Out of the Past

Gay and Lesbian History from 1869 to the Present

by Neil Miller

Vintage Books
A Division of Random House, Inc.
New York

OCCIDENTAL COLLEGE LIBRARY
1600 CAMPUS ROAD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90041

First Vintage Books Edition, February 1995

Copyright © 1995 by Neil Miller

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. Published in the United States by Vintage Books, a division of Random House, Inc., New York, and simultaneously in Canada by Random House of Canada Limited, Toronto.

Pages 658–660 constitute an extension of this copyright page.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Miller, Neil, 1945–
Out of the past : gay and lesbian history from 1869 to the present / Neil Miller.—1st ed.
p. cm.
"A Vintage original."
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-679-74988-8
1. Homosexuality—History. I. Title.
HQ76.25.M56 1994
306.76'6'09—dc20 94-10739
CIP

Book design by Rebecca Aidlin

Manufactured in the United States of America
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For Jane and Rob

STONEWALL AND THE BIRTH OF GAY AND LESBIAN LIBERATION

AT 1:20 A.M. on the night of June 17, 1969, eight officers from the Public Morals Section of the First Division of the New York City Police Department raided the Stonewall Inn, a gay bar located on Christopher Street, just off Seventh Avenue, in Greenwich Village. The Stonewall was a less-than-respectable establishment, even by the standards of gay bars of the time. It was owned by the Mafia. It was a hangout for drag queens and teenage hustlers, and on weekend nights, a go-go boy danced on top of the bar. Gay activist Craig Rodwell blamed unwashed drinking glasses at the Stonewall for a 1969 outbreak of hepatitis among gay men in New York. In less than two and a half years after it first opened, however, the Stonewall had become the most popular bar for gay men in Greenwich Village. As historian **Martin Duberman** described it in his book *Stonewall*, "Many saw it as an oasis, a safe retreat from the harassment of everyday life, a place less susceptible to police raids than other gay bars and one that drew a magical mix of patrons ranging from tweedy East Siders to street queens." It was said to be the only gay male bar in New York City where dancing was allowed.

The raid on the Stonewall that evening followed the usual pattern of police harassment of gay bars in New York. The manager was served with a warrant for selling liquor without a license. Police ordered patrons to leave the bar; those who had no identification or who were wearing clothes of the opposite sex were to be taken to police headquarters. Usually, in such raids (four Village gay bars had been raided in the preceding few weeks), those given permission to leave would file out docilely, to avoid further tempting arrest or exposure. However, this evening, instead of going home, the patrons began to congregate outside the bar. The mood was festive. As those "released" emerged one by one from the Stonewall—often striking poses and making campy comments—the crowd greeted them with cheers. *Village Voice* reporter Lucian Truscott IV, who described

the events in a front-page article headlined "Gay Power Comes to Sheridan Square," takes up the story:

Suddenly, the paddywagon arrived and the mood of the crowd changed. Three of the more blatant queens—in full drag—were loaded inside, along with the bartender and doorman, to a chorus of catcalls and boos from the crowd. A cry went up to push the paddywagon over, but it drove away before anything could happen. . . . The next person to come out was a dyke, and she put up a struggle—from car to door to car again. It was at that moment that the scene became explosive. Limp wrists were forgotten. Beer cans and bottles were heaved at the windows, and a rain of coins descended on the cops. . . .

The police took refuge within the bar. Outside, someone uprooted a parking meter and tried to break down the Stonewall's front door. Someone else squirted lighter fluid through the window, followed by a few matches. From inside the bar, the police—clearly rattled—turned a fire hose on the crowd. A few minutes later several carloads of police reinforcements arrived and attempted to clear the street, but just when they thought they had succeeded in dispersing the crowd, people would re-form behind them—yelling, throwing bricks and bottles, and setting fires to trash cans. According to Duberman's account (although the *Voice*'s Truscott claims this took place the following evening), the police found themselves face to face with a chorus line of mocking queens, kicking their heels in the air and singing:

We are the Stonewall girls
We wear our hair in curls
We wear no underwear
We show our pubic hair . . .
We wear our dungarees
Above our nelly knees!

By the time order was restored, thirteen people had been arrested.

The next night, Saturday, the police were back, but so were the crowds, and the events were already beginning to take on a more political character. Signs had been scrawled on the boarded-up front window of the bar: THEY INVADED OUR RIGHTS; LEGALIZE GAY BARS; SUPPORT GAY POWER. As the crowds faced off against the police, there were shouts of "Gay power" and "Christopher Street belongs to the queens." Like the night before, the rioters threw bottles and bricks; the police charged into the crowd on two occasions, attacking the rioters with nightsticks. On Sunday night, things had calmed down somewhat. The Stonewall was open again; employees had managed to clear away the debris. Among the patrons was Allen Ginsberg, who was making his first visit to the Stonewall. That night, Ginsberg uttered his oft-quoted remark "You know the guys there were so beautiful—they've lost that wounded look that fags all had ten years ago."

It was the "Boston Tea Party of the gay movement," as the writer **Dennis Altman** put it. It was "the hairpin drop heard around the world," as a Mattachine Society leaflet described it. In just three nights, something had changed. And **Judy Garland** was dead. It was uncannily symbolic that the Friday the riots began was also the day of the funeral of the most beloved icon of the *Boys in the Band* gay culture that worshiped the tenacity of female entertainers like Garland but mirrored their helplessness as well. Twenty thousand people had stood in line to view Garland's body at an uptown funeral parlor. On the streets outside the Stonewall that weekend and in the days and months that followed, the "old" gay culture and the homosexual male that sustained it was (mostly) laid to rest as well. From now on, everything would be described as "pre-Stonewall" or "post-Stonewall." As Tom Burke put it in an article in the December 1969 issue of *Esquire*:

Pity: just when Middle America finally discovered the homosexual, he died . . . he has expired, with a whimper, to make way for the new homosexual of the Seventies, an unfettered, guiltless male child of the new morality in a Zapata mustache and an outlaw hat, who couldn't care less for Establishment approval, would as soon sleep with boys as girls, and thinks "Over the Rainbow" is a place to fly on 200 micrograms of lysergic acid diethylamide [LSD].

