*Gay Purge: The Persecution of Homosexual Students at the University of Wisconsin, Madison 1962-1963* By Ezra Gerard

The research in this blog post was completed as a part of the University of Wisconsin-Madison’s Public History Project. The three-year project aims to reckon with the university’s history of racism, exclusion, and discrimination. The project will culminate in an exhibit in the fall of 2022, an interactive online website, and curricular tools. By sharing research before the opening of the exhibit, we hope to begin conversations about the history of UW-Madison and discuss how we can all work towards building a more equitable campus community. The nature of historical research is that it will always be incomplete. It is impossible for us to know everything that happened in the past. Therefore, the research in this post is imperfect, as all history is. Our student researchers have completed the research below with all of the historical documents available to them at the time of publication. There will be alternative perspectives to those detailed below. We believe that the discussions that arise out of these differing perspectives are an integral part of the process of reckoning with our history. We welcome responses and discussion. Responses submitted by email will be posted in a response and discussion post within one week after the original publication date. Responses with vulgar or offensive language will not be posted.

**Content Warning:** The UW–Madison Public History Project blog aims to provide a space where our community can begin the difficult work of reckoning with our history. Some of the content and language in this blog post is disturbing. In this post, you will encounter descriptions of LGBTQ+ persons that is harmful and offensive.

In 1962, the University of Wisconsin began to systematically seek out and expel homosexual male students.[[1]](#footnote-1) Undergraduate and graduate students suspected of engaging in same-sex relationships were brought before the university’s Committee on Student Conduct and Appeals (CSCA), interrogated, and in many cases expelled. Those who escaped expulsion were reprimanded and coerced into seeking psychological “treatment” in order to remain students at the university. Some lost their scholarships and jobs. Known as the “Gay Purge,” these efforts cleanse the university of “vice” had dire consequences on the lives of homosexual students. In its moralistic crusade, the University of Wisconsin destroyed students’ career prospects and caused them tremendous emotional and psychological anguish. The Gay Purge and the broader history of institutionalized homophobia on campus constitutes a shameful blemish on the history of the university which has yet to be officially acknowledged. While the Gay Purge represents a particularly virulent example of homophobia, it was by no means an isolated incident, but rather part of a continuum of moralistic and bigoted policy and action at the university. **In this essay, I refer to the victims of the purge with pseudonyms to preserve their privacy.[[2]](#footnote-2)**

The Gay Purge was not the first time UW officials expressed concern over the “problem” of homosexuality. In 1948, twelve men, including several UW students, were arrested and prosecuted for “sodomy” and “disorderly conduct.” Some were expelled and denied their degrees because of their conviction.[[3]](#footnote-3) Furthermore, the university tracked students expelled for homosexuality, sending letters to prospective employers to prevent “perverted” students from getting jobs. Student conduct records between the 1920s and 1960s indicate that the university consistently harassed and punished students for engaging in “immoral” sexual practices.[[4]](#footnote-4) Interest in the “problem” of homosexuality increased considerably in this period. This heightened scrutiny mirrors broader trends in the policing of homosexuality in the United States. In the 1930s and 1940s, Americans witnessed a “sex crime panic.”[[5]](#footnote-5) This mass hysteria concerning various forms of sexual “perversion,” including homosexuality, was fueled by the media, which promulgated sensationalized narratives of the non-normative sexual behaviors purportedly compromising the moral fiber of the nation.[[6]](#footnote-6) This panic stemmed in part from the social disorder and perceived increase in crime resulting from the Great Depression.[[7]](#footnote-7) Contributing to such fears was J. Edgar Hoover’s campaign against sexual “perverts,” particularly homosexuals, who allegedly threatened the nation.[[8]](#footnote-8) McCarthy era purges of homosexuals from the federal government contributed to a culture of paranoia about non-normative sexuality.[[9]](#footnote-9) Post-World War II anxieties also stoked concerns over sexual “deviance.”[[10]](#footnote-10) The influx of soldiers after the war raised questions about how these emotionally damaged and brutalized men would be reintegrated in society. Government propaganda and the media promoted the ideal of the nuclear family to support the return to the status quo after the war.[[11]](#footnote-11) Anxieties that the sex-segregated environment of the military caused homosexuality persisted into the post-war era as some feared that men would not “readjust” to “normal” heterosexual relationships. This view was common among doctors at the University of Wisconsin.[[12]](#footnote-12)

