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CO-CHAIRS’ COLUMN SPRING 2012

It’s been but a few months since Ian Lekus passed the baton to Jennie Brier and me, and now we can fully appreciate what an amazing job he did navigating the demands of this position including working with the AHA, bringing in new membership, streamlining processes for continuing members, and making sure this all-volunteer organization keeps moving forward. We aspire to keep up that momentum.

The Committee on LGBT History had a big presence at the 2012 AHA in Chicago. Our program included twelve panels, two tours of local exhibitions (“Out in Chicago” at the Chicago History Museum and “A Room of Her Own” at the Leather Archives and Museum), a screening of the documentary On These Shoulders We Stand, another successful reception co-sponsored by the Coordinating Committee on Women in History, and the open forum on findings from the LGBTQ Historians’ Task Force.

Formed in 2009 by the AHA and the CLGBTH, the Task Force had a three-year charge to investigate conditions and make recommendations to the AHA for best practices concerning LGBTQ historians and those doing LGBTQ history. At the forum, they reported on a survey that found that historians doing LGBTQ history generally felt supported, although sometimes faced funding challenges, especially for work outside of North America. Workplace and job market issues continued to be the areas of greatest challenge for LGBTQ historians. A final report, including recommendations, will be issued soon.

At the CLGBTH business meeting, new leaders (in addition to the new co-chairs) stepped up, including Phil Meyer (Treasurer), Wesley Chenault (Secretary), and David Palmer and Jon Hoffman (Online Operations). We discussed launching online membership and donations (coming soon!) and the possibility of negotiating...
purchasing rights for the newsletter with an academic database company. To build our visibility, we proposed a larger presence at the Organization of American Historians and the National Women’s Studies Association annual conferences, as well as doing more outreach to conferences and affiliated societies with focus outside of the U.S. or in underrepresented fields, such as religious history. Finally, we discussed supporting LGBT history in K-12 education, sparked by the 2011 passage and 2012 implementation of California’s FAIR Act (SB48), which mandates such inclusion.

Since January, the Committee on LBGT History has been busy. I have been participating in the FAIR Act Implementation Task Force, a coalition of educators and advocates helping school districts, administrators, teachers, and students bring the history of LGBT people and people with disabilities into California’s K-12 curricula. We have been working with the Disability History Association on a joint resolution for AHA support of such inclusion.

At the request of the AHA’s 2013 Program Committee, we assembled a track of panels devoted to Southern LGBT history, in addition to organizing our usual affiliated panels. Thanks to all of you who will be sharing your diverse and groundbreaking work, New Orleans is going to have an even bigger queer presence than usual when the AHA rolls into town. We have also done outreach to the OAH and NWSA to seek co-sponsorship of panels at their upcoming conferences. And we have tried to keep our members and “fans” informed with an active presence on our listserv and Facebook page.

We also announced the winners of Allan Bérubé, Audre Lorde, and Gregory Sprague Prizes. You can find a story on the prizes and winners in the newsletter. We want to acknowledge our outstanding committees: Bérubé Prize Committee members included Marcia Gallo, Lauren Jae Guttermann, Kevin P. Murphy, and Joey Plaster. Sprague and Lorde Prizes Committee members included Julio Cesar Capo, Thomas A. Foster, and Claire Potter. We commend all entrants for their submissions, which are worthy of praise and make important contributions to LGBTQ history. Applause to the GLBT Historical Society in San Francisco for underwriting the Bérubé Prize and the Gerber/Hart Library in Chicago for funding the Sprague Prize.

Some more appreciation is order. Jennie and I would like to personally thank interim newsletter editors Tim Stewart-Winter and Whitney Strub, who stepped in this past year to take over one of our most popular projects. They overcame missed deadlines (mine), challenges over printing and mailing, and any number of tiny crises to get two issues over the finish line. Emily Hobson, our steadfast book reviews editor, also continued to deliver throughout all the transitions. Thanks, too, to our outgoing Governing Board members, Wesley Chenault and Nick Syrett. Wes stepped forward as secretary during a crucial phase, and Nick has been an all-around workhorse for the CLGBTH these past few years, most notably organizing conference reports from far and wide. (A note from Jennie: Since Don and I took over the co-chair position, Don has done all of the work, including writing this column, as I finish up an administrative stint at UIC. He has truly gone above and beyond the call of duty. So I want to give a special thanks to him. I will do my best to join in equal partnership with him starting this summer.)