On July 16, a little more than two weeks after the events outside the Stonewall, Burke had the opportunity to glimpse that "new homosexual" close-up for the first time. New York Mattachine had called a public meeting at St. John's in the Village Episcopal Church, on Waverly Place. Dick Leitsch, the Mattachine president, dressed in a brown suit and looking to Burke like "a dependable, fortyish

Cartier salesclerk," presided over the meeting. In his opening remarks, Leitsch declared that although police brutality should be protested, it was important for the gay community to remain on good terms with the Establishment. Acceptance of homosexuals would come slowly, primarily through educating the straight population. At that point, according to Burke's account:

> *A tense boy with leonine hair is suddenly on his feet. "We don't want acceptance, goddamn it! We want respect! Demand it! We're through hiding in dark bars behind Mafia doormen. We're going to go where straights go and do anything with each other they do and if they don't like it, well* fuck them!" . . .
>
> *"Well, now I think," says Mrs. Cervantes [Mattachine assistant], "that what we ought to have is a gay vigil, in a park. Carry candles, perhaps. . . . I think we should be firm, but just as amicable and sweet as . . ."*
>
> "Sweet!" *The new speaker resembles Billy the Kid. He is James Fouratt, New Left celebrity, seminarian manqué. . . .*
>
> *"Sweet! Bullshit! There's the stereotype homo again, man. . . . Be proud of what you are, man! And if it takes riots or even guns to show them what we are, well, that's the only language that the pigs understand!"*
>
> *Wild applause. . . .*
>
> *Dick Leitsch tries to reply but Fouratt shouts him down. . . .*
>
> *A dozen impassioned boys are on their feet, cheering. . . .*
>
> *Again and again, Dick Leitsch tugs at his clean white tie, shouting for the floor, screaming for order. He is firmly ignored.*

Within days, at a meeting at nearby Alternate U., a radical evening school that offered classes ranging from organic foods to the Cuban Revolution, the first meeting of what was to become the Gay Liberation Front (GLF) took place. Then, exactly one month after the events at Stonewall, three to four hundred gays and lesbians gathered at Washington Square and marched to the site of the riots, chanting, "Gay power!" and singing "We Shall Overcome." The gay revolution—the last of the revolutions of the 1960s—had finally arrived.

The gay and lesbian revolution was the stepchild of all the radical social and political movements of the decade—the student movement and the New Left, the anti-Vietnam movement, radical feminism, the Black Panthers, hippies and yippies. It began in New York but became international in scope. Soon London and Paris and Rome, Sydney and Melbourne, even Buenos Aires, would follow. Gay liberation's ideology and tactics bore little resemblance to the cautious, well-behaved liberalism of the homophiles. In the United States, many of its leaders emerged not from the homophile movement but from the New Left and the social movements of the period. For example, Gay Liberation Front radical **James Fouratt**, the Billy the Kid look-alike who shouted down Dick Leitsch at the Mattachine meeting, had been a member of Abbie Hoffman's Yippies. **Carl Wittman,** author of "A Gay Manifesto," which was influential both in the United States and in Europe, had been a Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) organizer and theoretician. **Allen Young,** who coedited two early gay liberation anthologies, had worked for the leftist Liberation News Service and had gone to Castro's Cuba with the Venceremos Brigades to help with the sugar harvest. **Lois Hart,** an early Gay Liberation Front women's leader, had spent time at **Timothy Leary**'s estate in Millbrook, New York. They were young, alienated, radicalized by the war and the culture of protest of the 1960s, dismissive of mainstream values and politics-as-usual. When their revolution arrived, it was incredible how quickly it swept all before it, leaving the tortured and apologetic past far behind.

More than anything, the gay revolution represented a change in consciousness. It advocated nothing less than the complete transformation of society. What distinguished the new generation of gay liberationists from the homophiles was more than just an increased degree of militancy. As Dennis Altman, the Australian writer who was the most perceptive chronicler of the ideas behind the early gay liberation movement, observed, "No longer is the claim made that gay people can fit into American society, that they are as decent, as patriotic, as clean-living as anyone else. Rather, it is argued, it is American society itself that needs to change." To the young radicals, there was no need to create a "favorable" public image, as the homophiles had tried so hard to do. Now, Blatant was Beautiful.

A proud (and often public) declaration of one's homosexuality became the first act of joining the new movement—a marked change from the use of pseudonyms by many homophile leaders. As *Village Voice* writer **Jill Johnston** put it, "The key phrase is COME OUT. Come out of hiding. Identify yourself. Make it clear. Celebrate your

sexuality." (Johnston herself "came out" in the pages of the *Voice,* where she was the dance critic.) In the new world, nothing was sacrosanct. The nuclear family, monogamy, marriage, everything had to go. Sex and gender roles and the sexual objectification of others were to be obliterated. Monogamy would be replaced by open relationships (although not necessarily by promiscuity), and traditional family structures by communal living. There would be a revitalized sense of community. The young movement's allies were not compassionate psychologists or liberal churchmen but other downtrodden groups. Gay liberation looked to student radicals at home, to revolutionary movements abroad, and above all, to the potential for revolutionary change *within* each gay and lesbian person.

Just as African-Americans took on the term *black* to describe their newfound sense of pride and self-assertion, the word *gay* supplanted the clinical *homosexual* and the derogatory *queer.* (A decade and a half later, a new generation would take back the word "queer.") In the keynote speech at the National Gay Liberation Front Student Conference in San Francisco, in August 1970, **Charles P. Thorp,** the youthful head of the gay group at San Francisco State College, explained the difference. "Those who say they like the word Homosexual better than Gay say in essence they accept our sick-psychiatrist friends' definition of us. . . ." he said. "Homosexual is a straight concept of us as sexual. Therefore, we are in a sexual category and become a sexual minority . . . rather than an ethnic group, a people! But the word Gay has come to mean (by street usage) a life style in which we are not just sex machines. . . . We are whole entities. . . . Gay is a life-style. It is how we live. It is our oppression. It is our Tiffany lamps and our guns. Gay is our history and the history we are just beginning to become."

Much of the early gay liberation thinking was hostile to the bars and the baths that had increasingly come to dominate homosexual life in the 1950s and '60s. Movement rhetoric featured attacks on Mafia bars (especially in New York City); they were viewed as exploiting the community financially, ghettoizing gays and lesbians, and creating an environment where patrons were "so busy playing hunter or game that they can perceive no other reality, including the deeper reality of their own existence as Gay people," as one early liberationist put it. The sexual encounters of bathhouses came in for criticism as well—not because they spread disease (that criticism would come later), but because they encouraged sexual objectification and discouraged individuals from integrating their sexuality with the rest of their lives.