Amid these cultural anxieties about sexual deviance, medical scrutiny of homosexuality increased considerably. The medicalization of homosexuality would play a crucial role in how the Gay Purge was conducted. American doctors and psychiatrists researched the causes and potential “cures” of homosexuality.[[13]](#footnote-13) Building on theories developed in Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, sexual researchers particularly focused on the question of whether homosexuality was innate or acquired.[[14]](#footnote-14) Proponents of the innate model posited that homosexuals were born with their “condition” due to a mental imbalance or physical disorder. Others proposed that homosexuals acquired their proclivities through “corruption” by an older man or that they chose to have same-sex relations out of a desire for novel sex practices. While homosexuals who fell under both categories were subject to moral, medical, and legal scrutiny, acquired homosexuals were often judged more harshly. While innate homosexuals were regarded as “victims” of a disease, acquired homosexuals were demeaned for choosing to have same-sex sex. During the Gay Purge, university officials drew on medical research on homosexuality which claimed that homosexuals could be “cured” through therapy.

Several doctors at the University of Wisconsin contributed to the medicalization of homosexuality. Dr. Annette Washburn, director of psychiatric services, was an important figure in the medicalization and treatment of homosexuality at UW. Appointed as Assistant Professor at the UW medical school in 1934, Washburn was the first female doctor hired by the university. She played a role in founding the Neuropsychiatry Department within the Student Health Clinic.[[15]](#footnote-15) In the late 1940s, Washburn provided a report for assisting the Committee on Student Conduct and Appeals in handling cases of homosexuality. Like other psychiatrists in this period, Washburn maintained a distinction between “true” and “pseudo” homosexuality. Washburn asserted that while “pseudo” homosexuals could be “cured’ and reintegrated into the university community, she regarded “true” homosexuals as fundamentally dangerous to other students. She claimed that psychotherapy was “seldom beneficial” in the case of “true” homosexuals because such individuals possessed a “fixed personality” and did not want to be cured. Washburn was concerned that homosexuals might “corrupt” others, writing that university psychiatrists must consider the “effect and influence such individuals may exert on other students.”[[16]](#footnote-16) Washburn concluded that “such individuals should be discouraged from continuing their university careers” because they could “contribut[e] to the delinquency of others.”[[17]](#footnote-17) Chairman of the CSCA H.C. Jackson thanked Washburn for her report, calling it an “excellent statement.”[[18]](#footnote-18) In 1949, the CSCA passed a motion adopting Washburn’s report as a “guide” to handling homosexual students. As a result of Washburn’s report, Jackson stated that the CSCA would “consider for re-admission only those students who have taken treatment through the Student Health Clinic and are recommended for re-admission thereby.”[[19]](#footnote-19) This report laid the foundation for the persecution of homosexuals during the purge.

The 1962-63 Gay Purge marked a concerted effort to expunge homosexuals from campus fueled by post-war anxieties and “scientific” research on the “threat” of homosexuality. While homosexuals had consistently been subject to disciplinary action in previous decades, the purge was unique in its systematic nature. During the purge, the Dean of Men, Department of Protection and Security (DPS, now UWPD), and psychiatrists at Student Health Clinic collaborated in seeking out, disciplining, and “treating” homosexuals. Dean of Men Theodore Zillman and DPS detective Peter Rordam headed the campaign against homosexual students. Students were initially called in for interrogation by Zillman or Rordam before the CSCA considered whether it would take disciplinary action. Zillman emphatically maintained that the university “cannot allow admitted homosexuals on this campus.”[[20]](#footnote-20) During the purge, the university approached the issue of homosexuality through a medical *and* moral lens. The notion that homosexuality resulted from disease did not supplant the assumption that homosexuals were immoral “perverts.”

Homosexual students came to the attention of university officials in several ways. Some were caught while attempting to have sex. Others were called before the CSCA simply for being suspected of homosexuality. In their interrogations, detective Peter Rordam demanded that students divulge the names of other homosexual students. Rordam asked students “the names of others with whom they had had personal involvement as well as those whom they thought or believed to be homosexuals.”[[21]](#footnote-21) Some were told that they would be treated more leniently if they complied. Many students lied to avoid incriminating their friends.[[22]](#footnote-22) Others falsely accused other students when interrogated, likely naming the first person who came to mind.[[23]](#footnote-23) University officials did not simply discipline students who had been caught in a same-sex relationship. They actively sought out students *suspected* of being homosexual.

