number of persons convicted for crimes committed in places of detention is separately stated, including article 154a of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR and similar articles of the criminal codes of the other union republics. This form also indicated who committed the crimes – the prisoners or the prison staff. By the length of the prison terms handed down (up to five years) it is evident that the first part of article 235¹ was exercised. One can assume that it was used by the administration of penal institutions to humiliate recalcitrant prisoners and leave them in detention for a longer period.

Table 1: Number of convictions under article 235¹ of the BSSR Criminal Code (1945-1960)

Year	Number of convictions	Notes	Source
1945	0		NARB, 99/6/304
1946	1	Sentenced in the Brest region in the second quarter of 1946 to imprisonment for a term of 5 years, a clerk, aged between 26 and 50, the place of ‘crime’ – the countryside; another person was acquitted.	NARB, 99/6/305, ark. 57-57 adv., 119-119 adv.
1947	0		NARB, 99/6/306
1948	2	Both were sentenced in the first quarter of 1948 in the Mahilioŭ region to imprisonment for a term of 5 years, both were aged between 26 and 50, the place of ‘crime’ – ‘cities and workers' settlements’, one of the convicts was a worker, the other – ‘an unemployed element’.	NARB, 99/6/310, ark. 2-2 adv., 7-7 adv.
1949	0 (1?)	Republican reports do not show any convicts, but the reports of the Minsk region tell of a person convicted in the first quarter, who was deprived of liberty for more than 3 to 4 years, social group – ‘clerks and their families’, aged between 26 and 50, the place of ‘crime’ – ‘cities and workers' settlements’.	NARB, 99/6/313, ark. 17-17 adv., 260-260 adv.
1950	0		NARB, 99/6/315, 99/6/316
1951	1	Sentenced in the Paliessie region in the third quarter to imprisonment ‘for more than 7 to 8 years, inclusive’, social group – ‘clerks and their families’, aged between 40 and 49,	NARB, 99/6/323, ark. 94-94 adv.; 99/6/324, ark.

		the place of crime – ‘cities and workers’ settlements’.	121-121 adv.
1952	2	In the first quarter in the Hrodna region one was acquitted and two were convicted. In the first case – ‘imprisonment for up to one year, inclusive’, in the second case – ‘imprisonment for more than 1 to 2 years, inclusive’. The first convicted was from the social group ‘workers and their families’, the second was from the social group ‘other’, the first was aged ‘between 25 and 29’, the second – ‘between 30 and 39’, the first was a member of the Komsomol, the second had previously been tried for ‘criminal acts of the same kind’. The place of ‘crime’: in the first case – ‘cities and workers’ settlements’, in the second – ‘rural areas’.	NARB, 99/6/330, ark. 12-12 adv.; 99/6/331, ark. 74-74 adv.
1953	1	Sentenced in the Viciebsk region in the fourth quarter to ‘over 7 to 8 years of imprisonment, inclusive’. Social group – ‘workers and their families’, aged ‘between 18 and 19’, previously convicted of ‘criminal acts of different kinds’, the place of crime – ‘cities and workers’ settlements’.	NARB, 99/6/338, ark. 70-70 adv.; 99/6/339, ark. 84-84 adv.
1954	0		NARB, 99/6/346
1955	0 (1?)	Republican reports do not show any convicts, but the report of the fourth quarter in the Homiel region tells of a convict who was deprived of liberty for more than 4 to 5 years, social group – ‘other’, aged between 25 and 29, had previously been convicted of ‘criminal acts of different kinds’, the place of ‘crime’ – ‘cities and workers’ settlements’.	NARB, 99/6/352, ark. 73-73 adv., 135-135 adv.
1956	4	All 4 were sentenced in the Viciebsk region to imprisonment for more than 4 to 5 years, had previously been convicted of ‘criminal acts of different kinds’, the places of ‘crimes’ – ‘cities and workers’ settlements’, social group – ‘other’, one was aged ‘between 18 and 19’, another three – ‘between 25 and 29 years’. 3 were convicted in the second quarter, 1 – in the third quarter.	NARB, 99/6/358, ark. 25-25 adv., 43-43 adv., 122-122 adv.
1957	4	Three were convicted in the first quarter in the Brest region, all three of them – prisoners, two of them were sentenced to imprisonment ‘for over 3 to 4 years, inclusive’, one – ‘for more than 4 to 5 years, inclusive’; one was aged ‘between 20 and 24’, another two – ‘between 25 and 29 years’. The fourth was sentenced in the second quarter in the Homiel region to deprivation of liberty ‘for over 1 to 2 years, inclusive’, social group – ‘workers and their families’, aged ‘between 40 and 49 years’, the place of ‘crime’ – ‘cities and workers’ settlements’.	NARB, 99/6/364, ark. 1-1 adv., 28-28 adv.; 99/6/365, ark. 1-1 adv., 24-24 adv., 144-144 adv.
1958	6	Two were sentenced by the Homiel Regional Court in the third quarter under the second part of article 235 ¹ to	NARB, 99/6/372, ark. 49-49 adv.,

		<p>imprisonment 'for 3 to 4 years, inclusive', social group – 'other', one was aged 'between 18 and 19', another – 'between 20 and 24', both had been tried before for 'criminal acts of different kinds', the place of 'crime' – 'cities and workers' settlements', the time of the 'crime' – 'in this year'.</p> <p>Another two were sentenced in the fourth quarter in the Minsk region, the first one – to deprivation of freedom for 'more than 2 to 3 years, inclusive', the second one – to 'more than 4 to 5 years, inclusive', social group of the first one was 'workers and their families', of the second – 'clerks and their family members', the first was aged 'between 25 and 29', the second – '50 and older', the places of 'crimes' of both were 'cities and workers' settlements', both 'crimes' committed – 'in this year'.</p> <p>Two were also sentenced in the fourth quarter in the Mahilioŭ region to deprivation of liberty for 'over 4 to 5 years', both from social group 'workers and their families', both had been tried before 'for criminal acts of different kinds', one was aged 'between 25 and 29', the other – 'from 30 to 39', the place of 'crime' of both – 'cities and towns', the time of commitment of both – 'in this year'.</p>	93-93 adv., 95-95 adv., 160-160 adv.
1959	4	<p>Two were sentenced in the first quarter in the Homiel region, one – to imprisonment 'from 2 to 3 years, inclusive', another – to 'more than 4 to 5 years', social group of the first one – 'clerks and their family members', of the second – 'collective farmers and their family members' - 1, one was aged 'between 25 and 29', another – 'between 40 and 49', the places of commitment for both were 'cities and workers' settlements', the time of commitment for both was 'in the last year'.</p> <p>The third was sentenced in the first quarter in the Mahilioŭ region to the deprivation of liberty for 'over 4 to 5 years', social group – 'workers and their families', aged 'between 18 and 19', the place of 'crime' – 'cities and workers' settlements', the time of commitment – 'last year'.</p> <p>The fourth was sentenced in the third quarter in the Homiel region to imprisonment for 'over 7 to 8 years, inclusive', social group – 'workers and their families', 'workers who left their job', aged 'between 25 and 29', had been previously convicted of 'criminal acts of the same kind', the place of perpetration – 'rural areas', the time of perpetration – 'this year'.</p> <p>One defendant was acquitted in the third quarter in the Hrodna region.</p>	NARB, 99/6/377, ark. 8-8 adv., 16-16 adv., 60-60 adv., 165-165 adv.
1960	0		NARB, 99/6/386

Using Dan Healey's references [Хили 2008: 316] to the State Archive of the Russian Federation funds (Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii, hereinafter referred to as GARF) we were able to find statistics on the numbers convicted in the Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic in 1961 and later.

The data for the years 1961-1991 are taken from the documents of form №10a. The forms were changed because new criminal codes came into force in the Union republics in 1961. In these documents there are no data on the place of 'crime' (urban/rural), on the intended punishment, the age of the 'criminals' and the social groups from which they came. Moscow received only reports from the union republics; the regional reports were not sent there. We cannot therefore locate those convicted by region.

For the sake of comparison, here are the data for the years 1961-1991 in Table 2, not only for the BSSR, but also for the USSR as a whole, the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Lithuanian SSR and the Moldavian SSR. From these data one can see that there were all-union trends in the number of those convicted, but in some Soviet republics over the years there is quite a significant deviation from these numbers. It is obvious that the number of those convicted depended on the attitude of the local authorities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Prosecutor's Office, State Security Committee, and, perhaps, the party organs⁷ as well.

It is noticeable that the number of convictions correlates with different political epochs. For instance, in the years 1945-1954 on average there was less than one person convicted per year. During 1955-1964 an average of 4.7 per year were convicted. During 1965-1974 an average of 18.6 per year were convicted. During 1975-1984 an average of 28.3 per year were convicted. During 1985-1990 an average of 18.5 per year were convicted. Thus, it can be seen that in the late Stalin years the law enforcement agencies were paying almost no attention to such an exotic article as '*muzhelozhstvo*'. They had more important tasks like the so-called 'gang control', the forced collectivization of Western Belarus, the forced retention of the peasants on the collective farms, and the workers in the factories and so on. During Khrushchev's 'thaw' the number of convicts increases gradually, and in the years of Brezhnev's 'stagnation' we find a steady increase. Interestingly, in the years of Gorbachev's '*perestroika*' the number of convicted persons was decreasing not as fast as one would have expected it to, given the democratic rhetoric of the era. The inertia of the police, the prosecution and the courts was great enough to continue

⁷ Regarding the party's regulations of criminal convictions under the article '*muzhelozhstvo*' Igor Kon recalls: "One of the members of the editorial board, the former head of the Leningrad police, and then a well-respected professor (a really good specialist and a nice person), only spread his hands in surprise at why Igor Semenovitch should even raise this issue. And he mentioned how at one time he had collected a lot of material on Leningrad homosexuals, but in the regional committee of the party they said to him: "Do you want to close the Philharmonic Orchestra and the Kirov Ballet?!" The general had to retreat, but he remembered the insult, and even after reading my article the idea that the regional committee was right and he was wrong did not occur to him" [Кон 2008: 335-336].

convicting under article ‘*muzhelozhstvo*’ even a few months before it was cancelled. Unfortunately, the statistics of convictions under article 119 of the Criminal Code of BSSR/Republic of Belarus for the second half of 1991, 1992 and 1993 and the beginning of 1994, remain closed.

In some years it can be seen that the number of convicted persons increased significantly, but in the following years it went down. Perhaps it was the result of organized raids on homosexuals. Unfortunately, we cannot relate such raids with policy documents of the Ministry of Interior or the Communist Party. A similar trend can be seen in the previously published statistics on the Estonian SSR: 1967 – 17 convicted, 1968 – 1 convicted (data are not available for 1966) [Veispak 1991: 112].

Healey does not give statistics on the USSR and RSFSR for 1983-1986: whether there was not enough time for processing the archives, or at the time that he was working with the archival documents they had not yet been declassified. It was precisely in these years that the convictions under the article ‘*muzhelozhstvo*’ in the Soviet Union peaked: 1440 convicted in 1983, 1516 – in 1984, 1620 – in 1985 and 1455 – in 1986. In the BSSR the peak of convictions was reached in 1977 – 49 imprisoned.

Incidentally, the number of convictions for 1987-1990 published by James Riordan [Riordan 1996: 160-161] and then reprinted by Dan Healey does not correspond with the data of the documents of the Ministry of Justice of the USSR. Riordan at the time relied on fragmented information obtained from various sources (the newspapers *SPID-Info*, *Literaturnaya gazeta* and the report of the International Commission on Human Rights for gays and lesbians), and also mistook the RSFSR data for the USSR data in general. The information in the above-mentioned report of the International Commission is reliable; at least, the number of convictions in the RSFSR for 1989 and 1990 coincides with the figures in the statistics we have seen [Геццен 1994: 11].

Table 2. Number of convictions under article 119 of the Criminal Code of the BSSR, article 121 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and similar articles of the criminal codes of the Union Republics (1961-1991 years)

Year	Number of convicted in the USSR	Number of convicted in the RSFSR	Number of convicted in the Ukrainian SSR	Number of convicted in the BSSR	Number of convicted in the Lithuanian SSR	Number of convicted in the Moldavian SSR	Source
1961	705	464	50	10	19	2	GARF, P9492/6/58, l. 2, 37, 40 ob., 42, 45 ob., 47, 70 ob., 71 ob., 99, 103, 107, 127, 131
1962	767	530	42	1	3	2	GARF, P9492/6/69, l. 2, 150, 154, 158, 178, 182

1963	831	592	64	13	5	3	GARF, P9492/6/81, l. 2, 47, 51, 55, 75, 79
1964	777	547	47	4	5	0	GARF, P9492/6/91, l. 2, 52, 56, 60, 80, 84
1965	627	393	59	5	4	3	GARF, P9492/6/102, l. 2, 50, 54, 58, 78, 82
1966	770	485	70	3	4	0	GARF, P9492/6/112, l. 2, 45, 51 о6., 53, 73, 77
1967	940	617	68	25	3	1	GARF, P9492/6/128, l. 2, 47, 51, 55, 75, 79
1968	756	453	65	20	9	2	GARF, P9492/6/141, l. 2, 47, 51, 55, 75, 79
1969	993	641	67	13	12	1	GARF, P9492/6/151, l. 2, 41, 45, 49, 69, 73
1970	1223	787	84	33	11	6	GARF, P9492/6/161, l. 2, 40, 44, 48, 68, 72
1971	1206	854	75	20	5	5	GARF, P9492/6/177, l. 2, 45, 49, 53, 73, 77
1972	1255	882	57	10	3	4	GARF, P9492/6/193, l. 2, 29, 33, 37, 57, 61
1973	1319	853	96	33	9	0	GARF, P9492/6/205, l. 2, 26, 30, 34, 54, 58
1974	1355	883	95	24	11	6	GARF, P9492/6/221, l. 2, 29, 33, 37, 59, 63
1975	1214	803	88	34	5	6	GARF, P9492/6/239, l. 2, 28, 32, 36, 56, 60
1976	1181	773	87	36	9	3	GARF, P9492/6/254, l. 2, 35, 39, 43, 63, 67
1977	1320	877	85	49	7	7	GARF, P9492/6/271, l. 2, 38, 42, 46, 66, 70
1978	1314	882	72	24	24	2	GARF, P9492/6/285, l. 2, 36, 40, 44, 64, 68
1979	1262	822	81	23	13	2	GARF, P9492/6/300, l. 2, 38, 42, 46, 66, 70
1980	1119	708	93	16	6	2	GARF, P9492/6/317, l. 2, 39, 43, 47, 67, 71
1981	1229	849	76	15	7	5	GARF, P9492/6/328, l. 2, 30, 34, 38, 58, 62
1982	1191	809	78	31	9	2	GARF, P9492/6/368, l. 2, 27,