Be sure to vote for our two next Governing Board members. The ballot is in the back. We wish all of our members restful, productive, and especially fabulous summers!

Don Romesburg (with Jennie Brier)
CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS:
2013 JOHN BOSWELL AND JOAN NESTLE PRIZES

The Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History, an affiliate society of the American Historical Association, will award the John Boswell and Joan Nestle Prizes in 2013. The John Boswell Prize for an outstanding book on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer history published in English in 2011 or 2012. The Joan Nestle Undergraduate Prize for an outstanding paper on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer history completed in English by an undergraduate student in 2011 or 2012.

Materials may be submitted by students, faculty, authors, readers, editors, or publishers. Self-nominations are encouraged. Send one copy of the nominated book or paper to each of the three members of the Prize Committee. Joan Nestle Undergraduate Prize submissions may be emailed to the committee members.

Dr. Margot Canaday, Chair
6922 Prince George's Ave.
Takoma Park, MD 20912
mcanaday@princeton.edu

Dr. Ben Cowan
Department of History and Art
History
Robinson Hall B, 359
4400 University Drive, MSN 3G1
Fairfax, VA 22030
ben.a.cowan@gmail.com

Cookie Woolner
271 Parkside Ave #B1
Brooklyn, NY 11226-1426
cwoolner@umich.edu

Mailed submissions must be postmarked by 31 October 2012; emailed submissions must be postmarked by 11:59pm (Pacific time), 31 October 2012. If you have questions about the prizes, please contact the Co-Chair of the Committee on LGBT History, Don Romesburg, at romesbur@sonoma.edu. Do not mail submissions to the CLGBTH Co-Chair.

UPCOMING CONFERENCES

http://web.gc.cuny.edu/clags/pages/conferences/hay.html

What is LGBT(Q) History and Where Do We Stand? – Queen Mary, University of London, November 7, 2012
http://whatislgbtqhistory.blogspot.co.uk/

National Women's Studies Association – November 8-11, 2012, Oakland
http://www.nwsa.org/content.asp?pl=15&contentid=15

American Studies Association – November 15-18, 2012, San Juan, Puerto Rico
http://www.theasa.net/annual_meeting/

American Historical Association – January 3-6, 2013, New Orleans
http://www.historians.org/annual/2013/index.cfm

Homonationalism and Pinkwashing (CLAGS) – April 10-11, 2013, New York
http://web.gc.cuny.edu/clags/pages/conferences/homonationalism.html

Organization of American Historians – April 11-14, 2013, San Francisco
http://annualmeeting.oah.org/call_for_proposals/2013_sanfrancisco.html

Critical Ethnic Studies Association – September 19-21, 2013, University of Illinois-Chicago (see CFP)
http://www.criticalethnicstudies.org/

“Big Berks” (Berkshire Conference on Women's History) – May 22-25, 2014, University of Toronto (see CFP)
The Prize Committee wrote: “Using Philadelphia as a case study, this article demonstrates that we cannot understand the longer history of gay and lesbian rights without reference to African Americans. The committee was especially impressed with how Mumford wrote a LGBTQ history that not only draws heavily on other literatures to conceptualize the evidence at hand, but also is written in such a way as to make it highly relevant to scholars in those related fields. The essay builds on and reconceptualizes work in LGBTQ history that is recognizing that communities are not discrete, homogenous, or necessarily in competition with each other; even though much of the evidence might suggest that they are.”


Gregory Sprague Prize
The Gregory Sprague Prize recognizes an outstanding published or unpublished LGBTQ history paper, article, book chapter, or dissertation chapter completed in English by a graduate student. The winner was Ryan Lee Cartwright, “Sissies, Strumpets, and Queer Old Maids: Eugenic Family Studies and the Perversion of the Rural Idyll,” Queering the Countryside: New Directions in U.S. Rural Queer Studies, ed. Mary Gray and Colin Johnson (under review with NYU Press).

The Prize Committee wrote: “This essay examines rural U.S. gender and sexual nonconformity by making use of eugenic fieldwork from the 1910s and 1920s. It operates at the intersections of queer studies, rural studies, gender studies, and disability studies and tells us a lot about how ideas about white sexual deviance in the hovel families—particularly ‘promiscuity’—cemented themselves into the minds of Progressive thinkers. The committee was especially impressed with Cartwright’s ability to read archival sources against the grain, a crucial technique for doing queer and other subaltern histories. It is also successful at unseating the pastoral, seeing intersectionality, and asking important questions: What is the language used when categories are not stable, what must be borrowed, and what are the consequences?”