Some CSCA members questioned “the desirability of seeking hear-say information” about students’ sexuality.[[24]](#footnote-24) An SSC report from the early months of the purge indicates disagreement as to the extent to which the university should seek out homosexual students. The minutes note that

“After considerable discussion, it appeared that possible disagreement existed over the extent to which enforcement in these cases should be pressed--over the aggressiveness which the University should display in uncovering homosexuality. Several committee members seemed agreed that, with the exceptions of the professional homosexual, the assaultive student, the recruiter [i.e. a person who tries to make others homosexual], and the activity producing public display or embarrassment, the University investigative role here need properly be no more intensive or vigorous than is the case with enforcement efforts directed toward illicit heterosexual activity.”[[25]](#footnote-25)

Despite this disagreement, Rordam’s aggressive and invasive tactics prevailed. Rordam emphasized that such testimony was necessary in order to continue the investigation.[[26]](#footnote-26) Dean of Students L.E. Luberg commended DPS for its handling of the “group of deviates” accused of homosexuality.[[27]](#footnote-27)

Students who came to the CSCA’s attention initially received phone calls notifying them of the accusation and summoning them for interrogation.[[28]](#footnote-28) Zillman persistently harassed students who did not answer the call. In an oral history interview, Lewis Bosworth, a graduate student in the French Department, reported being harassed at work after ignoring the calls.[[29]](#footnote-29) Rordam was sent to Bosworth’s place of employment at the Medical School to demand his appearance before the CSCA. Rordam insisted that Bosworth be “dragged out” of the operating room where he was working.[[30]](#footnote-30) Bosworth reported that Rordam “threatened me with not appearing before university officials as requested.”[[31]](#footnote-31) Rordam told Bosworth that he would be subpoenaed by the District Attorney if he did not comply.[[32]](#footnote-32) Bosworth was compelled to appear at the Dean of Men’s office, where Zillman attempted to procure a confession. Bosworth resisted the Dean’s efforts and refused to admit to homosexual conduct.[[33]](#footnote-33) Bosworth also declined to divulge the names of other homosexual students as Zillman demanded of him. While CSCA did not expel Bosworth because he had not admitted to having homosexual sex, the university revoked a scholarship he had received to study abroad.[[34]](#footnote-34)

The university only expelled students who had an (alleged) record of homosexual conduct. Dr. Annette Washburne bemoaned this fact, stating that “it would be a blessing if a governing board could sanction dismissal” in cases of “true” homosexuals, even if they had not had sex with another man. Washburn regarded “true” homosexuals as a “menace” to the university community.[[35]](#footnote-35) While students were not expelled for *being* homosexual, their sexual orientation played an important role in whether the committee viewed them as a threat. Whether a person was considered an innate homosexual factored into discussions of the likelihood that they would repeat their “offence.” In the case of two undergraduates who were arrested behind the Kollege Klub because they *intended* to have sex, the committee ruled that “these students are so *homosexually oriented* that the probability of their repeating overt activity of this nature is great [emphasis added].”[[36]](#footnote-36) It is unclear how the committee decided that these students were “true” homosexuals.[[37]](#footnote-37) The case of “Jacob Merman” also indicates a particular concern for “true” homosexuals. After being expelled, Merman was initially denied a petition for readmission on the basis of an evaluation by Dr. Robert Bujard of Student Health Clinic who concluded that he was “homosexually-oriented” and therefore unlikely to change his “behavior.”[[38]](#footnote-38) Merman was later readmitted after he “devoted time and energy to his problem and sought council for it.”[[39]](#footnote-39) These cases indicate that the CSCA saw the distinction between “true” and “pseudo” homosexuals as an important factor in deciding a student’s fate.

The CSCA’s accusations had dire effects on students’ academic and professional careers. “Julian Goldman,” a PhD student in the German Department, was about to receive his degree before he was called before the committee. The CSCA forwarded Goldman’s file to the German Department and requested that Goldman’s case be reviewed prior to deciding whether to confer his PhD.[[40]](#footnote-40) In addition to the academic jeopardy students faced, the university denied some of its victims funding while still allowing them to remain in school. After petitioning the committee, “Michael Stewart” was granted readmission to the university, but was denied funding because of his conviction for homosexuality. Th CSCA “recommend[ed] to appropriate departments of the university that [Stewart] not be furnished subsidy by the university in the form of appointments such as teaching assistantship, etc.”[[41]](#footnote-41) Similarly, the CSCA “recommend[ed] against University appointments” for “Amos Russo” because of his sexuality. Russo had sought a teaching assistantship in the English Department, but Zillman stated that he should “not be encouraged” in seeking employment at the university.[[42]](#footnote-42)

These cases show that homosexual students continued to be marginalized by the university even when they were granted readmission. In part, the refusal to award funding to homosexual students served as a means of discouraging them from remaining at the university without formally expelling them. Additionally, the insistence on denying homosexual students teaching assistantships likely derived from assumptions that homosexual instructors might seduce their students. Furthermore, by preventing graduate students from teaching, the university denied these prospective scholars the teaching credentials necessary to further their careers in academia. Most importantly, denying homosexual students teaching assistantships deprived them of their financial stability. Herman Gladstone, a university doctor involved with evaluating homosexual students, testified in favor of one of his patients by stating that his “problems” would not “interfere with his functioning as a student or his effectiveness as a teacher.”[[43]](#footnote-43) Despite this medical testimony, the committee advised against allowing this student to be employed as a teaching assistant by the university. The moralism of the CSCA thus superseded the recommendations of university doctors.