							31, 35, 55, 59
1983	1440	1012	95	37	14	2	GARF, P9492/6/393, l. 2, 32, 37, 41, 61, 65
1984	1516	1091	120	18	10	5	GARF, P9492/6/427, l. 2, 24, 28, 32, 52, 56
1985	1620	1106	148	29	3	3	GARF, P9492/6/466, l. 2, 23, 27, 31, 51, 55
1986	1455	1011	93	23	8	8	GARF, P9492/6/500, l. 2, 27, 31, 35, 55, 59
1987	1155	829	64	17	4	6	GARF, P9492/6/533, l. 2, 25, 29, 33, 53, 57
1988	831	592	39	13	4	6	GARF, P9492/6/555, l. 2, 26, 30, 34, 54, 58
1989	788	538	45	17	6	3	GARF, P9492/6/579, l. 2, 21, 25, 29, 49, 53
1990	732	497	43	12	No data	2	GARF, P9492/6/605, l. 2, 19, 23, 27, 49
1991 (first half)	343	247	17	9	No data	0	GARF, P9492/6/650, l. 2, 9, 13, 18, 36

Embodying History: from Statistics to the Fates of Individuals

We still cannot imagine the way criminal cases of *‘muzhelozhstvo’* were handled on the basis of materials from the BSSR and the RSFSR. Access to most of these cases is denied because of the 75-year rule regarding convicts’ personal confidentiality. Dan Healey managed to find in the archives judicial records of 8 trials for 1935-1941 that he used for writing his monograph [Хили 2008: 253-269]. Later Healey gained access to 2 more criminal cases (1951 and 1959) in Leningrad Oblast (region) and then he published quite a detailed analysis of these [Healey 2012]. The Baltic States are more liberal about granting access to such criminal cases.

For several years now the Estonian artist Jaanus Samma has been investigating the life of homosexuals, including criminal prosecution in the Estonian SSR. An exhibition of his work “Not Suitable for Work: A Chairman's Tale” (curated by Eugenio Viola) was held in the Estonian pavilion at the Venice biennale in 2015. The exhibition was about a collective farm chairman, who in the 1960s was first dismissed from his position and expelled from the Party for being a homosexual and later convicted for *‘muzhelozhstvo’* under Article 118 Part 1 of the ESSR Criminal Code. The book that accompanied Saama’s exhibition gives an impression of what a criminal case about *‘muzhelozhstvo’* looked like [Samma 2015]. A smaller, but quite significant part of the criminal case was published – the denunciation to the

authorities which served as the starting point for the criminal case, transcripts of the interrogation of defendants and witnesses, cross-examination reports, forensic medical examination reports (including psychiatric testing), extracts from judicial records and some other documents.

Tens of thousands suffered from the '*muzhelozhstvo*' article in the USSR. There were also well-known people, including some whose biographies are closely connected with Belarus. For example, Leo Klejn, an archeologist from St. Petersburg, was born in 1927 and spent the pre-war period in Viciebsk, and attended a school with Belarusian as the language of instruction. After the war the Klejns settled down in Hrodna; it was there that Barys Klejn, Leo Klejn's younger brother, graduated from the local pedagogical institute and later worked there as an associate professor. Leo Klejn also commenced his studies there but in 1947 he had to transfer hastily to the University of Leningrad because of a conflict with the secretary of the city committee of the Communist Party. In 1981 Leo was arrested and sentenced to a 3-year term of imprisonment on charges of '*muzhelozhstvo*'. Around the same time a philologist, Konstantin Azadovski (convicted on trumped-up drug possession charges) and a historian, Arseniy Roginski (convicted on trumped-up forgery charges) were arrested in Leningrad. Klejn insists on the fact that he was arrested and convicted because his professional views were too uncomfortable and independent for the USSR academic establishment (especially for Boris Rybakov). According to Klejn the order to make short work of him came from Sergey Trapeznikov, the Head of the Department of Science and Educational Establishments of the Central Committee of the CPSU [Клейн 2010: 322-332]. Klejn was first sentenced to three years' imprisonment but he managed to have the verdict overturned. Next time he received a one-and-a-half-year prison term that he served. Unlike K. Azadovskiy and A. Roginski, Leo Klejn has never been rehabilitated. He was stripped of his degrees and qualifications and they were never restored – he obtained new ones.

Another high-profile case on charge of '*muzhelozhstvo*' is that of Sergei Paradzhanov, a film director who was arrested in Kyiv in December 1973 and sentenced to a five-year term of imprisonment. Paradzhanov was granted amnesty and freed one year early under pressure from the international artistic community. According to legend, Louis Aragon (a French writer and prominent member of the French Communist Party) played the decisive role in Paradzhanov's early release by asking Leonid Brezhnev personally to release him. Paradzhanov had occasional conflicts with the authorities because of his independent spirit. Regardless of his international fame he was no longer allowed to make films. Paradzhanov's case is connected with Belarus in the following way: on December 1, 1971 a meeting with the director took place in Minsk in connection with a showing of his film *Sayat-Nova* (*The Colour of Pomegranates*); it was rarely ever shown in cinemas. After the screening the director gave quite a long speech, in which he sharply criticized the

authorities from the State Cinema Committee of the USSR, the Communist party of Armenia and the Communist party of Ukraine [Белюсов 2005]. The speech was transcribed by KGB officers of the BSSR, and then the transcript appeared in Moscow, in the KGB of the USSR and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and then it was sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine [Григорян 2011: 191-194]. Paradzhanov had some more political 'sins'; that is why he is thought to have been imprisoned for political reasons.

We have no information about any previous cases where people convicted for '*muzhelozhstvo*' (part one of the Criminal Code of the BSSR [intercourse between two men above 18 years old by mutual consent]) have applied for rehabilitation. It seems clear that such rehabilitation, involving compensation for former convicts and their families, is necessary. It might sound like a fantasy under the current political regime but in case of regime change there should be a fully elaborated approach to the problem in place.

It took a long time for homosexuals who had died or been sent to concentration camps in 1933-1945 on the territories under the control of the Third Reich to be considered victims of Nazi terror. Article 175 of the Criminal Code that had been introduced during the Prussian period remained in force in both parts of Germany after the Second World War. Now the rehabilitation of the victims who suffered from Article 175 after 1945 is being planned. [Bosold, Brill und Weitz 2015; Schwules Museum 2004]. The German experience should be studied and adopted.

A medical discourse on “sexual perversions” in the USSR

Before entering into an analysis of the views of Soviet sexopathology as presented in the specialist literature, it should be noted that the author of this brochure is a historian, not a psychiatrist or a psychologist. The author's opinions on sexology and sexopathology are therefore those of a dilettante. This may, however, have a positive rather than a negative side to it. An outsider's perspective highlights particular aspects which are not crucial to the discipline itself and therefore might appear trite to those directly involved in the professional discourse, something that goes without saying and does not require any extra elaboration.

Homosexuality in psychological and sexopathological discourse

Things did not end just with the criminal persecution of homosexuals, of course. An image of homosexuals as suffering from a sickness was being created, in other words, they were pathologised. This was true not only for men, but for women as well.

The International Classification of diseases, traumas and causes of death in its 9th revised version, was in force on the territory of Belarus in the 1980s. It was 'adapted' for use in the USSR. It contained, inter alia, paragraph 302 'sexual perversions and deviations', according to which 'homosexuality' (302.0), 'bestiality' (302.1), 'paedophilia' (302.2), 'transvestism' (302.3), 'exhibitionism' (302.4), 'transsexualism' (302.5), 'psychosexual dysfunction of personality' (302.6), 'frigidity and impotence' (302.7), 'other sexual perversions', including 'fetishism, masochism, sadism' (302.8), 'unspecified sexual perversions and deviations' (302.9) were all considered to be 'perversions and deviations' [Снежневский 1983, т. 1: 474].

In keeping with a tradition which goes back to *Psychopathia Sexualis* (*Sexual psychopathy*) by Richard Freiherr von Krafft-Ebing (1840-1902), Soviet psychiatry ascribed homosexuality to psychopathy. Debates were held in the 1960s about whether homosexuality was a separate psychopathy: "The data obtained show that female homosexuals are in most cases psychopathic, but they do not form any separate group of psychopathies" [Деревинская 1967].

In a two-volume handbook on psychiatry, dating back to the late Brezhnev era and edited by the most influential Soviet psychiatrist, Academician Andrei Snezhnevsky, 'sexual perversions' are definitely attributed to psychopathies.

Sexual perversions are not specific to some group of abnormal personalities; they appear in a dynamic of different types of psychopathies. Sexual perversions are possible in a range of psychotic disorders. [...] Most commonly sexual perversions are observed in persons who have psychotic anomalies (hysterics, psychasthenics, nervous, schizoids and other psychopathic personalities), and also with some psychotic disorders (schizophrenia, epilepsy, senile dementia, etc.) [Снежневский 1983, т. 2: 417].

Russian lawyers (with Vladimir Nabokov being the most prominent among them) at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries noticed that there was a distinct contradiction between the persecution of homosexuality and labelling it as an illness [Хили, 2008: 135-136]. When two people perform an act of '*muzhelozhstvo*' as a result of their being ill, they should be given medical treatment, not placed in detention facilities.

The idea of decriminalization of homosexuality was gradually taking shape among Soviet sexopathologists. It was openly articulated in the years of *perestroika*, and before that there had been some sort of fight with the prison system over 'clients'. There is an interesting story that was shared by the forensic psychiatrist Kosarev, a member of the Serbsky Central Scientific Institute for Forensic Psychiatry [Kocapev 1967]. In this case a man serving a sentence under article 121 ('*muzhelozhstvo*') of the RSFSR Criminal Code wrote letters to the healthcare facilities and obtained hospitalization. Later on he was psychiatrically diagnosed and did not return to the place of confinement. The same author refers to the fact of decriminalization of homosexuality in Czechoslovakia in 1962 and notes that "at the 3rd Berlin Symposium on Forensic Psychiatry sceptical remarks had been expressed concerning the efficacy of psychotherapy in case of homosexuality" [Kocapev 1967: 293].

Sexology and sexopathology in the USSR before *perestroika* had enjoyed only a limited existence. The number of publications and their circulation was restricted. Foreign literature on the subject reached the USSR with great difficulties (even scientists with official status failed to receive parcels with the literature). In the sexological publications that were issued in the BSSR homosexuality is never mentioned [for example: Владин и Капустин 1981]. However, in Belarus publications issued in other Soviet countries (Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan) were in circulation.

About the level of development of soviet sexology and sexopathology it can be said that in the 1970s you could still find the opinion expressed that masturbation and erotic fantasizing were perversions [Антеп 1974: 143]. The same author classifies '*pica*' ('пикацизм') as a case of 'sexual abnormality', when "satisfaction with the object of opposite sex is achieved not naturally but through other apertures and parts of body". "Coitus per oris, coitus per anum, intermamma, cunnilingus, penilinctio, anilinctio" were considered to be the displays of *pica* [Антеп, 1974: 141].

The sexopathological literature that was published in the USSR did not only undergo self-censorship, but it was also subject to external censorship, and the censors were officials and ideologists, not psychiatrists. Whole sections were excluded from the translated books, often the very mention of homosexuality was impossible because of censorship. The well-known Russian psychiatrist Dmitrii D. Isaev (Saint Petersburg) told me that a section on homosexuality had been removed from a book by the GDR sexologist Siegfried Schnabl, *Man and Woman, Intimately: Issues of Healthy and*

Unhealthy Sex Life, a translation of which was published in Kishinev (now Chişinău) in 1982. Probably this was done because in the GDR homosexuality had been decriminalised back in 1968 and on the whole the attitude to homosexuals was much more liberal. It should be mentioned though, that a note was left in Abram Svyadosch's preface to the translation concerning this 'shortening' of the book: "The Russian translation of the book excludes a section on sexual perversions and the bibliography of works that are published in German" [Шнабель 1982: 6].

Igor Kon described in some detail the censorship of sexological literature, its publishing practice and the access to it in the Soviet Union [Кон 2010: 277-280, 298-315].

Never mind Freud! Soviet books on sexopathology in academic libraries – there were no such books in ordinary libraries! – were not given even to doctors without a special letter from their place of work certifying that comrade so-and-so is studying sexopathology professionally, and is not just trying to satisfy their unhealthy curiosity. It stopped only in the era of '*perestroika* and *glasnost*' after I had ridiculed such practices on the pages of the theoretical journal of the Central Committee of the CPSU *Kommunist*. Before that this would not have been printed anywhere – the existence of censorship and its forms were kept secret, just like sex [Кон 2010: 279].

I would add that even in the years of *perestroika* the literature on sexology that was mailed to Soviet doctors did not reach them – the censorship would confiscate it as pornographic [Исаев 1994: 75].

Just how unmet were the demands for sexological literature in the USSR can be judged by the *samizdat* ('self-published') copies of the books that had previously been legally published in the Soviet Union. One of these artifacts, a home-made copy of a translated book by the Polish sexologist Kazimierz Imieliński *Psychohygiene of sexual life* (the Russian translation had been published in the publishing house "Medicine"/"Медицина"), is in the private collection of the author of this brochure [Имелинский 1973].