In the view of the early liberationists, new community institutions and a distinctive gay culture were what was required. In his "Gay Manifesto," Carl Wittman drew a contrast between San Francisco as "ghetto"—a kind of refugee camp for homosexuals where "straight cops patrol us, straight legislators govern us, straight employers keep us in line, straight money exploits us"—and San Francisco as "free territory":

> *To be a free territory, we must govern ourselves, set up our own institutions, defend ourselves, and use our own energies to improve our lives. The emergence of gay liberation communes and our own paper is a good start. The talk about a gay liberation coffee shop/dance hall should be acted upon. Rural retreats, political action offices, food cooperatives, a free school, unalienating bars and after hours places—they must be developed if we are to have even the shadow of a free territory.*

This vision of homosexuals as a group oppressed by an evil and exploitive system and who had to create their own institutions was very different from the view of the homophile activists, who contended that there was little difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals. The new gay liberationists also differed from the older generation in that they saw themselves as contributing to the overall world revolutionary struggle. For example, at a meeting of the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO), held in Kansas City in late August 1969—just two months after Stonewall—radicals drew up a twelve-point program, denouncing the "insane war in Vietnam" and declaring support for a variety of struggles of other groups—"the black, the feminist, the Spanish-American, the Indian, the Hippie, the Young, the Student, and other victims of oppression and prejudice." They even went so far as to reject the traditional approach of fighting for civil rights for homosexuals, declaring, "We regard established heterosexual standards of morality as immoral and refuse to condone them by demanding an equality which is merely the common yoke of sexual repression." All twelve points pushed by the radicals were defeated by the more mainstream forces who controlled the convention, but the fact that such ideas were seriously debated by the conference was indicative of how swiftly things were changing.

The building block of gay liberation—following the example of the feminist movement—was the consciousness-raising group. The idea was that as participants shared experiences, they would come to see their problems not as individual ones but as a part of shared oppression. In the jargon of the time, the personal would become the political.

In New York City, the weekly Sunday-night meetings of the Gay Liberation Front (GLF) tended to be larger and noisier variations on the consciousness-raising model. They were unstructured and chaotic, "a cross between a Quaker meeting and an informal rap session," as Dennis Altman put it. Personal declarations and revolutionary rhetoric flourished. Writer and activist **Arthur Bell** captured the flavor of the early meetings in his book *Dancing the Gay Lib Blues:* "Characters were defined and established: the gay witch who chaired the meetings, the blond-maned cowardly-lion-looking moppet who tore up money at the New York Stock Exchange, the radical lesbian who purred hatred, the six-foot-six transvestite who played basketball before each meeting. . . ." But the unruliness of the meetings—and the predilection of GLF to support the issues of every minority group (all struggles were one, after all!), sometimes to the point of ignoring gay issues—gave Bell and others pause. Bell described one meeting when "a crazy" interrupted the proceedings to report that women were being discriminated against at the Electric Circus, a club on St. Mark's Place in the East Village. The meeting broke up in chaos, with half the participants rushing off to demonstrate outside the Circus, while the other half remained to discuss business. (Bell was one of a group of men who left GLF six months after its inception to found the Gay Activists Alliance; he later became a writer for the *Village Voice.*)

In its efforts at community-building, New York GLF sponsored a series of activities ranging from encounter groups to spaghetti dinners. Perhaps most important were the series of dances that GLF sponsored at Alternate U., starting in August 1969. A gay and lesbian dance was something unheard of in New York at the time, where the only gay dancing took place at the Mafia-run Stonewall Inn. By October of 1969, GLF dances were attracting 450 people, providing the alternative to the bars that the theoreticians advocated. Gay dances spread to universities across the country, and by the end of the year, were a monthly staple of social activities at the University of California at Berkeley. In January 1970, the University

of Minnesota held its first dance (and, soon after, elected **Jack Baker,** an openly gay man whose campaign poster featured him wearing high-heeled shoes, as student association president).

As a political organization that took its cues from the New Left, members of New York GLF initiated a number of protest actions. Members picketed the *Village Voice* to protest the newspaper's refusal to permit the use of the word *gay* in classified advertising; the *Voice* capitulated. GLFers protested the cutting down of trees at a gay cruising area in a Queens park. They also took part in expressions of solidarity with other radical groups—picketing the Women's House of Detention in Greenwich Village to protest the incarceration of Black Panther Party members, for example.

GLF groups quickly established themselves in the San Francisco Bay Area. There, in keeping with the spirit of the center of the counterculture, the early emphasis was on political theater. Gay guerillas performed in Berkeley's Sproul Plaza before a crowd of two thousand during the university's 1969 "disorientation week"; gay liberationists took over a meeting of San Francisco's establishment gay organization, the Society for Individual Rights (SIR), putting on a theater piece called *No Vietnamese Ever Called Me Queer.*

The GLF's keenness to align itself with revolutionary movements pointed up some of the contradictions within its ideology. When New York GLF members took part in an antiwar demonstration marking Hiroshima-Nagasaki Day during the first summer of the group's existence, they received a distinctly chilly reception. Black radicals, in particular, were hostile. The playwright **Leroi Jones** denounced homosexuality as a "white man's weakness," and **Eldridge Cleaver,** in his book *Soul on Ice,* wrote, "Homosexuality is a sickness, just as are baby-rape or wanting to be head of General Motors." Black Panther Party head **Huey Newton** did take the bold step of announcing he was willing to work with the gay and women's movement, however. At the Panthers' invitation, some thirty GLFers attended a Panther-sponsored Revolutionary People's Constitutional Convention, but many returned disillusioned by the sexism of the gathering. And when gays participated in the Venceremos brigades to help with the sugar harvest in Cuba—the same country that just a few years before had rounded up homosexuals and put them in internment camps—they discovered that the enthusiasm of other *brigadistas* for the Cuban revolution prevented them from challenging the revolution's antigay policies.

. . .

Meanwhile, New York's Gay Liberation Front was experiencing other problems: Its lesbian members were getting restless. They became increasingly convinced that the organization was male-dominated. Although a number of the men did try their best, the women felt that GLF gay men were just not sufficiently sensitive to sexism and issues of particular concern to lesbians. Starting in the spring of 1970, GLF lesbians sponsored a series of all-women dances. And GLF lesbians could not remain aloof from the currents of feminism. At about the same time, Rita Mae Brown, who had been active in the New York chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW), showed up at a Gay Liberation Front meeting. Brown's visit to GLF was a catalyst; from that moment, women's consciousness-raising groups within GLF began to explore the relationships between lesbianism and feminism, a development that was to fundamentally alter the course of the gay and lesbian movement.

The feminist movement itself had not been exactly congenial to lesbianism ever since feminist pioneer **Betty Friedan** had warned in the early days of the movement of a "lavender menace." For the women's movement, the issue was a particularly delicate one: Friedan and others were fearful that a fragile movement promoting the independence of women could be destroyed by accusations that it was dominated by lesbians. "Lesbian is the one word that can cause the Executive Committee [of New York NOW] a collective heart attack," wrote Rita Mae Brown and two friends in a letter in which they resigned from NOW to protest its antilesbian attitudes.