The Bérubé, Lorbe, and Sprague Prizes are awarded in even-numbered years, covering work completed during the previous two years. Scholarly committees determined winners after an open nomination process. The CLGBTH received 11 submissions for the Bérubé Prize, 20 for the Lorbe Prize and 14 for the Sprague Prize.
Michael Bronski, A Queer History of the United States (Beacon Press, 2011); and Vicki Eaklor, Queer America: A People’s GLBT History of the United States (Greenwood, 2008; New Press, 2011)

Reviewed by Daniel Hurewitz (Hunter College, City University of New York)

LGBT U.S. historians should celebrate: we now have not just one, but two substantive textbooks designed to provide a structure and design for teaching a queered version of American history. The publication of Michael Bronski’s Queer History of the United States and Vicki Eaklor’s Queer America (which first appeared in 2008, but just arrived in affordable paperback) signals both the widening reach of LGBT historians and the growing presence of LGBT history classes at the college level. (With the recent passage of California’s FAIR Education Act, the demand for such texts may continue to grow.)

Both the Bronski and the Eaklor are very strong books, both take us much deeper than Leila Rupp’s lovely Desired Past, and both would be tremendously valuable accompaniments to an LGBT U.S. history course. Yet fundamentally, these texts invite us to teach two very different versions of that course. Though both are organized chronologically and cover overlapping material, the goals, style, and emphases of the books differ enough in key ways that a class based on one would diverge significantly from a class organized around the other.

Michael Bronski’s Queer History of the United States lays out a broad intellectual agenda with a wide chronological sweep. He sets out not simply to tell the stories of queer people and what they have accomplished for themselves, but to “queer” the traditional U.S. survey narrative. From Bronski’s perspective, that means re-narrating fundamental moments in American history from the perspective of sexuality and gender. He moves, over the course of ten chapters, from Puritan England to ACT UP, and steadily tries to make sexuality and gender feel like one of – if not the – primary way through which U.S. history should be understood.

By contrast, Vicki Eaklor’s Queer America has a much narrower intellectual and chronological focus. While she contextualizes her narrative within general U.S. history, her emphasis is much more on LGBT Americans, what they did, and how they were viewed. And her emphasis is almost exclusively on 20th-century America. Of her eight detailed and substantive chapters, the first races quickly from pre-contact Europe to late 19th-century sexologists; the remaining seven sift much more slowly through the last 100 or so years, identifying the political groups, social activities and cultural production that defined LGBT lives.

Read together, these two very different approaches throw into sharp relief the strengths and limitations of each.

Part of what’s lovely about Bronski’s book is simply its broad reach. The book’s organization rests largely on the standard narrative of American history: one chapter opens with the Civil War, another focuses on Progressive Era reform, another on World War II. Within that framework, he continually links LGBT material to wider developments in racial, economic, and especially gender history. He is aided in that effort by the scope of his own knowledge and his instincts for seeing cultural ties: he successfully weaves connections, for instance, between the likes of Emily Dickinson, Henry David Thoreau, various anarchists (beyond Emma Goldman), and Thomas Eakins. And while chronological specificity sometimes eludes him, Bronski’s skills as a writer assure that this is a well-told narrative history pulled together by a set of analytical arguments.

At its core, Bronski’s book argues for a gendered, sexualized, and embodied history of the United States. When we meet the Puritans, we meet them first and foremost as people with a sexual view: they were dissenters from the “sexually permissive behavior” of 17th-century England who, as they set up their own society in North America, were “determined to ensure that its members did not fall prey to the temptations and errors they had left behind” (7-8). Similarly, he offers an account of the slave trade that places great emphasis on how slavery both “reinforced and normalized mainstream society’s ideas about moral and sexual inferiority” (23), and expressed those ideas with “a pervasive culture of sexual humiliation, sexual harassment, and rape” (24). Slavery emerges, in his treatment, as a fundamentally sexual institution.

Bronski also regularly explores the shifting versions of masculinity and femininity that came to the fore in various eras, in a way that both illuminates the periods and helps better contextualize the more narrow LGBT historical material. For instance, in his fine chapter on World War II, he devotes a fair bit of time to discussing the gendered significance of women’s mass entrance into the workforce and the new visual displays of the strong yet vulnerable male body. By weaving this together with the more “traditional” material on LGBT men and women’s experience in the service – drawn largely from Allan Bérubé but also Margot Canaday and others – he very effectively illustrates the wide, dynamic changes taking place in American society and shows how LGBT individuals, and attitudes about them, were central to those changes.