This was not the only time university doctors expressed disapproval of the purge. While the Student Health Clinic collaborated with the CSCA in evaluating and disciplining homosexuals, some psychiatrists repudiated how the committee treated its victims. Gladstone consistently expressed disapproval of the CSCA’s tactics and particularly took issue with Rordam’s interrogation procedures. Gladstone objected to the process of interrogation because “effective evaluation [of homosexuals] under stress circumstances was not possible.”[[44]](#footnote-44) Writing to the CSCA about a homosexual student, Gladstone asserted that it would “be detrimental to both this boy and to the University to subject him to an administrative psychiatric evaluation in view of the unethical way that he was brought to the university’s attention.”[[45]](#footnote-45) Furthermore, Dr. Seymour Halleck, a psychiatrist at Student Health Clinic, reported in a recent interview that he “tried to convince the Dean . . . that these people did not represent any threat or embarrassment to the university.”[[46]](#footnote-46) While these men by no means regarded homosexuality in a positive light, they called attention to the unjust interrogation procedures employed by Rordam and Zillman and viewed homosexuals as less threatening than the CSCA. This indicates that the purge was ultimately a moralistic crusade which veiled itself in medical authority.

Students faced the termination of their academic career for their involvement in consensual same-sex relationships. In addition to the threat a conviction of homosexuality posed to the livelihood of homosexual students, the emotional trauma of being brought before the committee had devastating effects. In one case, the distress of being persecuted by the university resulted in a suicide attempt.[[47]](#footnote-47) Some students left the university before they faced the CSCA. One student withdrew because “he just didn’t know how to cope with it.”[[48]](#footnote-48) The purge created a culture of fear among homosexual students. Homosexual students were “even afraid of each other,” because they worried a friend might name them during an interrogation.[[49]](#footnote-49) A student who was brought before the committee later recalled the emotional strife and sense of loneliness homosexual students felt as a result of the purge: “You couldn’t talk to your parents because you were in the closet . . . We were even afraid to talk to each other for a while . . . There was a feeling of paranoia.”[[50]](#footnote-50) Another student reported that he cut his hair because he “didn’t want to look like a fairy.”[[51]](#footnote-51) Even students who were not called before the CSCA were adversely affected by the homophobic climate fostered by the university. The purge created an environment hostile to homosexuality which likely sent many homosexual students back into the closet and caused them to doubt their sense of self.

Students were generally given the option to petition for readmittance to the university. In order to gain readmittance, students had to prove that they had made “progress” in handling their “condition.” Generally, this proof came in the form of a statement from a psychiatrist, either at the university or in the student’s hometown. Letters from university psychiatrists included an affirmation that the student no longer threatened the university community. A letter written by Dr. Seymour Halleck is typical of medical testimonies on behalf of homosexual students. Halleck wrote that the student “has demonstrated the capacity to control his action and is not a danger to himself or the university community. He has improved his social adjustment and appears well motivated to remain in school.”[[52]](#footnote-52) After students submitted their petition for readmission, the committee deliberated on whether the student had solved their homosexual “problem” and could therefore return to the university. While the committee readmitted a number of students, it reaffirmed its moralistic injunction against future homosexual conduct. In a letter notifying a student that he would be readmitted, Zillman cautioned that the CSCA “will expect the best performance as a campus citizen from you henceforward. I believe you recognize that further misconduct must prove most embarrassing for you.”[[53]](#footnote-53) Similar statements were common in such letters.