Brown's experience in the women's movement was typical of other lesbians' experience. Her involvement in politics began in 1968 when she helped found the Student Homophile League at New York University, where she was an undergraduate. She was quickly disillusioned, finding the men in the group indifferent to the concerns of lesbians, so she joined the National Organization for Women. At her first meetings, Brown felt alienated and ignored by the "bejewelled and well-dressed women" in attendance. Finally someone spoke to her. "I questioned her on the lesbian issue," Brown wrote in her essay "Take a Lesbian to Lunch," "and she bluntly told me that the word 'lesbian' was never to be uttered. 'After all, that is exactly what the press wants to say we are, a bunch of lesbians.' She then went on to say patronizingly: 'What are you doing worrying about lesbians; you must have lots of boyfriends.' "

But Brown felt she had nowhere else to go. She stayed at NOW, eventually becoming editor of New York NOW's newsletter and the administrative coordinator for the national organization. As long as she didn't bring up the lesbian issue, everything was fine. She also found that there were women at NOW who were interested in going to bed with her in order to pass themselves off as "new-wave feminists." Such women viewed lesbianism only as a sexual activity, not "a different way of living," Brown noted critically. Eventually, in November 1969, when the name of the Daughters of Bilitis was left off a NOW press release listing the sponsors for the first Congress to Unite Women, Brown's patience reached the limit. Two months later, she left the organization.

When she found her way to the Gay Liberation Front in the spring of 1970, a new phase both for Brown and for the GLF women began. Gradually, the GLF women began to conclude that lesbian oppression and gay male oppression had less in common than they had originally believed. Some of the women in GLF, particularly those in Brown's study group, began to move away from the men; the idea of an autonomous organization beckoned. As Brown put it, "We are no longer willing to be token lesbians in the women's liberation movement nor are we willing to be the token women in the Gay Liberation Front."

Newly emboldened, members of Brown's study group made a surprise appearance in May 1970 at the second annual Congress to Unite Women, held at a Manhattan school. On the opening night of the congress, some three hundred women were sitting in a large auditorium, waiting for a panel discussion to begin. Suddenly, the lights went out. When they came on again, the walls were covered with posters: TAKE A LESBIAN TO LUNCH; SUPERDYKE LOVES YOU; THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT IS A LESBIAN PLOT. Meanwhile, seventeen women, all wearing T-shirts that said "Lavender Menace" in a mockery of Betty Friedan's phrase, had taken control of the stage. For the rest of the evening, the "Menaces" held forth, talking about their lives as lesbians and inviting members of the audience to speak as well. By the last session, the congress voted to adopt a set of resolutions put forth by the Lavender Menaces. They went:

1. Be it resolved that Women's Liberation is a Lesbian plot.
2. Resolved that whenever the label "Lesbian" is used against

the movement collectively, or against women individually, it is to be affirmed, not denied.

3. In all discussions on birth control, homosexuality must be included as a legitimate method of contraception.

4. All sex education curricula must include Lesbianism as a valid, legitimate form of sexual expression of love.

At the close of the conference several Lavender Menaces announced the formation of consciousness-raising groups for women interested in exploring lesbianism and feminism. The eventual result was an organization called Radicalesbians, the first East Coast lesbian group since DOB was established years before. In its statement, called "The Woman-Identified Woman," Radicalesbians began with the memorable lines "What is a lesbian? A lesbian is the rage of all women condensed to the point of explosion. . . ."

From this point, many lesbians began to move away from the "mixed" gay liberation movement toward the formation of all-women groups committed to lesbian-feminism. In San Francisco, lesbians active in women's liberation groups had already formed an organization called Gay Women's Liberation. The New York chapter of the Daughters of Bilitis, while not specifically lesbian-feminist in orientation, sponsored a series of feminist speakers. Gradually, lesbians began to see themselves not merely as a distinct group with issues that were different from gay men, but as a feminist vanguard that *all* women could join. As lesbian-feminist theoretician **Charlotte Bunch** put it, "Lesbians must become feminists and fight against woman oppression, just as feminists must become Lesbians if they hope to end male supremacy." (For a more detailed exposition of the lesbian-feminist point of view, see the excerpt from Rita Mae Brown's "The Shape of Things to Come," p. 387.)

But the lesbian movement continued to encounter some of the same problems with straight feminists that the Gay Liberation Front encountered with the radical left: It identified with the women's movement, but there were at least some factions in the women's movement that wanted nothing to do with them. Betty Friedan, for one, was still fearful of the "lavender menace," even as the term was being ridiculed on the stage of the Congress to Unite Women. She led a successful effort to keep lesbians from being elected or reelected to posts in New York NOW. As late as 1973, she was telling *The New York Times* that lesbians had been sent to infiltrate the women's movement as part of a CIA plot.

For certain prominent feminists, "coming out" as a lesbian remained a frightening, if not traumatic, event. This was particularly true for **Kate Millett,** author of the influential book *Sexual Politics.* Millett had been lionized by *Time* magazine, which put her picture on its cover (and also featured a photograph of her kissing her husband). But Millett was a lesbian, and although she had said so at a Daughters of Bilitis meeting, she had never declared it publicly. At a meeting before five hundred people at Columbia University in the fall of 1970, she was confronted by a young woman named **Teresa Juarez,** who demanded from the audience, "Are you a lesbian? Say it. Are you?" Millett described the event in her autobiographical work, *Flying:*

> *Everything pauses, faces look up in terrible silence. I hear them not breathe. That word in public, the word I waited half a lifetime to hear. Finally I am accused. "Say it! Say you are a Lesbian." Yes I said. Yes. Because I know what she means. The line goes, inflexible as a fascist edict, that bisexuality is a cop-out. Yes I said yes I am a Lesbian.*

As lesbians increasingly moved toward an identification with feminist issues, straight women and some sectors of the women's movement moved toward them. San Francisco NOW was quite accepting of lesbians. Feminist leader **Ti-Grace Atkinson** proclaimed that "feminism is the theory and lesbianism is the practice." The "political lesbian" emerged—the woman who didn't have sexual relations with other women but made a total commitment to the lesbian movement out of solidarity with other women and opposition to male power and control. When Kate Millett revealed publicly that she was a lesbian and *Time* published a second article on her, contending that her disclosure "is bound to discredit her as a spokesman for her cause, cast further doubt on her theories, and reinforce the views of those skeptics who routinely dismiss all liberationists as lesbians," prominent heterosexual feminists rallied around her. At a news conference a few days after the article was published, feminists like **Gloria Steinem, Susan Brownmiller,** and **Flo Kennedy** staunchly defended Millett and expressed their support of homosexual liberation.

Finally, at the September 1971 national NOW convention, the organization passed a resolution that stated:

Be it resolved that N.O.W. recognizes the double oppression of lesbians;

Be it resolved that a woman's right to her own person includes the right to define and express her own sexuality and to choose her own life-style; and

Be it resolved that N.O.W. acknowledges the oppression of lesbians as a legitimate concern of feminism.