The Party organs were restricting sexopathology to a quite limited context, when scientists were forced to say that:

in our country there are none of those social factors that led to the spread and development of various sexual perversions in the pre-revolutionary times. Raising the cultural level of the population, the preventive policy of Soviet public healthcare, liquidation of prostitution, promotion of a healthier lifestyle, improvement of living conditions, sanitary measures, banning of pornographic literature, all of this led to an abrupt decrease in sexual perversions [Антеп 1974: 135].

Soviet statistics (which, however, rarely specified the figures) postulated that, while in the capitalist countries sexual abnormalities were on the increase, in the USSR “the data on the number of complaints to medical institutions about various forms of sexual perversions indicate a significant reduction of these diseases in the last 20 years. Compared to the 20s and the 30s, there was a tenfold reduction in the number of persons seeking medical help for perversions, and a sixfold reduction specifically for homosexuality” [Анреп 1974: 135]. The latter number comes as no surprise when you consider that in the 1920s male homosexuality was not criminalized. The first number can also indicate a full taboo on discussing sex, due to which it was difficult to learn about the very existence of sexologists and therapists, and a mistrust of the health care system.

It is interesting that the man who authored these quotations was familiar with the contemporary Western literature to which he was referring, but he was still giving definitions in accordance with Krafft-Ebing’s *Psychopathia Sexualis*.

The result of the Stalinist era was a complete silence on sexuality *per se*. “Sexuality, sensuality and everything related were shown exclusively in a bad light, as something hostile to the social order, family, culture and morals” [Кон 2010: 275]. Even scientific research on a ‘sexual’ topic was impossible. Only in the second half of the 1960s did works on sexuality begin to appear. Incidentally, it was thought that there was no sense in describing ‘normal’, ‘unproblematic’ sexuality, so attention was focused on what was perceived as pathology.

The important achievement of the 1960s – 1970s was the birth of medical sexology, which in the USSR was termed ‘sexopathology’.

This name is symptomatic: it implies that ‘normal’ sexuality is unproblematic, everything about it is clear, and those who do have a problem should surrender to the will of doctors [Кон 2010: 302].

In the publications listed above both male and female ‘deviant’ sexualities are described. An early work on female homosexuality was a candidate thesis by Elizaveta Derevinskaya [Деревинская 1965]. Printing it as a monograph was, of course, out of the question. Materials of the dissertation were later used by Abram Svyadosch in the preparation of his book *Female sexopathology* [Свядош 1974]. Like the authors of many earlier and later works Derevinskaya divides lesbians into ‘active’ and ‘passive’. It was not only a folk tradition to label homosexuals as either ‘active’ or ‘passive’; it was also significant here in that most of the women surveyed by Derevinskaya were penal colony prisoners and played certain social roles there. Dan Healey notes that separation of homosexual people into ‘active’ and ‘passive’ was characteristic of Soviet psychiatry in the 1920s as well [Хили 2008: 179-181].

The ‘treatment’ of homosexuality

Soviet sexopathology specialists held different views on the possibility of ‘curing’ homosexuals. Some authors openly expressed doubts about whether it was

at all possible to 'cure' homosexuality. Many wrote about the fundamental possibility of 'curing', but did not actually practice it.

Derevinskaya suggested a treatment plan for 'female homosexuality', but did not give any information about whether this plan had been successful in her own practice [Деревинская 1965: 12-14]. In a later article (co-authored with Abram Svyadosch) she wrote vaguely: "Positive results from the application of this method were observed with women in cases of the passive form of homosexuality" [Свядош и Деревинская 1967: 125].

Some authors reported successes with the 'treatment'. Johann Apter tried to 'cure' 122 homosexuals: 96 men and 26 women. He claimed that "in some cases under the right conditions in a microsocial environment with the possibility of choosing a heterosexual sexual object, a successful switch of sexual propensity to that object took place, which helped the cured patient to find happiness in marriage" [Аптер 1974: 149]. Vladimir Andrianov claimed that his psychotherapy with five homosexuals transformed "a totally homosexual libido into a bisexual orientation with four patients, and at that with two of them the heterosexual attraction became the dominant" [Андрианов 1968: 425].

Abram Svyadosch was also a supporter of 'treatment'. In his book *Female sexopathology* he describes several methods of 'therapy'. One of them is a 'conditioned reflex therapy of homosexuality', which presupposes giving the victim apomorphine (a substance that causes vomiting), and then showing them a photograph of a homosexual partner or suggesting to them they should imagine homosexual relations [Свядош 1974: 164].

It appears that heterosexuality can be 'cured' the same way. On closer inspection the 'treatment' of homosexuality turns out to be similar to the 'treatment' of political dissidence – first chemicals suppress an individual's will (or launch some biochemical reactions), and then an attempt is made to impose on them a certain way of thinking or certain reflexes. With regard to the placement of both political dissidents and homosexuals in psychiatric hospitals the term 'punitive psychiatry' was employed [Гессен 1994: 16]. It was noted previously that for 'curing' homosexuality chlorpromazine (known in the Soviet Union under the trade name 'aminazin') was actively used [Хили 2008: 293-294, 472]. For example, Svyadosch [Свядош 1974: 165-166] and Derevinskaya [Деревинская 1965: 14] suggested the use of chlorpromazine in the treatment of women. In this method chlorpromazine was used to temporarily suppress sexual desire, and at the same time psychotherapeutic conversations were carried out together with "waking persuasion sessions, during which a complete indifference to the partner was secured first, and after that an aversion to homosexual activity". Then 'interest in men', the idea of 'family happiness' and the desire 'to have children' were stimulated. Chlorpromazine became notorious through its use in punitive psychiatry in the Soviet Union for suppressing dissidence [Подрабинек 1979].

Ian Goland, a psychiatrist from the city of Gorky (now Nizhni Novgorod) was an especially well-known figure. He published a number of articles in which he reported his successes in the 'treatment' of homosexuality [for example, Голанд 1968; Голанд 1972]. The ways of 'curing' homosexuality which Goland suggested were relatively 'humane'. He made no use of chemical drugs and did not hospitalize his patients. To 'inculcate' heterosexuality Goland resorted to conversations with the doctor, hypnosis, and auditory training. Interestingly, in contrast to Svyadosch, Goland did not try to form an aversion to homosexuality:

The presence of the personal element within the pathological attraction experienced as part of homosexuality – an element which sometimes is highly developed, rising to the heights of true love and friendship – requires a particularly sensitive approach in the early stages. That is why in a patient we inculcate not an aversion to the inadequate object (because for him the sensual and personal components are one), but a calm attitude of indifference [Голанд 1973: 183].

In addition to homosexuality Goland also tried to 'cure' "fetishism, transvestism, voyeurism, exhibitionism, paedophilia" [Голанд 1973: 184].

Goland's immediate predecessor and teacher was Nikolai Ivanov, who had worked in Irkutsk and later in Gorky. Ivanov had quite a lot of experience in the 'treatment' of homosexuality. In his turn he relied on the experience of an older colleague in Irkutsk, Igor Sumbaev. As Aaron Belkin says, Igor Sumbaev and Nikolai Ivanov were 'curing' homosexuality in the late Stalin years [Белкин 2000: 265-268, 283]. The courses of psychotherapy were lengthy and did not include hospitalization. Given the level of Stalinist homophobia and other various xenophobias, it could potentially put psychotherapists in trouble and required certain courage. Unfortunately, these authors have left very few publications on the subject of psychotherapy of homosexuality. The most accessible was and still is Ivanov's book *Issues in the psychotherapy of functional sexual disorders*, in which one of the sections is dedicated to 'sexual perversions' and, above all, to homosexuality [Иванов 1966: 128-139].

In a two-volume book entitled *Private sexopathology* Georgy Vasilchenko supports the ideas of Ivanov and Goland in theory [Васильченко 1983, т. 2: 109-114], but it is noteworthy that in practice he was not involved in the 'treatment' of homosexuality.

It needs to be said that every Soviet sexopathologist who supported the 'treatment' of homosexuality, including Goland, wrote that for a successful 'treatment' the patient's desire to be 'cured' was absolutely essential. In other words, prior to the patient's visit to the consulting room of a psychotherapist/sexopathologist "a negative emotional attitude to their disorder, a fear of the social consequences, an awareness of the lowering of their standing in society by the fact of having the perversion" should

have been formed [Голанд 1973: 181]. The authors of Soviet books on sexopathology did not recommend 'curing' those who did not want to be 'cured' [for example: Васильченко 1983, т. 2: 99, 109, 114]. Francesca Stella conducted an oral history study, which showed that, although doctors in the USSR perceived lesbians as 'abnormal' or 'sick' people, they rarely attempted to forcibly treat them [Стелла 2014: 236-237; Stella 2015: 47-49]. Naturally, the desire to be 'cured' was formed under the influence of a heterosexist environment, but it is important to stress that therapists were not the ones forming it.

In the collective monograph by three experts *Functional female sexopathology* the idea of the impossibility of 'treating' homosexuality is expressed almost directly [Здравомыслов, Анисимова и Либих 1985: 189-191]. However, this book was published in Alma-Ata, and not because the authors lived there (Sergey Libich, for example, lived and worked in Leningrad), but because there it was possible to pass the censorship.

Sexopathologists from the USSR tried to 'cure' not only homosexuality, but other 'sexual perversions' as well. Some of the clinical cases were published. For instance, Johann Apter gives clinical examples of fetishism (no therapy is mentioned), masochism (with successful therapy) and a BDSM pair (a 'female sadist' and a 'male masochist', only the man was 'treated'). It is interesting that in the latter case, judging from the description, the relations were developing by full mutual agreement, meaning that they were corresponding to the current definition of 'norm' in sexual relationships [Аптер 1974: 153-155].

Other cases of sexual-gender abnormality: intersex and transsexuality

Intersex people get more sympathy from Soviet medicine than homosexual. To some extent, this is due to the fact that they were not the domain of sexopathology, but of interdisciplinary research, in which the central disciplines were endocrinology, genetics and surgery. The term 'intersexuality' was used. Intersex people, however, were called 'sick', but in the 1960s ideas about sex were sufficiently developed: "The concept of a 'true sex' turned out to be medically unsustainable as genetically a large number of patients differ both from men and from women" [Либерман 1966: 3]. However, it was considered an absolute necessity for social reasons to 'ascribe' an intersex person to either men or women; the possibility of uncertainty or of introducing a third gender was not considered. Much attention was paid to the self-identification of intersex people; the direction of their treatment and changing their sex as indicated on their passport (or leaving it unchanged) depended primarily on the desire of the patient (provided they had reached the age of majority):

It should be understood that a nosological diagnosis is absolutely not intended to determine the gender in which to raise a child, and it

does not pretend to establish a 'true sex', because the gender of a human is part of one's phenotype. In this regard, the diagnosis of the disease is important for prediction and for choice of the treatment option, but the method of treatment and the selection of sex are defined not only nosologically, but also socially (the age of the patient, their passport sex) [Либерман 1966: 179].

According to Leonid Liberman, "psycho-sexual orientation depends on upbringing and passport sex" [Либерман 1966: 194]. The author believed that for the formation of gender and sexual identity the upbringing and the passport sex that was assigned at birth are crucial; genetic and hormonal causes are secondary.

The surgeon Irina Golubeva, a member of the Institute of Experimental Endocrinology and Hormone Chemistry of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR, wrote a monograph on some varieties of intersex which were termed 'hermaphroditism'* [Голубева 1980]. She attaches a great deal of importance to the psychosexual examination of intersex people (and not just to a genetic, hormonal examination or to a gonadal biopsy).

The role of the doctor in this case is not limited to the prescription of hormonal drugs, and the surgical correction of genitalia. Only a deep understanding of the psychology of the patient, the special features of their personality and character, and their sexological anamnesis can enable the doctor to help the patient gain complete confidence in the field of choice, to the extent of forming a family [Голубева 1980: 33].

Golubeva notes that, although the gender of their upbringing has the greatest impact on the self-identification of intersexuals, however, "in case of a discrepancy between the phenotype, the structure of the external genitalia and the gender of their upbringing a clear sex identification does not occur, since the patient worries whether their sex was identified correctly" [Голубева 1980: 34]. Finally, the author emphasizes the necessity of abiding by the ethics, and also letting the 'sick' have the last word in the choice of gender:

When collecting sexological anamnesis [...] the doctor absolutely must not articulate or, worse, impose their views about it to the patient. It is essential to be extremely careful, tactful and sensitive, and to keep in mind the painful, intimate nature of the issue with which they are dealing. Most often the doctor is the only person to whom the patient has the courage to entrust all their tragedies,

* Currently, the term 'hermaphroditism' is considered obsolete and rarely used, but in the 1960s – 1980s in the USSR it was used to name many special cases of intersex. At the same time the term 'intersexuality' was used in a broader sense.

doubts and secrets, and the patient must be sure that the 'seal of confession' will not be broken [Голубева 1980: 35].

Golubeva regretted the absence in Soviet legislation of any legal regulation for determining and changing sex, and for registering documents for intersex people. In accordance with the legislation in force at the time, when changing civil/passport gender, individuals had themselves to change all the documents in the offices of the authorities that had issued them (the passport office at the place of residence, the personnel department at the place of work and so on). It was psychologically impossible, because it forced them to talk about the fact of changing their passport gender virtually everywhere in the area of residence, and, moreover, to do it on their own. Doctors in each case 'informally' sought the right to change the documents with the higher authorities (regional, national and all-union). But the process could last for more than a month, and in the meantime the person occupied a hospital bed, for they had no passport, no residence permit, no work. And this then forced others with similar problems to wait their turn. Doctors resorted to other informal practices, for example, they handed out false medical certificates in order to preserve the secrecy of the operations performed. Finally, Golubeva suggests giving intersex people free hormonal preparations for substitution therapy, to which most of them had no access [Голубева 1980: 101-107]. She also draws attention to transsexuals:

Although patients with this disease are within the competence of psychiatry, their needs in some cases of legal, social, surgical and hormonal sex reassignment inadvertently brings them face to face with doctors, who are involved in, so to speak, somatic forms of hermaphroditism. At the same time we were unable to find scientific research on the subject in the literature – both medical and legal – of the USSR. Nevertheless, experience shows that patients with transsexualism do occur and are in need of medical assistance [Голубева 1980: 150].