Other students had their petitions rejected on the basis of an unfavorable report from their psychiatrist. “Andrew Harrington” was denied readmission based on a report by Dr. Robert Bujard. A few months later, Harrington made another attempt to gain readmission after consulting with Dr. Gladstone. This time his request was granted. Gladstone affirmed that Harrington did not require psychiatric treatment. Harrington assured the committee that his homosexual relationship had been merely a “momentary aberration” and emphasized that the “completion of college is an all important goal in my life.”[[54]](#footnote-54)

It is difficult to know the extent to which students internalized the moralization and pathologization they faced from the university. In their pleas for readmission, many students claimed to have changed their ways, although it is likely at least some of these men simply parroted what they knew the committee wanted to hear. Others were likely thrown into a state of doubt and self-hatred after being subjected to psychiatric evaluation and disciplinary action. The case of “David Novak” provides a unique example of resistance against the university’s curative efforts. Novak insisted at his hearing with the committee that “he did not desire to be cured.”[[55]](#footnote-55) He seemed content with his desires and “described to the committee the great relief he felt when he discovered that there were other homosexually oriented people and that he could feel at home with them.”[[56]](#footnote-56) Novak asserted that “as long as he was not harming anyone and being discreet, he felt he was acting with appropriate propriety.”[[57]](#footnote-57) Even when faced with potential expulsion, this student affirmed that he did not see anything wrong with his sexual desires.

The preceding case is exceptional, however. Students generally made desperate efforts to downplay their involvement in same-sex relationships and to prove that they did not constitute a threat to the university community. In their defense, students repeatedly affirmed that they were not “aggressive homosexuals” and some stated that they solely played the passive role.[[58]](#footnote-58) One student affirmed that he had “never . . . felt any urge to ‘bother’ students with his activities.”[[59]](#footnote-59) Such statements were meant to assure the committee that these men would not “corrupt” other students. DPS reports on homosexual students often noted that the accused had “never tried to convert anyone,” indicating that the issue of homosexual seduction concerned university officials.[[60]](#footnote-60) “Edward Young” declared that he “wanted definitely to get help with his problems and felt certain he could overcome his difficulties.”[[61]](#footnote-61) “Samuel Jones” defended himself by stating that he “found no satisfaction in those activities.”[[62]](#footnote-62) “Aaron Harrington” stated that he wasn’t sure if he needed “psychiatric help” but “after thinking it over” reported to the committee that he would meet with a university psychiatrist to be certain he does not have a problem.”[[63]](#footnote-63) This reconsideration of the need for counseling indicates that this student may have found it pragmatic to adhere to the university’s advice even though he did not consider his desires a “problem.”

In addition to proving that they had been “cured” through psychiatric treatment, religion played an important role in students’ attempts to gain readmittance to the university. “Gregory Anderson” requested permission to re-enroll after having been “reprimanded” for homosexual conduct and told that he could not enroll in future semesters without prior approval of the committee. Anderson affirmed that he would continue “treatment” for homosexuality at his church. His pastor asserted that as a result of “several sessions” Anderson “decided to truly face the problem and became determined to do something about it.”[[64]](#footnote-64) After confirmation that Anderson would continue to seek what amounted to conversion therapy at his church, university officials assented to his readmission. In a letter notifying Anderson that he would be readmitted, Zillman commended him for seeking religious council.[[65]](#footnote-65) It seems that the university saw religious indoctrination as an equally valid way of treating homosexuality as psychological counselling. This indicates a convergence of medical and moral views of homosexuality that produced an image of homosexual students as both sick and immoral.

The University of Wisconsin’s moralistic crusade against homosexual students imperiled students’ careers and caused indelible emotional and psychological damage. Efforts to expel homosexual students were a part of a wider movement at college campuses across the country to extirpate “sexual perverts.” Most famously, Harvard University conducted a purge of its male homosexual students in the 1920s.[[66]](#footnote-66) Other institutions including the University of Michigan, the University of Texas, the University of Missouri, and the State College of Iowa also disciplined and expelled students for homosexuality.[[67]](#footnote-67) Despite the prevalence of these purges, their history has largely remained silent.

Despite important strides at the University of Wisconsin promote diversity and inclusion in recent years, the history of institutionalized bigotry has yet to be officially acknowledged. I urge the university to do justice to the victims of this purge by formally apologizing for the indelible damage it inflicted on gay students. While the trauma experienced by victims of the purge cannot be undone, it is imperative that the university acknowledges its bigoted past and condemns institutionalized homophobia. Furthermore, I urge the university to seek out survivors of the purge and provide monetary reparations for the emotional and financial hardships they endured. Although the Gay Purge marks a particularly egregious example of institutional bigotry, it is by no means an isolated incident. By coming to terms with its history, the university can make a statement to queer students that discrimination will not be tolerated. This is a crucial gesture at a time marked by a surge in bigoted rhetoric and acts of violence across the United States. Through condemning its history of homophobia and taking action against contemporary bigotry, the university can help to ensure that UW’s campus will become a safer place for queer students.
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