The convention decision—approved almost unanimously—was a "complete turnabout," as Sidney Abbot and Barbara Love noted in their book, *Sappho Was a Right-On Woman.* Although the issue would continue to be divisive at different points throughout the next decade, for the first time NOW had expressed a strong sense of solidarity with lesbians. For lesbians, it was an important step as well, as they moved away from gay men and toward a more women-identified political and social stance.

Lesbians were not the only restless members of the Gay Liberation Front. In December 1969, a group of men left the organization to found the Gay Activists Alliance (GAA), which rapidly became the most visible and largest gay organization in New York. The founders included **Jim Owles,** an ex-GI from Chicago who had been discharged from the air force for antiwar agitation and became GAA's president at the ripe old age of twenty-three; **Marty Robinson,** twenty-seven, a carpenter (and son of well-to-do Jewish parents) who had been involved in the Mattachine Society and radicalized by the Stonewall riots; and **Arthur Evans,** slightly older, a former Columbia Ph.D. candidate considered the "brains" behind the new group. They represented a reform-oriented faction that was determined to work exclusively on gay issues—as opposed to GLF's multi-issue orientation—and whose interest in raising gay issues in mainstream politics was more akin to the old Mattachine approach. They also favored a less chaotic atmosphere than the one that prevailed at the Gay Liberation Front: The new organization's bylaws stated firmly that "meetings shall be conducted according to *Roberts Rules of Order.*"

Watching a GAA meeting in progress, Dennis Altman observed that "the leadership would, in other circumstances, have all been president of their student councils." Nonetheless, GAA had its own less-than-conventional members, like street transvestite **Ray "Sylvia" Rivera,** and others who were more interested in developing a new gay culture rather than in political action. It also had a "pleasure committee" that sponsored popular dances.

If GAA resembled Mattachine in its civil rights orientation, it was radical in its own way. The organization saw its primary goal as rallying homosexuals through direct action. It perfected the fine art of the "zap," in which GAA members confronted politicians, the media, and other individuals and institutions. Early targets of "zaps" included New York mayoral and gubernatorial candidates, *Harper's* magazine (a sit-in), and the New York City Clerk's Office (a mock engagement party for two gay male couples). Just the threat of a zap was enough to convince the producers of **Dick Cavett**'s television show to invite two GAA members as guests (along with **Phyllis Diller, James Earl Jones,** and **Nora Ephron**). Then there was the famous "quack-in" at Fidelifacts of Greater New York, a credit agency on Forty-second Street. GAA accused Fidelifacts of gathering information about the sex lives of individuals and selling its findings to client companies and other investigatory agencies. Fidelifact's president was quoted as saying, "If one looks like a duck, walks like a duck, associates only with ducks, and quacks like a duck, he is probably a duck." In response, twelve GAA members—dressed in duck costumes—were seen waddling at the entrance to Fidelifacts, quacking and carrying picket signs.

The zap had a psychological as well as a political purpose. "The real significance of zapping a political figure like [New York City Mayor] John Lindsay," wrote Dennis Altman, "may lie less in its effect on the policies being challenged than in the new self-confidence and identity the activity provides those who participate and the new model of gayness it offers to those as yet too scared to come out."

Often, while the zap antagonized politicians in the short run, it could be enormously successful in the long run. The tactic also forced politicians to confront the gay issue for the first time. For example, about three dozen GAA members zapped **Arthur Goldberg,** the former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations who was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for governor in 1970. As Goldberg emerged from his limousine at a busy intersection on Manhattan's Upper West Side, GAA members approached him and asked politely if he favored sodomy law repeal and an end to police harassment. Taken aback, Goldberg responded, "I think there are more important things to talk about," and went off to shake some

hands. Soon enough, GAA protesters were shouting, "Answer homosexuals! Answer homosexuals!" After a few more handshakes, Goldberg thought it wise to make a speedy exit. Protesters followed him to his limousine, shouting "Gay power!" and "Surround the car, surround the car!" Still another GAA protester began chanting, "Crime of silence, crime of silence, crime of silence." Such tactics could not have endeared the GAAers to Goldberg, but they did indicate that gays were a force to be reckoned with. Goldberg won the Democratic primary to oppose incumbent **Nelson Rockefeller.** Two weeks before the November election, he became the first New York gubernatorial candidate ever to announce his support for gay rights.

A GAA attempt to sit in at the Republican state headquarters proved less successful, however, when five GAA leaders were arrested, marking the first time members of a gay political group were arrested for protests regarding gay issues. But the "Rockefeller Five," as they were known, became a movement rallying point.

Not every politician required a zap in order to see the wisdom of supporting gay rights. **Bella Abzug,** running for Congress in 1970, became the first candidate for major office to speak at a GAA meeting and she soon became the darling of the organization (and of gay voters in general). Soon all manner of politicians were vying for GAA endorsements. A GAA Elections Committee sent out questionnaires to candidates, invited them to speak at membership meetings, and sponsored voter registration drives. The Mattachine Society had tried to do some of the same in earlier days, but with the enhanced visibility afforded by zaps and candidate forums, GAA was beginning to show that homosexuals were an active and important voting bloc. Once again, the psychological effect on gays and lesbians themselves was as important as any political gains: If a handful of activists could convince politicians that gays were a key political constituency, then they *were* a key political constituency, not just a marginalized group of people.

The next phase of GAA's political involvement was its effort to introduce a bill into the New York City Council that would ban discrimination against gays and lesbians in employment and housing. This was another way that Owles, Robinson, and other GAA leaders thought that gays could establish themselves as a legitimate minority group. The organization launched a petition drive to prod **Carol Greitzer,** a member of the city council representing the Village and the Upper West Side, and no friend of gay rights, to introduce

the bill. Greitzer remained wary, but in early January 1971, two other Council members, **Eldon Clingan** and **Carter Burden,** held a news conference to announce that they were introducing Intro 475, which would add the words "sexual orientation" to the provisions of New York City's Human Rights law.

Introducing legislation was one thing; passing it was another. Just getting hearings on the bill proved difficult, requiring still another zap, this time at the apartment building of reluctant city councillor **Saul Sharison.** But once committee hearings did occur, in the fall of 1971, they exposed conflicts within GAA between those who were serious about getting a bill enacted and those who wanted to use the hearings as an occasion for political theater. The issue reached a dramatic point during the questioning of **Richard Amato,** a GAA member who had conducted extensive research into employment discrimination against homosexuals. In the course of questioning by Councillor **Michael De Marco,** an opponent of the measure, Amato was asked, "What if we employ a Mr. Schultz on Monday and Tuesday we get a Miss Schultz? That's the problem. I just saw two people in dresses trying to get into the men's room. . . ."