The psychological help for Golubeva's intersex patients was provided by a psychoendocrinologist from the Institute of Psychiatry of the Ministry of Health of the RSFSR, Aaron Belkin. In the 1990s he wrote a popular science book *The Third Sex* [Белкин, 2000], in which he goes into detail about intersex, homosexual and transsexual people, considers various hypotheses about the origin of intersex, homo- and transsexuality. In his book Belkin gives many examples from his own practice dating back to Soviet times. Like Golubeva, Belkin cites several instances of the 'informal' attitude of physicians to patients, how, for example, in some cases, he personally had to obtain 'permission to change sex' from officials for those intersex people who needed to change their passport gender. Belkin does not call intersex and transsexual people sick any more, but it should not be forgotten that the book was written and published several years after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In Soviet times a quite detailed article on observing a transsexual was published by Pavel Posvyansky (the same case was later described in Belkin's book). A 'patient', Alexander Vasilyevich V., started to have the sense of being female rather late in life, at the age of 55. This sense came upon him cyclically, it would appear and then disappear. In the most recent instance Alexander had had the dominant sense of being male. Whenever the female aspect came to the fore, he would travel to Moscow in the hope of undergoing sex reassignment surgery and for the opportunity to walk freely as a female (a big city gives anonymity). Alexander Vasilyevich (Alexandra Vasilyevna) came to the therapists (he was under the supervision of Pavel Posvyansky for seven years), but did not let himself be hospitalized, refused to be photographed and to be recorded on tape [Посвянский 1972: 391]. Alexander Vasilyevich's condition was described by the psychiatrist as 'circular psychosis'.

Spread of sexological knowledge in the last years of the USSR

Igor Kon, a renowned sociologist and psychologist, was very much involved in the popularisation of sexological (not sexopathological) knowledge. However, his book *Introduction to sexology* was published in Hungary and East Germany, and for censorship reasons could not come out in the USSR before *perestroika*. Igor Kon's article about the psychology of adolescent and youth homosexuality was published in a low-circulation collection on the topic of 'sexual disorders'. In this article Kon relies mainly on recent Western European and American sources in discussing homosexuality as a phenomenon which is not abnormal, not a disease, but censorship was still there; for instance, homosexuality was called 'paraphilia'. And here is an example of a sentence where an attempt to remove the stigma from homosexuality is clearly seen, and at the same time the need to satisfy censorship requirements is met:

When studying problematic psychosexual behaviour it is especially important to avoid stigmatization, bearing in mind that inadvertent labelling can easily become a powerful pathogenic factor, around which the psychosexual identity of a forming personality is structured [Кон 1978: 63].

In 1986 a Russian translation of a book by the Polish sexologist Kazimierz Imieliński was issued [Имелинский 1986]. In the book, the Polish original of which was published in 1982, homosexuality is called a 'deviation' and not a 'disease'. The author argued for the decriminalization of homosexuality (in Poland at the time of writing homosexuality had been decriminalized), and also wrote about the plans to withdraw homosexuality from the International Classification of Diseases at its next revision (which did in fact soon happen). All these passages were left in the translation (i.e. they were not censored). The scientific editor of the translation was the leading Soviet sexopathologist G. Vasilchenko. It would seem that Soviet

sexopathology had had an opportunity to reconsider its position, under the guise of *perestroika*, glasnost and the authority exerted by scientists outside the USSR. But in 1990 a one-volume reference book entitled *Sexopathology* was published. It too was edited by Vasilchenko and marked a return to the views on 'homosexuality' and the possibility of its 'treatment' that had prevailed in the earlier Brezhnev era [Васильченко 1990].

During *perestroika* sexological literature finally began to appear in large print runs and the language in which it was written became understandable to non-specialists. But the quality of this literature varied. Along with Igor Kon's book *Introduction to Sexology* [Кон 1988] questionable brochures were also published in which homosexuality was associated with AIDS and was still called as a disease:

And yet, although it is both logical and timely to adopt a more liberal attitude towards homosexuality in comparison with the years of the command-administrative system in our country, this problem should not be regarded as harmless and as one that does not require a corresponding measure of control. The question is not so much about the danger of AIDS as it is about the neutralization of the homosexual seduction of the younger generation, as V. Kachanov, an officer of the Moscow Criminal Investigation Police Department, rightly points out... [...] From our point of view, homosexual tendencies expressed by an adult man and especially his unwillingness to change his sexuality should not be subjected to forced correction or other repressive actions. But this does not mean that we should abandon the fight for the heterosexuality of teenagers [Чемоданов и Гришин 1990: 22].

In 1991, a brochure written by the Stavropol urologist Igor Derevyanko was published and widely distributed. In it the author sees no difference between homosexuality, transsexuality and intersex, and suggests viewing these phenomena as variations of the same 'disease'. In the same brochure one can find phrases like: "In a normal heterosexual intercourse [...] the man plays an active role, and the woman is a passive sexual partner" [Деревянко 1991: 15]. At the same time Derevyanko advocated the decriminalization of homosexuality and regarded homosexuals with a certain sympathy.

Homosexuality and psychiatry in the BSSR

There is a lack of written (or at least published) sources that reveal the ways in which psychiatrists' views of homosexuality changed in the BSSR. We tried to compensate for this by interviewing a psychiatrist N. who asked to remain anonymous. This specialist from Minsk has been working in the field for over 40 years. According to N., doctors understood that homosexuality is not treatable, but the authorities forced them to administer 'treatment'. Patients were prescribed

tranquilizers and neuroleptic drugs. Homosexuals, who (in small numbers) found themselves in hospital, had been sent from the prison system. Nobody volunteered for 'treatment'. Sexopathology and sexology were not taught as subjects in medical schools, and there were no theorists in these areas in the BSSR. The absence of sexological theory in the BSSR was confirmed additionally by Dmitry Isaev (St. Petersburg) in conversation. Dmitry Kapustin, author of several popular books already mentioned above, was an exception, but he was more of a practitioner, and did not write anything about homosexuality and other 'deviations'.

There is a story about a village homosexual from the Ušačy district that had been collected and written down from the words of a respondent (b. 1930) during an ethnographic expedition in 1999. The hero of the story went straight to a psychiatric hospital rather than prison, and never returned home:

"He was always quarrelling with the women. But I wasn't afraid of him, we used to graze cows together. He didn't like women, but he did like men. He lived alone, his parents had died. He went around in rags all the time. He used to brew his own moonshine at home. Sometimes he would bring a guy home, get him drunk, and then put him to bed. Then someone shopped him to the authorities, and he was taken to the madhouse. There they say he fell madly in love with the chief of the hospital. They must have got fed up with him there and poisoned him" [Лобач 2006: 101].

I made an attempt to find the number of diagnoses of 'sexual perversions' in medical statistics. But I found nothing: the section on diagnoses in psychiatric statistics, which are stored in the records of the BSSR Ministry of Health (fund no. 46 of the National Archives of the Republic of Belarus), is insufficiently detailed.

Valentin Kondrashenko seems to have been the first Belarusian psychiatrist to start considering sexual 'deviations' in his publications; this happened in the years of *perestroika*. In the section "Deviations in sexual behaviour" of his book *Deviant behaviour of adolescents* he quite tolerantly lists different variations of sexual behaviour [Кондрашенко 1988: 145-158]. Kondrashenko writes that:

differentiation between non-pathological and pathological forms of sexual deviances is very difficult and in many ways arbitrary. [...] Of even greater difficulty is the delimitation of non-pathological forms of sexual deviations from normal sexual behaviour. The notion of 'normal sexual behaviour' is vague and ambiguous. [...] All these criteria are relative and are perceived by society differently depending on age, religion, level of culture and scientific knowledge. It is known, for example, that at different times society treated homosexuality, transvestism, exhibitionism (especially for women) differently [...]. [Кондрашенко 1988: 146-147].

Daily life

During Soviet times knowledge of non-normative sexuality (including homosexuality) outside sexopathological and criminal discourses was rigorously suppressed and silenced. That is why very little can be learned from publications about how those homosexuals who were fortunate enough to stay out of sight of the police and psychiatrists actually lived. It is a fact that police and psychiatric persecution were not all they had to deal with.

The well-known choreographer and singer Boris Moiseev was born in 1954 in Mahilioŭ and graduated from the Belarusian State Choreographic School in Minsk in the early 1970s. After graduation Moiseev worked in the corps de ballet of the Kharkiv Opera and Ballet Theatre. One day in 1975 the administrator of the dormitory burst into his room without warning and caught him kissing with a roommate. Since kissing was not considered a ‘crime’, no criminal case was opened. Individual cases involving the young ballet dancers were considered at a Komsomol meeting. Moiseev was fired and had to move to Kaunas [Моисеев 2007: 58-68]. Boris Moiseev is known as a great hoaxer. Nevertheless, the story looks quite plausible and typical of the era.

The British researcher Francesca Stella tells a similar story. One of Stella’s respondents said that in 1986 she was studying in a construction college in Leningrad. She and another girl were caught ‘red-handed’ in a room by the administrator of the dormitory. There was a ‘court of comrades’, and the girls were banished from the Komsomol. The respondent’s mother was notified of her daughter’s ‘inappropriate behaviour’ in a letter. Due to the stress experienced the pair almost immediately broke up [Стелла 2014: 238-240; Stella 2015: 49-51].

Unfortunately, we were unable to come across such stories within Belarus. Perhaps they could still be found among the files of Komsomol organizations of various levels in the public archives.

It is difficult to imagine a place where homosexuals would have felt safe. Some of them formed groups where the members did not need to hide from each other. Such groups are known to have existed in Moscow and Leningrad in the Brezhnev era and also in some Belarusian cities (for example, Homiel) in the 1990s. In other ‘bohemian’ milieus homosexuals (the open ones) were ‘tolerated’, although disliked. Here is an example from a short story by Alexander Romanov “A woman without a name” written in 1984:

On that day, as always, I had guests. That day, however, there did seem to be more of them than usual. [...] The third was Zheńka, a super-intellectual with super-inclinations – a philosopher by education and a homosexualist by affections. I can’t stand the “queer” folk, but I quail before philosophers: they’ve read Hegel, whom I can only admire. However, Zheńka did not put his “queer”

inclinations on display in my apartment. He's smart enough to realise that my friends and I don't play games like that [Поманов 2006].

Alexander Romanov's group existed not only in short stories, but in reality as well, in Hrodna, where there was a prototype of Zhenka: Evgenii Ruban (1941 – 1997), a Hrodna chess player, a graduate of the Faculty of Philosophy of Leningrad University. He came second in the BSSR chess championships in 1964 and won the Leningrad championship in 1966. The Dutch grandmaster and former resident of Leningrad Genna Sosonko claims that Ruban was stripped of the title of Chess Master of the USSR because he had a criminal conviction. Allegedly, he was found guilty of an act of same-sex intercourse in a public place (although it was categorized by the police and the court as 'hooliganism', not '*muzhelozhstvo*') [Сосонко 2006: 164-166].

The Minsk group that formed around Kim Khadeev was probably friendlier to homosexuals and others who did not fit into late Soviet normativity. Kim Khadeev (1929-2001) was a prominent representative of the 'bohemian' lifestyle. Like the above-mentioned Alexander Romanov, Khadeev served time for making critical statements about the political system. With no official recognition, and often even without an official place of work, he enjoyed great authority in Minsk intellectual circles. He was a highly educated man who earned his living by writing candidate's and even doctoral dissertations in various branches of the humanities. In his apartment there were always guests indulging in intellectual conversation with the owner (or in his absence). A number of prominent figures in Belarusian cultural life (for example, Vladimir Rudov, Mikalai Zacharanka, Dmitry Strotsev, Yulia Chernyavskaya) were associated with the Khadeev circle. It is believed that Kim Khadeev was homosexual. On the other hand, many refute these rumours [for example: Марковский 2009]. Either way, one can talk with certainty about the homosociality of the famous Minsk thinker. His immediate friends were almost exclusively men:

To many people Kim's not exactly indifferent attention to young boys, each of whom was a future brilliant figure in art, seemed suspicious. To me as well, I admit. However, one could understand our suspiciousness, because this man had neither a wife nor a female lover, there were always only 'boys', 'boys', 'boys' around... [Кулон 2013: 171].

Anatol Astapienka (under the pseudonym 'Anton Kulon') is clearly writing about the presence of open homosexuals in Khadeev's circle: "The coexistence of different people: geniuses and mediocrities, unspoiled girls and prostitutes, boys in love and persons of non-traditional orientation, the young and the old – all of that was 'Kim's Academy'" [Кулон 2013: 171].

One can try to reconstruct the places in the city where the homosexual subculture was present through the oral recollections of the participants. These places in Soviet times were limited to toilets, *pleshkas*⁸, and public baths.

Comparing the late Soviet subculture of gay men with that of North America, Daniel Schluter notes that the former's late 1980s – early 1990s can be compared to the latter's 1950s. In the second half of the 1960s and especially in the 1970s in the United States and Canada the level of institutionalization of gay subcultures increased significantly – there were not only 'their' bars and saunas, but also organizations that met almost any need (from law offices to libraries). At the end of the 1970s in the North American cities the homosexual part of the population was much more institutionally developed than the vast majority of ethnic groups (ethnic minorities) [Schluter 2002: 31-32]. D. Schluter wrote that the degree of self-organization of homosexuals whom he saw in the Soviet Union in 1988-1991, can be characterized as a fraternity, but not as a community. The 'fraternity' manifested itself through a quite well developed identification of homosexuals as a group, as well as through outdoor venues in major cities. However, in order to call the homosexual subculture a 'community', "formal economic, political, societal, or cultural organizations catering to the homosexual population" [Schluter 2002: 6] were lacking (specialized non-governmental organizations and a gay press had only just begun to emerge, there was nothing more).