In these ways, Bronski really does fulfill his promise of queering American history – of illuminating key moments of the U.S. past through the prism of gender and sexuality. If something is lost in his formula, it seems to be the deeper exploration of some mainstays of LGBT history. For instance, while there is some discussion of early 20th-century New York from George Chauncey, there is not an expansive portrait of the fairy world and its many players. Similarly, the butch-femme scene that Elizabeth Kennedy and Madeline Davis described – both in terms of structure and meaning – is referenced, but not deeply investigated. That seems to
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be the trade-off, though, in a volume of such wide scope that also examines major elements of the traditional American narrative.

Vicki Eaklor has written a very different sort of book, one that reads much more like a standard textbook. By focusing almost exclusively on the 20th-century, she avoids what she deems the “stickier problems” of the preceding centuries and focuses instead on the era that witnessed “the more common use of the homosexual/heterosexual binary” (xi). Within that timeframe, her aim is to be comprehensive, almost encyclopedic, in giving students the essential elements of LGBT American history, and she has designed the book to be taught. She opens with a 14-page timeline that ranges from the 1892 murder of Freda Ward by Alice Mitchell to the 2009 declaration of Frank Kameny’s home as a historic site. Each chapter concludes with a debate for students to wrangle with, as well as a list of suggested sources. This book very clearly sets out to be the backbone of a history course.

As such, the book is plainly a success. Queer America is tightly organized and dense with people, events, and information. The material that Eaklor really sinks her teeth into begins with the twentieth century — after the race from conquest to the Gilded Age — and the details of LGBT living spring from the page. Here are the lesbian Progressive reformers and the New York fairies. Here is the queer Harlem Renaissance and Henry Gerber’s Society for Human Rights. Here are the early gay bathhouses and the lesbian-led salons.

While in comparison to Bronski, Eaklor aims much more narrowly at things LGBT, she gives a greater sense of the breadth of LGBT experience. For instance, in her chapter on Cold War America, after setting up the suburban gender norms of the era, she spends a fair bit of time not only on the Lavender Scare, but also on the place of LGBT artists in the larger culture, including Tennessee Williams on Broadway, Tab Hunter in film, and even Liberace on stage. In her chapter on the 1980s, she not only offers an account of AIDS and AIDS activism, but also explains the shifting rise of NGLTF and HRC, really digging into the “inside baseball” queer political history of that era. Uniquely, she gives clear accounts of the careers of various LGBT elected officials: who was elected when, who came out when, and to what effect. And unlike Bronski, she carries her account to the very recent past, with Lawrence v. Texas and the debates over marriage.

There is a feeling with Eaklor that everything is in here, and it is exciting to see the scholarship of the last 35 years distilled so effectively. (Indeed, part of the fun of reading both these books was finding the many passages where they had synthesized the work of various friends and colleagues: I had multiple moments of delighted recognition including — full disclosure — a couple of footnotes to my own book.) It’s heartening to know that if you were using Eaklor in a class, whether your own interests rested more on the social, cultural, or political elements of a particular era, Eaklor would provide the basic nuggets to ground both your own focus and the material you were not emphasizing. You can count on her for specificity as well as breadth.

Compared with Bronski, Eaklor does less to offer overarching narratives or arguments to hold the book together as a whole. While she draws comparisons, say, between the cultural politics of the 1950s and the 1920s, or repeatedly highlights how frequently political groups divided over tactics, she provides less a sense of a few key defining elements to organize these 100 or so years. But that, again, seems to be the necessary trade-off in offering this type of more encyclopedic account.

As I read through both volumes, I found myself thinking about what it would be like to teach with them. Setting aside the differing timeframes, one thing is clear for both: neither book slows down enough to take you deeply inside particular moments and so, either in lecture, through visuals, or close readings of primary documents, you would still need to provide that focus. If you taught Bronski’s book, you could frame the class within his broader arguments about race, gender, and sexuality, and then provide some of the LGBT-specific detail that he has left out. If you taught Eaklor’s volume, you might do the opposite: while drawing attention to some handful of her events to flesh them out further, your task would be to construct an overarching set of arguments that held those developments together. In part, choosing between them might mean deciding which kind of a course you wanted to teach.