At that moment, the two cross-dressers in question (including GAA's Ray "Sylvia" Rivera) screamed from the back of the council chambers that the only reason they had gone to the men's room was because they had been refused entry to the ladies' room. Councillor De Marco—sensing a golden opportunity—urged them to come forward. They were soon joined by other GAA members who began shouting "Heterosexual bastards" in front of the council chambers. From that point on, the hearings turned rowdy, as witnesses were cheered and jeered by members of the audience. On the third day, when Councillor Sharison threatened to adjourn the hearings after one outburst, a group of GAAers rushed to his desk shouting, "Justice! Justice! Justice!" and "Bigot! Bigot! Bigot!" The committee finally voted seven to five *not* to bring the bill to the full Council for a vote.

In an article in the *Village Voice,* the GAA's Marty Robinson tried to justify the seemingly self-defeating tactics that led to the defeat of Intro 475:

> *. . . when GAA undertook Intro 475, it was not advocated as the goal for the movement but as a tactic, a tool toward liberation. It was called anti-closet legislation, to underline how the*

> *threat of loss of employment had been used to keep Gays in silent submission. Intro 475 does have much value in itself, but Gay Liberationists . . . saw Intro 475 as the best way of getting the message to the community: the closet is built in fear, not shame. In that very real sense, Intro 475 never was and never could be defeated. Many gays came out of the closet for the struggle and many more will join them as that struggle continues.*

It was not until 1986 that a gay rights bill would pass the New York City Council.

GAA itself soon faded from the scene, as conflicts between reformist and radical factions within the organization intensified. In 1973 one group, under the leadership of GAA's president, **Bruce Voeller,** a professor of biology at Rockefeller University, left the organization, forming the National Gay Task Force (NGTF). The new organization's aim was to be a gay version of the NAACP or the ACLU, establishing gays and lesbians as a political force, and synthesizing "the old homophile and the reformist gay and lesbian liberationist approaches into a new hybrid with broader appeal," according to gay historian Toby Marotta. Voeller became the organization's first executive director. NGTF's board of directors attracted a variety of gay luminaries, ranging from homophile veterans Frank Kameny and Barbara Gittings to historian Martin Duberman and **Howard Brown,** who had been John Lindsay's health services administrator and who had "come out" on the front page of *The New York Times*. The future shape of American gay politics was emerging.

It had been an exhilarating first few years for the new gay and lesbian liberation movement. The events of that early period would set the stage for much that would happen in the next twenty-five years throughout the United States: the emphasis on "coming out"; the use of political theater, zaps, and similar tactics to achieve visibility and publicity; the drive to pass gay rights legislation as a way of gaining legal protections *and* rallying the gay community; and, with the National Gay Task Force, the establishment of the first national group. In their adoption of freewheeling organizational formats, later organizations like ACT UP and Queer Nation could be said to be the "children" of the Gay Liberation Front; in their fondness for zaps, they were descendants of the Gay Activists

Alliance. The attempt to build a separate lesbian culture of the mid-seventies and early eighties was the logical extension of the movement of lesbians away from "mixed" organizations in the first two years of gay liberation. The early years also offered a glimpse of some of the divisions that continue to divide the gay and lesbian movement to this day: conflicts between radicals and reformers; between lesbians and gay men; between those who favor supporting the struggles of other groups and those who want to focus exclusively on gay issues.

In just the first year, the movement's progress was amazing. Nothing illustrated it better than the gay pride march that took place in New York City on June 28, 1970, the first anniversary of Stonewall. Somewhere between five thousand and twenty thousand people marched from New York's Greenwich Village to Central Park. Two hundred members of the Gay Activists Alliance, an organization that had barely existed six months before, led the way. GLF and the Lavender Menaces marched; so did the New York chapters of the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis. Participants came from Philadelphia and Washington and Baltimore. *The New York Times,* which had virtually ignored the original Stonewall riots, put the event on page one; *The New Yorker* wrote about it in "The Talk of the Town." But it was the *Village Voice,* as usual, that best caught the spirit of the event:

> *They stretched in a line, from Gimbels to Times Square, thousands and thousands and thousands, chanting, waving, screaming—the outrageous and the outraged, splendid in their flaming colors, splendid in their delirious up-front birthday celebration of liberation. . . .*
>
> *They swept up Sixth Avenue, from Sheridan Square to Central Park, astonishing everything in their way. No one could quite believe it, eyes rolled back in heads, Sunday tourists traded incredulous looks, wondrous faces poked out of air-conditioned cars. My God, are those really homosexuals?* Marching? Up Sixth Avenue? . . .

That same day, twelve hundred marched down Hollywood Boulevard in Los Angeles, in a celebration calling itself Christopher Street West. The *Los Angeles Advocate,* the gay newspaper, reported that crowds ten deep lined both sides of the street; estimates of the number of spectators were as high as fifteen thousand to twenty

thousand. The newspaper couldn't resist observing that "sensation-sated Hollywood had never seen anything like it. Probably the world had never seen anything like it since the gay days of Ancient Greece." Meanwhile, in Chicago, several hundred marched—with six police squad cars and three paddy wagons following behind. The *Advocate*'s Chicago correspondent reported that a postmarch communal dinner was attended by about two hundred, including Men Against Cool, a coalition of straight and gay men who supported women's liberation. After the dinner, the newspaper reported, "A group went to the Playboy Club and had a demonstration in support of Women's Liberation, with slogans like 'Gay Brother Support for Sister Power' . . ."

The movement was sweeping from coast to coast, and Stonewall was to remain a rallying point. It would be years before there were gay pride marches in places like Louisville, Kentucky, and Worcester, Massachusetts, and Des Moines, Iowa. But that would happen, too. "Are we trying to invent a new existence, whizzing through decades of social evolution in an afternoon? Or only joyriding?" Kate Millett wanted to know. The next twenty-five years would offer some clues.

"A Gay Manifesto"

Carl Wittman's "A Gay Manifesto" was one of the most important documents of the gay liberation period. Wittman (1943–86) graduated from Swarthmore College, outside Philadelphia, and played a prominent role in the early days of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the radical student group. He was one of the authors—along with **Tom Hayden**—*of the SDS strategy for organizing poor whites. At age twenty-three, Wittman moved to San Francisco, where he continued the union organizing work that he had begun on the East Coast and became active in co-op movements there. It was in San Francisco that Wittman came out as a gay man; from that point, his interests began to move from labor to more broad-based social concerns. According to his friend Michael Bronski, Wittman said that he wrote his manifesto in the spring of 1969, before Stonewall. In fact, the document makes no mention of Stonewall. The manifesto was reprinted in the underground and leftist press, where gay radicals would have encountered it for the first time. Wittman later founded a gay commune in Wolf Creek, Oregon, that published the magazine* RFD, *"a journal for country faggots," as it called itself. He died of AIDS in 1986. Wittman emphasizes that his manifesto was written from the point of view of a white, middle-class man and for gay men. In it one can see a working out of many of the early gay liberation ideas:*

IN THE PAST YEAR there has been an awakening of gay liberation ideas and energy. How it began we don't know; maybe we were inspired by black people and their freedom movement; we learned how to stop pretending from the hip revolution. . . .