These are the popular meeting places for homosexuals in Minsk in the second half of the 1980s (we could not find any information on the first half): the toilet in the basement of the Central bus station, the toilet on the bus station *Družnaja*, the toilet on the ground floor of the apartment house on Sverdlov street near the intersection with Kirov street. Other well-known meeting places for gay men in the 1990s were the Chelyuskinty Park, the Central public garden (popularly known as 'Panikovka'), and a sauna on Moskovskaya Street. In the 1990s gay men also spent their free time on certain benches in Gorky Park. For information about the most interesting Minsk *pleshka* – the '*pleshka* on wheels' – read below.

For many men the time when they had their first homosexual experience was when they were on national service in the army. For others the army was the place for the final realization of their sexuality. One of our interlocutors told an almost idyllic story about a group of soldiers in one small frontier outpost consisting of 'friends' in couples, who would sometimes lock themselves away somewhere together (for example, in a sauna or boiler room) in order to relieve sexual tension. Often, however, homosexual relations in the army were related to domination, subordination and *dedovshchina* (hazing); there were instances of

⁸ *Pleshka* – a slang term for a meeting place for homosexuals. As a rule *pleshkas* were situated in the centres of towns and cities, in the squares or in parks. In English it approximates to 'cruising strip'.

homosexual rapes, including gang rapes (one of these stories is in the field materials we collected).

The subject of same-sex sexual activity among male prisoners is explored in, for example, Leo Klejn's memories [Клейн 2010: 322-398] and his book *Inverted World*. We do not have any directly Belarusian material on this subject.

Glasnost and *perestroika* coincided with the beginning of the AIDS epidemic in the USSR. The press, which now had an opportunity to highlight material that had previously been suppressed, enthusiastically went for savouring 'dirty' facts and stories. It was now possible to use the word 'homosexuality' and to discuss the phenomena related to the word. This led, on one hand, to a significant number of homophobic publications. On the other hand, there also were publications in which the authors tried to overcome the homophobia which had been instilled in them since childhood by Soviet society; they wrote about the problems of homosexuals with some sort of sympathy. Anyway, most of the authors attributed the spread of HIV/AIDS to gay men and called gays the 'risk group' [Мопоз 1990: 50-74].

During the years of *perestroika* in the USSR (including the BSSR) a phenomenon known as 'repairing' ('ремонт') became widespread. The 'repairmen' were youth gangs who expressed their violently homophobic beliefs as follows. A nice-looking guy would be sent to a *pleshka*. There he would meet a potential victim and lead him off to the place where the rest of the gang were waiting. The victim was beaten and robbed, in the worst cases raped and even killed [Владимир Д. 1990]. Sometimes a 'mole' was not needed – they could track and bring down the victim not far from the *pleshka*. In interviews the 'repairmen' were said to be hanging around, for example, at the 'Panikovka' in Minsk in the 1990s. Since the police offered gays no kind of protection against 'repairing' and also did not accept or deal with reports of such crimes, gays had to defend themselves – thus the 'repairmen' themselves often used to get beaten up.

The 1990s and the first half of the 2000s: the birth of the movement for LGBT rights

Perestroika brought a sexual revolution to the USSR. A 'quiet' sexual revolution had been taking place in the country since the 1960s – the age for becoming sexually active was decreasing, and the number of divorces and single mothers was on the rise. Society was beginning to have a more permissive attitude to sexual life outside marriage, and there was a growing interest among the population in the previously almost inaccessible sexological literature. During the years of *perestroika* sexological knowledge became widely available, and sexuality was recognized as an independent value. It began to be widely discussed in the media. At the end of *perestroika* the media of the USSR arrived at a more or less serious discussion of sexual 'differentness', and a niche gay and lesbian press also began to appear.

The first legal gay publication in Russia was the Moscow newspaper *Tema*. At the end of 1990 its editor Roman Kalinin was able to register the publication with the Moscow council of deputies. The fact that *Tema* was read in Belarus can be seen from the content of publications. Under the heading "Dating Club" ads from different regions of Belarus were regularly published, and in one of the issues of 1992 an article "At the obelisk" appeared. In it the author, who worked at the Moscow editorial office, describes a trip he made to Viciebsk in Belarus; the newspaper had received five letters from lonely young gay men there. Thanks to the emissary of the *Tema* editorial board the young men met and established a circle of friends. The article also described a *pleshka* at the monument to the liberators of Viciebsk in Victory Square [Быстров 1992]. The same issue of *Tema* published an excerpt from a reader's letter from Minsk; the writer of the letter was a university student who unexpectedly found a "*pleshka* on wheels" in the city – on the rear platform of a trolleybus on route 2. This route went along Skaryna Avenue (the name of the main thoroughfare of Minsk at the time) and was always crowded. This made it possible for those so inclined to quietly touch each other up, get out at the next stop and continue on a date. The existence of such a 'mobile *pleshka*' in the 1990s was confirmed by one of our respondents in an interview.

The Belarusian media also started discussing subjects that had previously been taboo. For example, a series of articles dedicated to the story of two young lesbians was published in the Hrodna newspaper *Perspektiva* between November 1991 and January 1992.

On 15 November 1991 the same newspaper printed a letter from a young woman. She was asking the editors for more coverage of the "sexual minorities' problem". The author talked about her life experience and expressed the hope that "someone brave enough will create a society of sexual minorities (like in Moscow, Riga and St. Petersburg) here, in Hrodna".

One of the readers wrote a reply which was printed in the issue for 29 November. The publication of the letter was accompanied by an editorial comment, expressing the attitude of the editorial board towards the subject:

The reader's letter, which we here print in abridged form, expresses doubts concerning editorial policy on the matter, so let's make it clear. In our opinion a society cannot be democratic and lawful if it accepts only the interests of the majority – ethnic, cultural, sexual, etc. Protecting the rights and interests of minorities is the foundation of civilization, justice demands it, regardless of whether somebody likes it or not.

Despite some very positive declarations, the real editorial policy was not all that friendly towards the LGBT community. In the issue of 15 November, where the first letter was printed, the editors also published an unsigned article "I am a slut. What you still don't know about Madonna". This article positively salivates over the scandalous details of the sexually liberated video by the famous American singer, with homosexuals being called 'pederasts'.

The story of the letters to the newspaper continued. Since the second reader expressed the wish to meet the author of the first letter, a journalist with *Perspektiva*, Alexander Romanov, contacted them and offered to organize a meeting on 'neutral territory'. The meeting did actually take place, the women met, making sure that they were not alone in Hrodna. They kept in touch afterwards, sharing lesbian-related news and information with each other.

Romanov, however, was not only acting out of a sincere desire to help, but also pursuing his own professional interests. He wrote another piece on the outcome of the meeting, which was duly published in the readers' letters section and titled "Loving a woman is natural" in January 1992. The material ended with the suggestion that other lesbians should send letters to a specific address in order to meet. For safety reasons the address chosen was Romanov's home address.

This series of publications is examined in greater detail in the article "Pink Retro" [Валодзін 2016]. It should also be noted that the journalist Alexander Romanov, and the above-mentioned author of the story "A woman without a name" Alexander Romanov, are one and the same person.

Many publications in the early 1990s printed private dating ads. Quite often they (including the above-mentioned newspaper *Perspektiva*) published the ads of those who wished to meet a same-sex partner. Publications that specialized in dating ads started to spring up. The best known was the Minsk magazine *Vstrecha* (*Meeting*, 1992 – 1994). It was distributed not only in Belarus, but also in other countries that had emerged after the collapse of the USSR. The magazine's circulation in its heyday reached 350,000 copies. Right from its very first issue in 1992 *Vstrecha* had a column called "Queer Living Room" (with Alexei Kravchenko in charge) aimed at lesbians and gays (from №2 1993 the column was renamed "Option"). In addition to the actual ads,

Vstrecha also published articles – original and in translation – about gays, lesbians and transgender people: from an interview with the sexologist Abram Svyadosch to a report from the “Christopher Street Day” festival in St. Petersburg. Apart from Moscow and St. Petersburg the correspondents of the Minsk magazine also reached Berlin. For instance, *Vstrecha* ran a report from the “Homolulu” festival, held in the German capital in October 1992 (№1/1993, pp. 32-33).

The way homosexuality was covered in the Belarusian media of the 1990s could be a subject for separate research. The direction that such research might take can be found in the detailed analysis conducted by Nasta Mancevič [Манцэвіч 2014] of publications in the newspaper *Perekhodnyi vozrast* (*The Teenage Years*) in the period 1994-2005.

In 1994 the decriminalization of voluntary anal sex between men was passed very quietly. The Law dated 1 March 1994 “On Making Amendments and Addenda to the Criminal Code of the Republic of Belarus and some other legislative acts of the Republic of Belarus” excluded the first part of article 119 of the Criminal Code. It was one of 146 changes made in the Code. The changes came into force on 1 May 1994 [Данилюк, Лукашов и Саркисова 1994: 118]. Decriminalization occurred later than in Ukraine (1991) and Russia (1993). It seems that decriminalization of voluntary homosexual relations occurred not only under pressure from the Council of Europe, which Belarus was preparing to join, but was also planned by local lawyers. For example, 1992 saw the publication of a monograph on criminal law by Stanislav Tishkevich, an associate professor of the Police Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The book recommends the criminalization only of “[sexual] activities [...] with the use of violence towards the victim, with abuse of the victim’s helpless state or with threats – listed by the legislator – as a means of extortion” [Тишкевич 1992: 148].

Gay businesses were beginning to appear, a sure sign that the formation of an LGBT community was well under way. The first were clubs: ‘Vstrecha’ (in the second half of 1990s), ‘Oskar’ (1999-2000), ‘Babylon’ (2001-2007, 4 Tolbukhin Boulevard), ‘Drama’ (46 Timiryazev Street), ‘Narcissus’ (first half of the 2000s), ‘Lyutik’ (closed in 2007), ‘Buffet YoYo’ (2006-2007, 12 Chkalov Street), ‘6a’ (existed until 2013). The clubs ‘Vstrecha’, ‘Narcissus’, ‘Lyutik’ and ‘6a’ all occupied the same premises at 6a Partizanski Avenue.

Sometimes (but nowhere near as often as we would have liked) the ‘themed’⁹ clubs became places for public events with some civil spirit, as well as parties. For instance, in September 2001 many gay pride events (the grand opening and closing of events, poetry readings, and so on) were held in the ‘Babylon’ club. The festival ‘Gender route-2’ in ‘Buffet YoYo’ on 8-10 December 2006 offered a good example of cooperation between the feminist and the LGBT movements.

⁹ “Theme” (Russian and Belarusian tema) – a non-gendered collective term for non-heterosexuals. We use it here in English translation as well, for it is short, all-inclusive and sounds local.

Unfortunately, except for a few gay-friendly bars (for example, 'Soyuz-Online'), clubs became the first and last manifestations of gay business. In Belarus the situation for such businesses was unfavourable due to the homophobia of the local authorities, the police and the owners of the premises rented by the clubs or bars.

A prime example was a series of homophobic articles in the newspaper *Minskiy kuryer*. Two journalists from the paper, Irina Vasilyeva and Maxim Egorov, visited the 'Lyutik' club in order to "carry out a journalistic investigation". The club closed soon after the articles appeared [Мицкевич 2007].

The club 'Oskar' was shut down by the administration of the factory 'Promsvyaz', where it was renting premises. The administration of the plant unilaterally broke the contract, verbally affirming that the motivation for their action was homophobic.

On the night of 3 July 2001 30-year-old Ivan Sushinsky, one of the directors of the club 'Oskar', was killed in his apartment. This is one of the few examples of homophobic violence that found their way into the press [Bortnik 2007: 369]. Much more frequent were the rumours circulating about hate murders of gays. At the same time, the case of Ivan Sushinsky shows just how dangerous it was to be engaged in Minsk gay business.

HIV aid organizations began to appear in Belarus in the early 1990s. One example is the organization 'Stop AIDS Belarus'. It was registered in 1994 and most of its members were representatives of the LGBT community. Headed by Evgeny Zablotzky, it lasted for only a very short time (1-2 years). Although other organizations had many queer members as well, it was not until 2004 that an organization for men who have sex with men (MSM), 'Vstrecha', was set up. Previously 'Vstrecha' had been participating in HIV/AIDS prevention projects as an initiative group since 1998.

'Vstrecha' originated as an informal club formed around the eponymous magazine with private dating ads. The magazine ceased to exist in 1995, but the club continued to operate. Its members saw themselves as something of an LGBT organization. They chose to act 'quietly': they did not seek registration as a formal structure, and rarely performed as public personalities. The editor-in-chief of the magazine *Vstrecha*, and later the informal leader of the initiative of the same name, was Tatyana Zueva (1959/1960 – 2014). After a stroke in 2001, Tatyana could not for health reasons continue to participate in the work of the initiative as actively as before. Nevertheless, she became the editor of an informational and educational brochure also called *Vstrecha* (2007), and she also served as an honorary board member of the organisation after it registered with the authorities in 2004 [Еремін 2014]. Another prominent figure of the club, and later of the organization 'Vstrecha' was Oleg Eremin, who still works in the public organizations in the field of HIV prevention.

In 1998, Edvard Tarliecki and the group of people around him announced the creation of the Belarusian League of Freedom for Sexual Minorities 'Lambda' (later the name was shortened to the Belarusian League 'Lambda'). The creators of

‘Lambda’, unlike those of ‘Vstrecha’, chose to publicize their activity widely: they founded a magazine, tried to register the organization, gave interviews, organized conferences and even gay pride events.

At first there were conflicts between the two groups on the issue of publicity. To the members of ‘Vstrecha’ all the publicity seemed to be ‘excessive’ and threatened to result in homophobic hysteria, thus damaging the cause of emancipation of gays and lesbians. ‘Lambda’ members accused their opponents of cowardice. Over time, however, they both realized that their methods were not contradictory, but in fact complemented each other.

‘Lambda’ was heavily engaged in various activities for a few years. In August 1998 it began to put out a magazine with the title *Forum*. Initially an eight-page black-and-white risograph newsletter, it was eventually transformed into a 40-page glossy magazine with a colour cover, called *Forum Lambda*. In June 1999 the magazine was registered with the State Press Committee.

A website associated with ‘Lambda’ was set up: apagay.com.

‘Lambda’ held pickets for various causes in Minsk while it was still possible (in the late 1990s pickets were permitted). These were the first events held under the rainbow flag. The first gay pride was held on 6-9 September 1999 in Minsk. Although it was not held in public (workshops, film screenings and parties all took place inside), riot police still came to one of the parties. The attempt to organize a pride a year later (7-10 September 2000) was almost completely disrupted by the authorities: seminars had to be held on the street and clubs refused their premises to be used for parties. But in 2001 an opportunity arose to really ‘have a blast’. In the run-up to the farce known as ‘presidential elections’ an order came down from on high not to touch anything or anyone in order to create a beautiful picture of life in Belarus for Western observers. The beginning of September 2001 was a time of ‘rampant liberalism’. It was precisely at this time (2-9 September) that a gay pride was held. It was preceded by a retrospective of films by François Ozon in the ‘Pobeda’ cinema (August 28-31). In addition to lectures, workshops and parties, even poetry readings were included in the programme. The highlight was a Love Parade on 7 September, when participants walked from the circus to the ‘Panikovka’ (Aleksandrovsky Square).

The Love Parade was organized in cooperation with the Belarusian Federation of Anarchists (FAB). Throughout all the ‘Lambda’ years the anarchists were the only political force in Belarus that consistently and openly supported the idea of equality for all people regardless of sexual orientation or gender. The anarchist federation supported ‘Lambda’ in July 2001, when the organizing committee of the Congress of Belarusian Youth denied ‘Lambda’ the right to delegate their representatives to the Congress. ‘Lambda’ and anarchist activists staged a joint theatrical protest directly at the Congress, calling upon participants to sign up to a ‘Congress of Sinful Belarusian Youth’.

It is known that some prominent anarchist activists formed the backbone of the editorial board of the satirical newspaper *Navinki* (*News from the Madhouse*). Not surprisingly, the theme of equality of homosexuals featured regularly on the newspaper's front pages. The background to one of those features involved what was probably one of the most ridiculous stories of the time. In March 2002 a well-known homophobe from the Belarusian conservative opposition, Paval Sieviaryniec, circulated a statement to the media. The statement was entitled "The last perversion of Edzik Tarliecki". Published in the conservative newspaper *Naša Niva*, this statement looked like yet another homophobic attack thick with hate speech:

We are also aware that his [Tarliecki's] sexual minorities' league 'Lambda' engages not only in physiological perversions, but also in organizing actions that discredit the democratic community in Belarus. The appearance of gay flags, gay pride parades and other gay provocations at events with the white-red-white symbols¹⁰, at demonstrations against the regime and at meetings held to mark special occasions is an insult aimed at the entire national movement. It gives exceptionally powerful arguments to BT [Belarusian television] and reduces the concept of 'human rights' to an advertisement for profligacy and evil [Севярынец 2002].

However, the same statement (not a single word changed!), when printed in the satirical *Navinki*, sounds quite different: as a piece of subtle banter on the part of the editors, who managed to accurately parody the style of Sieviaryniec. As a response to Sieviaryniec, a photograph strip cartoon called 'Cinderella' was published on the last page of the same issue; in it Tarliecki plays one of the main roles. The strip begins with Pasha Sieviaryniec complaining about the difficulties of life in Belarus: "How difficult it is to live as a Christian: people are rude, they don't believe in God, *Navinki* makes fun of me, faggots flirt with me..." The strip ends with the phrase: "From that moment on Pasha ceased to be a belligerent homophobic obscurantist..." Both Sieviaryniec's statement and the entire comic strip can be seen at <https://belarusianqueerstory.noblogs.org/post/2016/01/02/vystava2/>.

'Lambda' was also supported by individual public organizations, for example, 'Abjadnany Šliach' ('The United Way') and 'Maladaja Hramada' (Association of Young Social Democrats). However, because these were individual organizations and not umbrella associations of NGOs, they could hardly have been called a political force.

The last issues of *Forum Lambda* came out in 2002. In the same year the last gay pride (of those organized by 'Lambda') was held, and it was much more modest than in the previous year.

¹⁰ In Belarus under Lukašenka white-red-white flag became a symbol widely used by and closely associated with the political opposition to Lukašenka regime. Before, in 1991–1995 it was a national flag of the Republic of Belarus.

In 2002 the Belarusian Ministry of Justice registered the Republican women's youth organization 'Jana' ('She'). In fact, the organization was primarily intended for lesbians rather than for all women. It was headed by Svetlana Plavsyuk. In 2004-2005 the organization's activists began to collect signatures for a legislative initiative on same-sex marriages. At that time it was necessary to collect 10,000 signatures in order to initiate legislation. They managed to collect more than 4,000. 'Jana' was involved in projects on HIV/AIDS prevention and participated in roundtable discussions of legal matters. In 2003 a single issue of a magazine (or rather, fanzine) called *Svyaz* was released. Activists of 'Jana' together with activists of 'Radislava' and anarcho-feminists participated in organizing a women's (feminist) camp in 2004 near Rakaŭ. Around 2008-2009 'Jana' ceased to operate.

The first Belarusian Social Forum, held on 5-7 November 2004 in Stajki near Minsk, brought together representatives of pro-anarchist and left-wing groups. The Forum united both organizations focused more on the political struggle and non-governmental organizations. One of the sections was called "A movement for minority rights in Belarus" and was moderated by the international secretary of 'Lambda', Sergei Tarpachov [<https://belarus.indymedia.org/83>]. The section was named covertly so as not to attract too much attention from the administration of the 'Stajki' sports complex and other 'competent organs'. The section was almost exclusively devoted to a discussion of the situation of the LGBT movement in Belarus. Statements were made by the head of 'Jana' Svetlana Plavsyuk, Sergei Egorov from Homiel (he spoke about the monthly Homiel publication for gays *Queque sum*, which existed for about a year) and Uladzislaŭ Ivanoŭ (he read a paper on the ethnography of (homo)sexuality in Belarus). Discussion focussed on Svetlana Plavsyuk's main concern: the need to initiate a bill to legalize same-sex marriage. Sergei Tarpachov expressed concerns about the fact that discussion of such a bill would cause a wave of homophobia, and suggested concentrating first on the adoption of anti-discrimination legislation and a hate crimes law. They also discussed the situation regarding the illegal blocking of LGBT websites in Belarus. In particular, Sergei Tarpachov said that following an appeal to the court he had been able to unlock the web-site *apagay.com* in many Belarusian internet cafés. The section was also attended by representatives of the Belarusian Federation of Anarchists, the Women's crisis centre, The Association of Young Social Democrats and other organizations.

The issue of LGBT rights is gradually coming to be perceived as a human rights issue not only by gays and lesbians themselves, but also by human rights organizations.

As early as the 1990s Amnesty International recognized LGBT rights as an integral part of human rights [Dudek et al. 2007: 35-44]. Accordingly, the Belarusian branch of the organization started to document violations of LGBT rights and undertook information campaigns. The most active member of the Belarusian branch of 'Amnesty International' – as far as dealing with LGBT issues was

concerned – was Viačaslaŭ Bortnik. Thanks to him surveys of the legal situation of LGBT people in Belarus were circulated not only through the bulletin of *Amnesty International in Belarus*, but also through foreign publications [Bortnik 2007; Dudek et al. 2007: 141-146].

Under the influence of its Swedish partners the human rights centre 'Viasna' began considering discrimination against homosexuals on a par with discrimination of religious communities and minorities [Вопросы толерантности 2005: 129-148].

The atmosphere of the beginning of the 2000s is conveyed in a short documentary "They still smile". In 2002, Irina Sizova's 17-minute production received an award for the best short film at the Swiss lesbian-gay film festival "Pink Apple" [Bütikofer 2002]. The film was also shown at the Warsaw International Film Festival "Human Rights in film", and at some other sites. In "They still smile" you can see footage of the II International Conference "Lesbian movement" (Minsk, 8-9 March 2002), as well as interviews with members of the movement for the rights of lesbians and gay men – Katerina Minakova, Maria Dudareva, Pavel Galushko, Alexander Plesetski (well-known travesty performer), Edvard Tarliecki and others whose names are not mentioned in the subtitles.

In conclusion, attention should be paid to queer fiction. No 'lesbian' or 'gay' literary societies or almanacs appeared during the 1990s. However, a greater openness among the public and among the writers led to the writing and publication of some homoerotic works in Belarusian. As the author of this brochure is not a specialist in literature, he is able to give only a couple of examples of works of Belarusian literature relevant to the topic of this brochure published before 2007. May those whose works are not mentioned here not be offended.

The homosexuality of Jury Humianiuk (1969-2013) became a topic for discussion after his tragic death [<http://www.svaboda.org/content/article/24879169.html>]. Homoerotic poems can be found in his work. Here, for example, is the poem "Pink-eyed dragon" from the collective volume "Kola" ("A Circle", Hrodna, 1993):

A pink-eyed dragon beckons me.

His skin is purest velvet.

Like a woman will I shelter him.

This will true happiness be.

The pink-eyed dragon will be good

He'll hide his predatory teeth.

He'll feel his tireless heart,

and entranced, sits like an Indian yoga.

The pink-eyed dragon fades away

to where nothing is. The dreams alone

in my head, like beer in a barrel,

make foam of greyish-green.

My pink-eyed little dragon,

sleep sweetly till the time is right,

Ружавокі дракон мяне вабіць.

Мае ён аксамітную скуру.

Я яго прытулю, як кабету.

Гэта будзе сапраўднае шчасце.

Ружавокі дракон стане добрым

і схавae драпежныя зубы.

Ён адчуе нястомнае сэрца,

ўвойдзе ў транс, як індыйскія ёгі.

Ружавокі дракон адыходзіць,

дзе нічога няма. Толькі мары

ў галаве, нібы піва ў барыльцы,

робяць шэра-зялёную пену.

Ружавокі дракон, мой маленькі,

сні салодка да лепшай гадзіны,

sleep while your marks of grey
lie safe within your mirrored body.

спі, пакуль твой адбітак ссівелы
люстраное захоўвае цела.

Nasta Kudasava's first collection of poetry "Liscie maich ruk" ("Leaves of my hands") was published in Minsk in 2006. Many of the intimate lyrics in the collection are written on behalf of a female lyrical hero and are addressed to a woman. This, for example, is a six part poem "Goddess" (due to lack of space we give only part 4):

I will lie nearby –
a night valet,
not saying
a single step,
not saying
a single point,
I will lie nearby,
if you would only.
Only searching
for the dear hand...
I will lie nearby
you moaning,
I will lie nearby –
dogmas will burn!
The one, promised
to me
by God!

Лягу побач –
начны лёкай,
не гаворачы
ні кроку,
не гаворачы
ні кропкі,
лягу побач,
каб ты – толькі.
Толькі вобшук
рукі роднай...
Лягу побач
тваім стогнам,
лягу побач –
гарэць догмам!
Нарачоная
мне
Богам!

In the mid-2000s the poet Nasta Mancevič, who does not hide her same-sex amorous feelings in what she writes, appeared on the scene. However, her first and so far only collection of verse *Ptuški* ("Birds", 2012) came out too late to be included in this study.

Svetlana Aleksievich has been testing the patience of those who love her work for almost 20 years by not publishing her book *The Wondrous Deer of the Eternal Hunt*, a collection of love stories. Only a small part of the book was published in the Riga journal *Daugava* (№4 2000) and was never reprinted. Some smaller fragments also appeared in 2001 in the Russian newspapers *Trud* (18 January) and *Rossiyskaya Gazeta*. The writer claimed in a 1998 interview that she had collected about 500 love stories. One of the three stories that impressed the author the most was a love story of two men, two ballet dancers, one mature and one young. The protagonist of the book sees love not just as joy, but as a gift, as an inexplicable mystery [Кучкина 1998]. Unfortunately, the story remains unpublished (as does the entire book).

Once the taboo on the discussion of homosexuality had been lifted, writers who themselves are quite far removed from homoeroticism began to mention it in their writings. For instance, Vasil Bykaŭ made a soldier who was raped by a sergeant with the help of 'dedy' (bullies in the army) the protagonist of his novel *Vaučynaja jama* ("Wolf Pit", 1998). After killing the rapist the soldier fled from the army into the zone contaminated by radiation from the Chernobyl nuclear power plant explosion.

Afterword

I hold the view that the attitude of society towards LGBT people reflects the general level of tolerance and acceptance of 'the other'. Homophobia, as a rule, does not exist on its own, but in conjunction with sexism, clericalism, nationalism, racism, antisemitism, immigration phobia, islamophobia and other prejudices and phobias. For a society to become truly free, it has to eradicate these prejudices and phobias. Unfortunately, today's Belarus is going in the opposite direction. However, if you look back, we can see some cause for optimism. In particular, the situation for homosexuals and transgender people during recent decades has improved rather than deteriorated.

Activist historical studies are of great value to the author as an attempt to look back. These studies also help the public to focus on certain social problems of today, such as discrimination of certain social groups, authoritarianism, social injustice (because in the past similar phenomena can be seen – albeit in a different guise – or, conversely, they may be completely absent). Finally, the past can offer us more than just an endless array of heinous crimes; it can also show us inspiring examples of self-organization and social creativity. There are topics – as yet still unarticulated – which can be raised outside the boundaries of the universities and research institutions of Belarus today.

In this study we (the author and those who participated in the research and reviewing) are in particular striving to raise the issue of rehabilitation for men who were convicted according to the first part of the article '*muzhelozhstvo*' in the BSSR. The state and society must give a formal apology to people who were wrongfully labelled as 'criminals'.

In the course of preparing this brochure for publication we came face to face with the problem of inaccessibility of sources. We did not, for example, manage to find a copy of the film "They still smile" anywhere closer than in the Schwules Museum; many books had to be purchased abroad, as they simply do not exist in Belarusian libraries. I am willing to share the collected materials with other researchers and LGBT activists.