Where once there was frustration, alienation, and cynicism, there are new characteristics among us. We are full of love for each other and are showing it; we are full of anger at what has been done to us. And as we recall all the self-censorship and repression for so many years, a reservoir of tears pours out of our eyes. And we are euphoric, high, with the initial flourish of a movement. . . .

We want to make ourselves clear: our first job is to free ourselves; that means clearing our heads of the garbage that's been poured into them. . . .

Male chauvinism: All men are infected with male chauvinism—we were brought up that way. . . . Male chauvinism, however, is not central to us. We can junk it much more easily than straight men can. For we understand oppression. We have largely opted out of a system which oppresses women daily—our egos are not built on putting women down and having them build us up. Also, living in a mostly male world we have become used to playing different roles, doing our own shit-work. And finally, we have a common enemy: the big male chauvinists are also the big anti-gays.

But we need to purge male chauvinism, both in behavior and in thought among us. Chick equals nigger equals queer. Think it over. . . .

"Gay stereotypes": The straights' image of the gay world is defined largely by those of us who have violated straight roles. There is a tendency among "homophile" groups to deplore gays who play

visible roles—the queens and the nellies. As liberated gays, we must take a clear stand. 1) Gays who stand out have become our first martyrs. They came out and withstood disapproval before the rest of us did. 2) If they have suffered from being open, it is straight society whom we must indict, not the queen.

Closet queens: This phrase is becoming analogous to "Uncle Tom." To pretend to be straight sexually, or to pretend to be straight socially, is probably the most harmful pattern of behavior in the ghetto. . . .

If we are liberated, we are open with our sexuality. Closet queenery must end. Come out.

But saying come out, we have to have our heads clear about a few things: 1) Closet queens are our brothers, and must be defended against attacks by straight people. . . . Each of us must make the steps toward openness at our own speed and on our own impulses. Being open is the foundation of freedom; it has to be built solidly. . . .

On *Positions and Roles:* Much of our sexuality has been perverted through mimicry of straights, and warped from self-hatred. These sexual perversions are basically anti-gay:

"I like to make it with straight guys."
"I'm not gay, but I like to be 'done.' "
"I like to fuck, but don't want to be fucked."
"I don't like to be touched above the neck."

This is role-playing at its worst; we must transcend these roles. We strive for democratic, mutual, reciprocal sex. This does not mean that we are all mirror images of each other in bed, but that we break away from roles which enslave us. . . .

Perversion: We've been called perverts enough to be suspect of any usage of the word. Still many of us shrink from the idea of certain kinds of sex: with animals, sado/masochism, dirty sex (involving piss or shit). Right off, even before we take the time to learn any more, there are some things to get straight:

1. We shouldn't be apologetic to straights about gays whose sex lives we don't understand or share.
2. It's not particularly a gay issue, except that gay people probably are less hung up about sexual experimentation.
3. Let's get perspective: even if we were to get into the game of deciding what's good for someone else, the harm done in these "perversions" is undoubtedly less dangerous or unhealthy than is tobacco or alcohol. . . .

Black liberation: This is tenuous right now because of the uptightness and supermasculinity of many black men (which is understandable). Despite that, we must support their movement, particularly when they are under attack from the establishment; we must show them that we mean business; and we must figure out who our common enemies are: police, city hall, capitalism.

Homophile groups: Reformist or pokey as they sometimes are, they are our brothers. They'll grow as we have grown and grow. . . .

Conclusion: An Outline of Imperatives for Gay Liberation:

1. Free ourselves: come out everywhere; initiate self-defense and political activity; initiate counter community institutions.
2. Turn other gay people on; talk all the time; understand, forgive, accept.
3. Free the homosexual in everyone: we'll be getting a good bit of shit from threatened latents: be gentle, and keep talking and acting free.
4. We've been playing an act for a long time, so we're consummate actors. Now we can begin to be, and it'll be a good show!

Lesbianism and the Women's Movement

In 1972, a collective of lesbians living and working in Washington, D.C., called the Furies published a series of essays on the subject of lesbianism and the women's movement. In her essay, called "The Shape of Things to Come," Rita Mae Brown expressed the lesbian-feminist point of view that saw lesbians as the vanguard of the women's movement:

and how the great sex researcher conducted his interviews, I recommend Dr. Wordell Pomeroy's *Dr. Kinsey and the Institute for Sex Research.* Eric Marcus's *Making History* provides an informative interview with Dr. Evelyn Hooker.

CHAPTER 18—THE AGE OF MCCARTHY: Nicholas von Hoffman's *Citizen Cohn* offers a damning (and gossipy) view of Roy Cohn. I also used the standard biographical works on McCarthy: Richard Rovere's *Senator Joe McCarthy* and Thomas Reeves's *The Life and Times of Joe McCarthy.* For the effect of the McCarthy period on gays and lesbians, I recommend D'Emilio's *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities,* the most thorough account. Also helpful were back issues of *ONE* magazine.

CHAPTER 19—THE STRUGGLE FOR BRITISH LAW REFORM: Stephen Jeffery-Poulter's *Peers, Queers, and Commons* offers a detailed account of the struggle for British law reform. I also found Noel Annan's *Our Age* helpful. Andrew Hodges's biography *Allen Turing* gives a good sense of Britain during the McCarthy era. For Australia in this period, see Garry Wotherspoon's book on Sydney, *City of the Plain;* for Canada's law reform struggle, see Gary Kinsman's *The Regulation of Sexuality.*

CHAPTER 20—THE OTHER SIDE OF THE 1950S: For a literary and biographical examination of the Beats, I recommend John Tytell's *Naked Angels.* Barry Miles's *Allen Ginsberg* offers a good look at the Ginsberg-Orlovsky relationship. The works of the Beats themselves—Kerouac's *On the Road,* Ginsberg's *Howl,* and Burroughs's *Naked Lunch,* among others—are, of course, essential. For a portrait of the Tangier expatriate subculture, Michelle Green's entertaining *The Dream at the End of the World* is the most thorough work so far. Millicent Dillon's biography of Jane Bowles, *A Little Original Sin,* offers another view.

CHAPTER 21—THE OTHER SIDE OF THE FIFTIES, PART II: Lapovsky and Kennedy's examination of the butch/femme subculture in Buffalo, New York, provides a truly fascinating anthropological look at that world. Faderman's *Odd Girls* and her essay "The Return of Butch and Femme" are also illuminating. For the point of view of a black lesbian and also of a woman who felt alienated from the prevailing butch-femme culture, see Audre Lorde's autobiography, *Zami: A New Spelling of My Name.* For a deeply felt but somewhat romanticized view of butch/femme mores and culture, Joan Nestle's *A Restricted Country* is essential. One still awaits a full-scale biography of Lorraine Hansberry that deals forthrightly with her lesbianism.