Some materials (mainly Belarusian LGBT publications of the 1990s – early 2000s) are publicly available on the blog of a research project at the following address: <https://belarusianqueerstory.noblogs.org/>. The electronic version of this brochure can also be found there.

So far some historical subjects have been only touched upon and not treated fully. I hope that this brochure will provide the necessary impetus for other research because it demonstrates that the sources do indeed exist and that it is possible to approach the subject.

This research will also be continued. In particular, my colleagues and I continue to search for respondents: LGBT people older than 45 who can talk about their daily lives prior to 1994. If you are that kind of person or if you know such a person, please contact us.

We are also happy to receive comments and additions to the contents of this brochure.

The contact address for your messages: history.kruzhelka@gmail.com.

Bibliography

Bortnik 2007 – Viachaslau Bortnik. Hate Crimes against Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People in Belarus // *Beyond the Pink Curtain: Everyday Life of LGBT People in Eastern Europe* / Edited by Roman Kuhar and Judit Takacs. Ljubljana, 2007. P. 363-375.

Bosold, Brill und Weitz 2015 – Homosexualität_en / herausgegeben von B. Bosold, D. Brill und D. Weitz, im Auftrag des Deutschen Historischen Museums und Schwulen Museums. Berlin, 2015. S. 98-99, 112, 130, 156-157, 168, 205.

Bütikofer 2002 – Anne Bütikofer. "They still smile" – Lesben in Weissrussland // *Die*. 2002. №24 (Sommer). S. 20-21.

DIK Fagazine №8 – DIK Fagazine. No. 8. September 2011. [Theme of the issue: "Before '89"]

DIK Fagazine №9 – DIK Fagazine. No. 9. August 2014. [Theme of the issue: "Czechoslovakia"]

Dudek et al. 2007 – Das Recht, anders zu sein. Menschenrechtsverletzungen an Lesben, Schwulen und Transgender / Sonja Dudek, Richard Harnisch, Rupert Haag, Kerstin Hanenkamp, Claudia Körner, Colin de la Motte-Sherman (Hg.). Berlin, 2007.

Essig 1999 – Laurie Essig. *Queer in Russia: A Story of Sex, Self, and the Other*. Durham and London, 1999.

Healey 2012 – Dan Healey. Comrades, Queers, and "Oddballs": Sodomy, Masculinity, and Gendered Violence in Leningrad Province of the 1950s // *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. Vol. 21. No. 3. September 2012. P. 496-522.

Kitowicz 1882 – Pamiętniki Ks. A. Kitowicza. Wydanie nowe przejrane i uporządkowane przez Władysława Zawadzkiego. Lwów, 1882. Contemporary edition: Jędrzej Kitowicz. *Pamiętniki, czyli Historia polska / Tekst opracowała i wstępem poprzedziła Przemysława Matuszewska; komentarz Zofii Lewinówny*. Wydanie trzecie. Warszawa, 2009.

Matuszewicz 1986 – Marcin Matuszewicz. *Diariusz życia mego*. Tom 1. 1714-1757 / Tekst opracował i wstępem poprzedził Bohdan Królikowski; komentarz Zofii Zielińskiej. Warszawa, 1986.

Nastulczyk, Oczko 2012 – Tomasz Nastulczyk, Piotr Oczko. *Homoseksualność staropolska*. Kraków, 2012.

Riordan 1996 – James Riordan. Sexual minorities: the status of gays and lesbians in Russian–Soviet–Russian society // *Women in Russia and Ukraine*, ed. by Rosalind Marsh. Cambridge, 1996. P. 156-172.

Ruduša 2014 – Rita Ruduša. *Forced Underground. Homosexuals in Soviet Latvia*. Riga 2014.

Samma 2015 – Jaanus Samma. *Not Suitable For Work. A Chaiman's Tale* / Curated by Eugenio Viola. Berlin, 2015.

Schluter 2002 – Daniel P. Schluter. *Gay Life in the Former USSR: Fraternity Without Community*. New York and London, 2002.

Schwules Museum 2004 – *Self-Confidence and Persistence. Two Hundred Years of History*, ed. by Schwules Museum. Berlin, 2004. P. 96-137, 149, 163-164.

Sokolova 2014 – Vera Sokolova. State approaches to homosexuality and non-heterosexual lives in Czechoslovakia during state socialism // *The Politics of Gender*

- Culture under State Socialism. An expropriated voice / Edited by Hana Havelkova and Libora Oates-Indruchova. London and New York, 2014. P. 82-108.
- Stella 2015 – Francesca Stella. Lesbian Lives in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia. Post/Socialism and Gendered Sexualities. Basingstoke, 2015.
- Tomasik 2014 – Krzysztof Tomasik. Homobiografie. Wydanie drugie, poprawione i poszerzone. Warszawa, 2014.
- Veispak 1991 – Teet Veispak. Homosexuality in Estonia in the 20th Century: Ideological and Juridical Aspects // Sexual Minorities and Society: the Changing Attitudes toward Homosexuality in the 20th Century Europe. Papers presented to the international conference in Tallinn May 28-30, 1990, ed. by Udo Parikas and Teet Veispak. Tallinn, 1991. P. 105-114.
- Авдеев 1959 — Михаил Авдеев. Курс судебной медицины. Москва, 1959.
- Андрианов 1968 — Владимир Андрианов. Аутогенная тренировка как метод специальной психотерапии сексуальных расстройств у мужчин // Вопросы психотерапии в общей медицине и психоневрологии: Тезисы и авторефераты конференции (23-27 декабря 1968 г.). Харьков, 1968. С. 423-425.
- Аптер 1974 — Статеві розлади / За ред. Йогана Аптера. Друге виправлене видання. Київ, 1974.
- Белкин 2000 — Арон Белкин. Третий пол. Москва, 2000.
- Белоусов 2005 — Олег Белоусов. Искусство парадокса (Сергей Параджанов) // Олег Белоусов. Мой город. Минск, 2005. С. 261-266.
- Блюмин 1967 — И. Блюмин. Судебно-медицинская экспертиза половых состояний мужчин. Москва, 1967.
- Блюмин 1970 — И. Блюмин. Материалы к экспертизе половых состояний. Автореф. дис. на соискание ученой степени канд. мед. наук. Москва, 1970.
- Быстров 1992 — Игорь Быстров. У обелиска // Тема. 1992. №1(9). С. 8.
- Валодзін 2016 — Уладзімір Валодзін. Ружовае рэтра // Новы час. 2016. 8 студзеня. С. 5.
- Васильченко 1983 — Частная сексопатология (Руководство для врачей) / Под ред. Георгия Васильченко. В двух томах. Том 2. Москва, 1983.
- Васильченко 1990 — Сексопатология: Справочник / Под ред. Георгия Васильченко; сост. А. Бруенок. Москва, 1990.
- Владимир Д. 1990 — Владимир Д. Ремонт // Тема. 1990. №0. С. 7.
- Владин и Капустин 1981 — Владислав Владин, Дмитрий Капустин. Гармония брака. Минск, 1981.
- Вопросы толерантности 2005 — Вопросы толерантности: история, современность, перспективы / Шведское общество Мира и Арбитража (Svenska Freds); Правозащитный центр “Весна” (Беларусь). Минск, 2005.
- Воробьев 2010 — Александр Воробьев. Выборы в Учредительное собрание на территории Беларуси и соседних российских губерний: монография. Могилев, 2010.
- Гессен 1994 — Маша Гессен. Права гомосексуалов и лесбиянок в Российской Федерации. Отчет Международной комиссии по правам человека для гомосексуалов и лесбиянок. San Francisco, CA, 1994. English translation: Masha Gessen. The Rights of Lesbians and Gay Men in the Russian Federation. An International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission Report. San Francisco, CA, 1994.

Голанд 1968 — Ян Голанд. К вопросу о психотерапии гомосексуализма // Вопросы психотерапии в общей медицине и психоневрологии: Тезисы и авторефераты конференции (23-27 декабря 1968 г.). Харьков, 1968.

Голанд 1972 — Ян Голанд. О ступенчатом построении психотерапии при мужском гомосексуализме // Проблемы современной сексопатологии (сборник трудов). Труды Московского НИИ психиатрии МЗ РСФСР. Том 65. Москва, 1972.

Голанд 1973 — Ян Голанд. Основные этапы процесса психотерапии сексуальных перверсий // Тезисы докладов конференции по психотерапии (г. Москва, март 1973 г.). Москва, 1973.

Голубева 1980 — Ирина Голубева. Гермафродитизм (клиника, диагностика, лечение). Москва, 1980.

Горелик, Ефимов и Тишкевич 1971 — Уголовное право БССР. Часть Особенная / Под ред. Иосифа Горелика, Михаила Ефимова и Ивана Тишкевича. Минск, 1971.

Горелик, Тишкевич 1976 — Иосиф Горелик, Иван Тишкевич. Вопросы уголовного права (Особенной части) в практике Верховного Суда БССР. Минск, 1976.

Григорян 2011 — Левон Григорян. Параджанов. Москва, 2011. — (Серия “Жизнь замечательных людей”).

Данилюк, Лукашов и Саркисова 1994 — Комментарий к Уголовному кодексу Республики Беларусь (изменения и дополнения 1993-94 гг.) / Станислав Данилюк, Алексей Лукашов, Элла Саркисова. Минск, 1994.

Деревинская 1965 — Елизавета Деревинская. Материалы к клинике, патогенезу, терапии женского гомосексуализма. Автореф. дис. ... канд. мед. наук. Караганда, 1965.

Деревинская 1967 — Елизавета Деревинская. Об отношении гомосексуализма к психопатиям // Вопросы психиатрии, психотерапии, сексологии. Тезисы докладов конференций психиатров Карагандинской области. Караганда, 1967.

Деревянко — Игорь Деревянко. Гомосексуализм. Москва, 1991.

Еремин 2014 — Олег Еремин. “Мы с вами столько сделали, чтобы геи в этой стране имели право любить...” Ушла из жизни Татьяна Зуева // Вместе. Информационный бюллетень ассоциации “Белсеть АнтиСПИД”. №18(24). Сентябрь 2014. С. 2-3.

Здравомыслов, Анисимова и Либих 1985 — Василий Здравомыслов, Зоя Анисимова и Сергей Либих. Функциональная женская сексопатология. Алма-Ата, 1985.

Иванов 2013 — Виктор Иванов. Контрреволюционные организации среди гомосексуалистов Ленинграда в начале 1930-х годов и их погром // Новейшая история России. 2013. №3. С. 126-143. Accessed online: <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/kontrevolyutsionnye-organizatsii-sredi-gomoseksualistov-leningrada-v-nachale-1930-h-godov-i-ih-pogrom.pdf>; date of the last access 14.02.2016.

Иванов 1966 — Николай Иванов. Вопросы психотерапии функциональных сексуальных расстройств. Москва, 1966.

Игнатов 1966 — Алексей Игнатов. Ответственность за преступления против нравственности (Половые преступления). Москва, 1966.

- Игнатов 1974 — Алексей Игнатов. Квалификация половых преступлений. Москва, 1974.
- Игнатов 1988 — Алексей Игнатов. Об ответственности за половые преступления // Советская юстиция. 1988. №3. С. 28-29.
- Имелинский 1973 — Казимир Имелинский. Психогигиена половой жизни / Пер. с польск. Москва, 1973. [Self-made copy. Минск, 1970-я.] Original title: Kazimierz Imieliński. Życie seksualne: Psychohigiena. Warszawa, 1970.
- Имелинский 1986 — Казимир Имелинский. Сексология и сексопатология / Пер. с польск. Москва, 1986. Original title: Kazimierz Imieliński. Zarys seksuologii i seksiatrrii. Warszawa, 1982.
- Исаев 1994 — Дмитрий Исаев. Сексуальные меньшинства // Петербург начала 90-х: безумный, холодный, жестокий... Санкт-Петербург, 1994.
- Карнович и Коршик 1958 — Георгий Карнович и Михаил Коршик. Расследование половых преступлений: Пособие для следователей. Москва, 1958.
- Кирсанов 2005 — Владимир Кирсанов. 69. Русские геи, лесбиянки, бисексуалы и транссексуалы. Тверь, 2005.
- Клейн 2010 — Лев Клейн. Трудно быть Клейном: Автобиография в монологах и диалогах. Санкт-Петербург, 2010.
- Клеш 2012 — Артур Клеш. Русский гомосексуал (1905-1938 гг.): парадоксы восприятия // Новое литературное обозрение. 2012. №117. Accessed online: <http://magazines.russ.ru/nlo/2012/117/k11.html>
- Клеш 2013 — Артур Клеш. Историография русской гомосексуальности до и после Октябрьской революции: различные подходы и перспективы // Как мы пишем историю? / Отв. ред. Гийом Гаррета, Грегори Дюфо, Людмила Пименова. Москва, 2013. С. 335-375.
- Кон 1978 — Игорь Кон. Психология подростковой и юношеской гомосексуальности // Диагностика, лечение и профилактика половых расстройств. Труды Московского НИИ психиатрии МЗ РСФСР. Том 81. Москва: 1978.
- Кон 1988 - Игорь Кон. Введение в сексологию. Москва, 1988.
- Кон 2001 — Игорь Кон. Любовь небесного цвета. Санкт-Петербург, 2001.
- Кон 2008 — Игорь Кон. 80 лет одиночества. Москва, 2008.
- Кон 2010 — Игорь Кон. Клубничка на берёзке: Сексуальная культура в России / 3-е изд., испр. и доп. Москва: 2010. English translation of the earlier version: Igor S. Kon. Sexual Revolution in Russia: From the Age of the Czars to Today. Translated by James Riordan. New York, 1995.
- Кондрашенко 1988 — Валентин Кондрашенко. Девиантное поведение у подростков: Социально-психологические и психиатрические аспекты. Минск, 1988.
- Косарев 1967 — В. Косарев. К вопросу о судебно-психиатрическом значении гомосексуализма // Актуальные вопросы сексопатологии. Труды Московского НИИ психиатрии МЗ РСФСР. Том 51. Москва. 1967.
- Круталевіч, Юхо, 2000 - Вадзім Круталевіч, Іосіф Юхо. Гісторыя дзяржавы і права Беларусі (1917-1945 гг.). Мінск, 2000.
- Крымінальны Кодэкс 1929 — Крымінальны Кодэкс Беларускай Сацыялістычнай Савецкай Рэспублікі. Менск, 1929.

Крымінальны кодэкс 1935 – Крымінальны кодэкс БССР. Са змяненнямі на 1 чэрвеня 1935 года. Афіцыйны тэкст. Менск, 1935.

Крымінальны кодэкс 1957 – Крымінальны кодэкс Беларускай ССР. Афіцыйны тэкст са змяненнямі на 1 мая 1957 года і з дадаткамі сістэматызаваных матэрыялаў (На беларускай і рускай мовах). Мінск, 1957.

Крымінальны кодэкс 1961 – Крымінальны кодэкс Беларускай ССР (на беларускай і рускай мовах). Мінск, 1961.

Кулон 2013 — Антон Кулон. Синяя книга белорусского алкоголика. Алкогольная повесть-быль. Минск, 2013.

Кучкина 1998 — Ольга Кучкина. Светлана Алексиевич: И даже богач мне сказал: “Перед смертью только и вспомню, как пил вино из женской туфельки...” Белорусская писательница собрала в новой книге 500 невыдуманных историй о любви // Народная воля. 11 ліпеня 1998. №122(474). С. 2.

Либерман 1966 — Леонид Либерман. Врожденные нарушения полового развития (генетика, “патогенез”, клиника). Ленинград, 1966.

Лобач 2006 — Владимир Лобач. Эрос в белорусской традиционной культуре // Белорусский эротический фольклор / Издание подготовили Татьяна Володина, Анатолий Федосик. Москва, 2006. С. 53-109.

Манцэвіч 2014 – Наста Манцэвіч. “Вы тоже люди, хоть и немного другие!” Как отвечали на письма гомосексуальных подростков журналисты и психологи газеты №1 для подростков “Переходный возраст” (в 1994-2005 гг.) // Makeout. 20 студзеня 2014. <https://makeout.by/2014/01/20/vy-tozhe-lyudi-hot-i-nemnogo-drugie.html>

Марговский 2009 — Григорий Марговский. Садовник судеб // Крещатик. 2009. №1. Accessed online: <http://magazines.russ.ru/kreschatik/2009/1/ma12.html>

Марзалюк 2001 – Ігар Марзалюк. Матрымання і секс у Беларусі ХІ-ХVІІІ стст. // Terra Alba. Т. 2. Homo venerius: Сексуальная прастора беларускай культуры / Пад рэд. С. І. Даніленкі. Мінск, 2001. С. 122-138.

Міцкевіч 2007 – Юля Міцкевіч. Черный пиар: так “работают” белорусские журналисты // Taboo. 2007. №4. С. 2-3.

Моисеев 2007 – Борис Моисеев. Птичка. Живой звук. Тверь, 2007.

Мороз 1990 – Олег Мороз. Группа риска. Москва, 1990.

Осипов 1967 – Павел Осипов. Половые преступления (общее понятие, социальная сущность и система составов). Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата юридических наук. Ленинград, 1967.

Подрабинек 1979 — Александр Подрабинек. Карательная медицина / Под ред. Людмилы Алексеевой. Нью-Йорк, 1979. Accessed online: http://www.imwerden.info/belousenko/books/kgb/podrabinek_karat_med.htm

Посвянский 1972 — Павел Посвянский. Циркулярный психоз с периодической эффеминацией (транссексуализмом) // Проблемы современной сексопатологии (сборник трудов). Труды Московского НИИ психиатрии МЗ РСФСР. Том 65. Москва, 1972.

“Примерно наказать...” 1993 – “Примерно наказать этих мерзавцев” // Источник. 1993. №5-6. С. 164-165.

Пятницкий 1910 – Борис Пятницкий. Половые извращения и уголовное право. Могилёв, 1910.

Ролдугина 2016 – Ирина Ролдугина. “Почему мы такие люди?” Раннесоветские гомосексуалы от первого лица: новые источники по истории гомосексуальных идентичностей в России // *Ab Imperio*. 2016. №2. С. 183-216.

Романов 2006 — Александр Романов. Избранное (посмертный сборник) / Под ред. Сергея Коленченко. 2006 (http://samlib.ru/k/kolenchenko_s_n/posmertnyjsbornik.shtml).

Роткирх 2011 – Анна Роткирх. Мужской вопрос. Любовь и секс трех поколений в автобиографиях петербуржцев. Санкт-Петербург, 2011. Original title: Anna Rotkirch. The Man Question. Loves and Lives in Late 20th Century Russia. Helsinki, 2000.

Свядош 1974 — Абрам Свядош. Женская сексопатология. Москва, 1974.

Свядош, Деревинская 1967 — Абрам Свядош, Елизавета Деревинская. Комбинированный метод лечения гомосексуализма // Вопросы психиатрии, психотерапии, сексологии. Тезисы докладов конференций психиатров Карагандинской области. Караганда, 1967.

Севярынец 2002 – Павал Севярынец. Апошняя вычварэньне Эдзіка Тарлецага // *Навінкі*. 2002. №6(55). С. 1.

Сліж 2015 – Наталля Сліж. Шлюбныя і пазашлюбныя стасункі шляхты Вялікага Княства Літоўскага ў XVI-XVII стст. Смаленск, 2015.

Снежневский 1983 — Руководство по психиатрии / Под ред. Андрея Снежневского. В двух томах. Москва, 1983.

Собрание припадков 1722 — Собрание припадков краткое. Супрасль, 1722.

Созонов 1909 – Михаил Созонов. Историческая записка о Могилёвской мужской гимназии. За столетний период ее существования. 1809-1909. Могилёв, 1909.

Соловьева 2007 – Татьяна Соловьева. Классический “треугольник” (Страницы личной жизни Н. П. Румянцева) // Рукописное наследие деятелей отечественной культуры XVIII – XXI вв. Материалы Международной научной конференции (Санкт-Петербург, 14-16 июня 2005 г.). Санкт-Петербург, 2007. С. 33-45.

Сосонко 2006 – Генна Сосонко. Клейменный // Генна Сосонко. Диалоги с шахматным Нострадамусом. Москва, 2006. С. 156-174. English translation: Genna Sosonko. A Master with no Name. Evgeny Ruban (1941 – 1997) // Genna Sosonko. Smart Chip from St. Petersburg and other tales of a bygone chess era. Alkmaar, 2006. P. 67-78.

Статут 1989 – Статут Вялікага княства Літоўскага 1588: Тэксты. Даведнік. Каментарыі. Мінск, 1989.

Стелла 2014 – Франческа Стелла. Исследование жизни лесбиянок в советский период: поколенческий подход // На перепутье: методология, теория и практика ЛГБТ и квир-исследований / Центр независимых социологических исследований; ред.-сост. Александр Кондаков. Санкт-Петербург, 2014. С. 231-248.

Тишкевич 1992 — Станислав Тишкевич. Единая теория уголовного нормотворчества и квалификации преступлений: Основные концептуальные положения. Теоретическая модель уголовного кодекса суверенной Республики Беларусь: Монография. Минск, 1992.

Украинское ЛГБТ-движение 2015 – Украинское ЛГБТ-движение, 25 / Ред. Стас Науменко, Тарас Карасийчук, Максим Касянчук. Киев, 2015.

Хили 2008 - Дан Хили. Гомосексуальное влечение в революционной России: Регулирование сексуально-гендерного диссидентства / Пер. с англ. Москва, 2008. Original title: Dan Healey. Homosexual Desire in Revolutionary Russia: The Regulation of Sexual and Gender Dissent. Chicago, 2001.

Хлынцов 1965 – Михаил Хлынцов. Расследование половых преступлений. Саратов, 1965.

Чемоданов, Гришин 1990 — Гомосексуализм. Проституция: Методическое пособие / Авторы-сост. Владимир Чемоданов, Александр Гришин. Москва, 1990.

Шалаев 1966 — Николай Шалаев. Судебномедицинская экспертиза по делам о мужеложстве // Сборник научно-практических работ судебных медиков и криминалистов. Вып. III. Петрозаводск, 1966. С. 31-37.

Шаргородский, Осипов 1973 — Михаил Шаргородский, Павел Осипов. Преступления против личности // Курс советского уголовного права. Т. 3. Часть особенная / Отв. ред. Николай Беляев и Михаил Шаргородский. Ленинград, 1973. С. 473-660.

Шнабль 1982 — Зигфрид Шнабль. Мужчина и женщина. Интимные отношения / Пер. с нем. Кишинев, 1982. Original title: Siegfried Schnabl. Mann und Frau intim. Ein Ratgeber in Fragen des gesunden und des gestörten Geschlechtslebens. Rudolstadt, 1969.

Яковлев 1969 – Яков Яковлев. Половые преступления. Душанбе, 1969.

List of illustrations

1. Jan Józef Filipowicz. The portrait of Janusz Aleksander Sanguszko. Copper-plate engraving. The engraving is placed at the frontispiece of the book: *Bogatko I., Scientia artium militarium architecturam pyrotechnicam...*, Leopoli 1747. From the collections of the National Library (Warsaw). Accessed online: <https://polona.pl/item/643591/>
2. Viktor Smoliar (a sculptor). The monument to Nikolai Rumiantsev in Homiel. Source of the photograph: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Palace_of_Pashkevichs_in_summer.JPG
3. Józef Holewiński. The portrait of Maria Rodziewicz. Woodcut. The engraving from "Kłosy" newspaper, 1889, nr 1265, s. 193. From the collections of the National Library (Warsaw). Accessed online: <https://polona.pl/item/30622506/>
4. Józef Czapski. The portrait of Jerzy Giedroyc. 1971. From the collections of the Kultura Literary Institute Association, Maisons-Laffitte, France. Photograph by Adam Golec. Accessed online: http://kulturoparyska.com/pl/ludzie/pokaz/c/jozef_czapski/multimedia/galerie/kolekcja-sztuki
5. Józef Czapski. Sketches from New York. The Chrysler Building. Reproduction from "Kultura" magazine, 1950, nr 4/30, s. 80. Accessed online: http://kulturoparyska.com/pl/ludzie/pokaz/c/jozef_czapski/multimedia/galerie/rysunki-jozefa-czapskiego-w-kulturze
6. Leo Klejn. Photograph by Igor Simkin. Source: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Leo_Klej_n_2012.jpg
7. Poster of Sergei Parajanov's film "The Colour of Pomegranates". 1968. Source: <http://www.kinopoisk.ru/picture/2177091/#>
8. Self-made copy of a translated book by Kazimierz Imieliński "Psychohygiene of sexual life". Private collection.
9. An illustration from the book "Private sexopathology" edited by Georgy Vasilchenko [Васильченко 1983, т. 2: 97].
10. Kim Khadeev. Source of the photograph: <http://artaktivist.org/kim-xadzeey/>
11. Public toilet at the intersection of Sverdlov and Kirov streets in Minsk. Current state.
12. Trolleybus of the 2nd route at Francysk Skaryna avenue. Minsk, 1993. Photograph by Aare Olander. Source: <http://transphoto.ru/photo/335269/>
13. "Buffet YoYo" club. August 2006. Source of the photograph: <http://www.tiga.by/photo/view/id/1931/>
14. Picket of the "Lambda" league. Minsk, 19 April 1999.
15. "Amnesty International" activist Bill Schiller speaks at the press conference during "Belarus Gay Pride-2000" festival in front of Maksim Bahdanovič monument. Minsk, 10 September 2000.
16. "Love Parade". Minsk, 7 September 2001.

List of abbreviations

BSSR – Belarusian Soviet Socialist Republic.

CMEA – Council for Mutual Economic Assistance.

CPSU – Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

ESSR – Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

GARF - Gosudarstvennyi Arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation).

GDR – German Democratic Republic.

LGBT – lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender.

NARB – National Archives of the Republic of Belarus.

OGPU - Objedinionnoe Gosudarstvennoe Politicheskoe Upravlenie (Unified State Political Administration).

RSFSR – Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

SSR – Soviet Socialist Republic.

USSR – Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.



Jan Józef Filipowicz. The portrait of Janusz Aleksander Sangusko. 1747. Copper-plate engraving



Viktar Smoliar (a sculptor). The monument to Nikolai Rumiantsev in Homiel

Józef Holewiński.
The portrait of Maria Rodziewicz.
1889. Woodcut



Józef Czapski.
The portrait of Jerzy Giedroyc. 1971





Józef Czapski. Sketches from New York.
The Chrysler Building.
Reproduction from «Kultura» magazine,
1950, nr 4/30, s. 80



Leo Klejn



Public toilet at the intersection of Sverdlov and Kirov streets in Minsk. Current state



Trolleybus of the 2nd route at Francysk Skaryna avenue. Minsk, 1993



«Buffet YoYo» club.
August 2006

Picket of the «Lambda» league.
Minsk, 19 April 1999





«Amnesty International» activist Bill Schiller speaks at the press conference during «Belarus Gay Pride-2000» festival in front of Maksim Bahdanovič monument. Minsk, 10 September 2000

«Love Parade».
Minsk, 7 September 2001



Queer History of Belarus in the second half of the 20th century: a preliminary study

Author of the text:

Uladzimir Valodzin

Members of the research team:

Natallia Mańkoŭskaja

Tania Siacko

Kaciaryna Borsuk

Consultants:

Ira Roldugina (Moscow)

Valery Sozaev (St. Petersburg)

Uladzislau Ivanoŭ (Vilnius)

Translators:

Yuly Varlamov

Natallia Aliaksandrava

Editor of the translation:

Jim Dingley (London)

Print run 200 copies.

All copies of this edition are distributed for free.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives

4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons,

PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.



Online version:

<https://belarusianqueerstory.noblogs.org/>

Address for your feedback:

history.kruzhelka@gmail.com