CHAPTER 22—THE HOMOPHILES: John D'Emilio's superb *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities* is the definitive book on the gay movement of the 1950s and '60s. Eric Marcus's *Making History* offers a number of interesting interviews with fifties and sixties gay and lesbian political figures, using an oral history approach. Katz contains a number of documents in this regard, as well as interviews with lesbian activists Barbara Gittings and Kay Tobin. Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin's *Lesbian Woman* provides an early view of the Daughters of Bilitis by that organization's founders.

CHAPTER 23—STONEWALL AND THE BIRTH OF GAY AND LESBIAN LIBERATION: There are a number of books on this heavily documented period. Martin Duberman's *Stonewall* (1993) provides a close look at the events surrounding the Stonewall riots and the lives of some of the people who participated in them. Donn Teal's *The Gay Militants* presents a detailed account of the first year of gay liberation; Sydney Abbot and Barbara Love's *Sappho Was a Right-On Woman* tells the lesbian side. Dennis Altman's *Homosexual* offers a thoughtful summary of the ideas behind the gay (male) liberation movement; the essays in *Lesbianism and the Women's Movement* do the same for lesbians. Toby Marotta's *The Politics of Homosexuality* takes the story further into the seventies. For the spirit of the early movement, I recommend Arthur Bell's *Dancing the Gay Lib Blues* and Kate Millett's autobiographical *Flying.* The essays in Karla Jay and Allen Young's *Out of the Closet* offer a wide variety of perspectives. For the arrival of gay liberation in London, see Jeffrey Weeks's *Coming Out.* Barry D. Adam's *The Rise of a Lesbian and Gay Movement* puts the gay and lesbian liberation movement in an international perspective.

CHAPTER 24—THE 1970S: THE TIMES OF HARVEY MILK AND ANITA BRYANT: Randy Shilts's *The Mayor of Castro Street* offers an invaluable depiction of the rise of Harvey Milk and gay politics in San Francisco. For an up-close look at Milk, Moscone, and Dan White and the assassinations, I recommend Mike Weiss's *Double Play.* Shilts, in *Conduct Unbecoming,* offers a sympathetic look at military rights pioneer Leonard Matlovich; so does Matlovich's biography, *The Good Soldier,* written by Mike Hippler, with participation (and extensive quotes) from Matlovich. For Oliver Sipple, the man who saved President Ford's life, see Shilts's *The Mayor of Castro Street.*

CHAPTER 25—SEX AND MUSIC IN THE SEVENTIES: Edmund White's *States of Desire* offers a fascinating examination of gay male culture in the decade before AIDS. Dennis Altman's essays in *Coming Out in the Seventies* take a critical look at the effects of sexual liberation. But Andrew Holleran's novel, *Dancer from the Dance,* probably evokes the era better than any other work.

CHAPTER 26—LESBIAN NATION AND WOMEN'S MUSIC: Faderman's *Odd Girls* gives a good perspective on the period, while frequently

taking a critical stance. For the theoretics behind "Lesbian Nation," see Jill Johnston's book of the same name, Rita Mae Brown and Charlotte Bunch's essays, and Adrienne Rich's "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." The material on women's music and its role in creating lesbian culture comes largely from interviews I conducted previously with singer Holly Near and Judy Dlugacz, head of Olivia Records.

CHAPTER 27—THE AGE OF AIDS: As with the years immediately following Stonewall, the Age of AIDS is probably the most documented period in contemporary U.S. gay history. Despite its biases, Randy Shilts's *And the Band Played On* remains the most valuable source on the early days of the epidemic. In view of the role that Larry Kramer played as the catalyst for so much of the decade's AIDS organizing, his collection of essays and speeches, *Reports from the Holocaust,* represents an important record. Frances FitzGerald's *Cities on a Hill* offers a superb journalistic portrait of San Francisco during the early AIDS years; Andrew Holleran's essays in *Ground Zero* provide an inside look at gay New York City. Bruce Nussbaum's *Best Intentions* examines AIDS organizing and the politics of AIDS research. Michaelangelo Signorile's *Queer in America* portrays the radicalism of ACT UP and Queer Nation from the point of view of the leading proponent of "outing." Phyllis Burke's *Family Values* gives a West Coast perspective on Queer Nation. (Burke also provides an engaging account of lesbian parenthood.)

CHAPTER 28—COMMUNISM AND FASCISM: For a look at Communism in the Soviet Union and China and its effect on homosexuals, I drew on newspaper and magazine articles from sources ranging from *Christopher Street* to the *Washington Post.* Bret Hinsch's *Passions of the Cut Sleeve* explores same-sex love in ancient China, although it does not attempt to treat the modern period. For Cuba, Allen Young's *Gays Under the Cuban Revolution* is a good introduction. Cuban novelist Reinaldo Arenas's memoir, *Before Night Falls,* is a vital source, despite its violently anti-Castro tone. Extremely antagonistic to Castro but also important is the 1984 documentary film *Improper Conduct.* For Argentina, I made use of an essay on Argentine gay history by the eminent sociologist Juan José Sebreli, as well as my own reportage in *Out in the World.*

CHAPTER 29—ENGLAND: THE BATTLE OVER CLAUSE 28: Once again, Stephen Jeffery-Poulter's *Peers, Queers, and Commons* documents the period most thoroughly. Peter Jenkins's book *Mrs. Thatcher's Revolution* gives a good picture of the general political background to Clause 28. For the South Africa section, I referred to Mark Gevisser and Edwin Cameron's anthology *Defiant Desire,* as well as my own interviews with Simon Nkoli.

CHAPTER 30—JAPAN: I made use of biographies of Yukio Mishima by Henry Scott-Stokes and John Nathan. Mishima's novel *Forbidden Colors* presents a portrait of gay life in 1950s Japan. For a look at Japanese attitudes toward same-sex love among males in the premodern period, see Gary Leupp's forthcoming *Male Colors.* For the more modern period, see my *Out in the World.*

CHAPTER 31—THE CLINTON YEARS: For my discussion of the battle over gays in the military, I used newspaper coverage, particularly *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post,* as well as magazines ranging from *Newsweek* to *The New Republic* to *The Advocate.* Andrew Kopkind's article "The Gay Moment," published in *The Nation,* provides a good account of the social and cultural changes that marked the first year of the Clinton presidency. For an analysis of gay political failures of the military battle, I recommend Chris Bull's article "And the Ban Played On," in *The Advocate,* and Mark Schoofs's piece, "No Quick Fix," in *Out.*