But either choice would be a good one. And that’s wonderful to see — both that our field now merits a textbook, and that we have two strong options from which to choose.


Reviewed by Shane Landrum (Brandeis University)

In Perversion for Profit, historian Whitney Strub argues that the United States Supreme Court under Earl Warren liberalized obscenity regulation without explicitly defending this shift, and that this series of judicial choices smoothed the road for the rise of the New Right. Strub, an assistant professor at Rutgers University, Newark, joins a growing number of historians who are reassessing the Warren Court’s decisions on sexuality with a critical eye. His book sits especially nicely alongside Marc Stein’s recent work Sexual Injustice, which focuses on the Warren Court’s decisions against LGBT rights. Strub’s analysis complements that book and will be of considerable interest to scholars of U.S. sexual politics, legal history, conservatism, and grassroots political organizing more generally.

Strub recounts his story in eight chapters and begins in post-World War II Los Angeles, where, he argues, enforcements of obscenity law were targeted primarily at public expressions of homosexuality. Throughout the book, he argues that marginal sexual subcultures have consistently been targets of obscenity-law enforcement and that this pushed gays and lesbians, especially, to take strong stands on obscenity law. Further, he holds, 20th-century liberalism never adopted opposition to anti-homosexual obscenity prosecutions into its normatively-heterosexual core. By not arguing for a specific constitutional right to sexual free expression, midcentury liberals betrayed their otherwise vigorous defense of First Amendment rights.

The second chapter explores a series of Supreme Court decisions that dramatically reshaped obscenity law in the mid-1960s without ever producing a coherent statement of legal doctrine. In effect, the Warren Court liberalized obscenity law on a case-by-case basis without ever mounting a strong First Amendment defense of its choices. By the time Thurgood Marshall wrote his first Supreme
Court opinion in Stanley v. Georgia (1969), the court had carved out a principle that media of prurient interest was legally protected unless made available to minors or advertised in pandering ways. This “consenting adults” standard for obscenity enforcement enjoyed wide if tacit public support and fueled a commercial boom in sexually explicit media.

The middle four chapters explain how conservatives mobilized against the increasing availability of pornography. Chapter 3 focuses on the titular work, Perversion for Profit, a 1963 film by the conservative group Citizens for Decent Literature (CDL). CDL’s national office effectively repackaged Catholic concerns about media decency in secular guise, then organized grassroots chapters around the nation. By explaining how CDL redisplayed and publicized sexually explicit mass media imagery in the interest of creating what they themselves termed an “aroused public” (85), Strub shows that sexual expression worked far more effectively as a catalyst for the Right than for the left. This chapter, with its nod to Foucault, would make excellent reading for an undergraduate course, especially when paired with the film (now freely available on the Internet Archive).

In his fourth chapter, Strub describes how the ready availability of sexually explicit material, combined with liberals’ weak defenses of prurient expression as mere “free speech,” provided the nascent New Right with a near-boundless source of political capital. Given liberals’ faint praise for sexual expression, the right’s cries of a “floodtide of filth” only became more effective as popular culture became increasingly sexualized. “Damning the floodtide carried more political salience than damming it,” Strub asserts (119).

By the late 1960s, the basic elements of a political strategy centered around “the political capital of moralism” had coalesced (119). Strub sees these early conservative victories as triumphs of style over substance, since their practical effects on obscenity policy were minimal. At the same time, by the late 1960s and early 1970s, mainstream American media culture enjoyed a brief moment of “porno chic,” as Strub details in Chapter 5. Sexually explicit media became so widespread that the Catholic Church’s Office of Motion Pictures termed some pornography acceptable, declaring that three X-rated films were “morally unobjectionable for adults, with reservations” (148).

Even so, this period did not last. Pulled to power by the New Right, the Nixon administration substantially limited the legal gains of sexual liberals. The Rehnquist Court, which included four Nixon-appointed justices, rolled back liberal rulings on obscenity regulation beginning in the summer of 1973. As Chapter 6 details, the final element of the Right’s political success developed in the late 1970s, after Jimmy Carter’s successful presidential run legitimized the use of faith in presidential electoral politics. The evangelical Democrat’s liberal views on abortion backfired politically as Christian conservatives mobilized against the Democratic Party. Increasing numbers of voters flocked to the polls convinced that the Republican Party would take a conservative stand on sexual matters, including the increasingly visible place of commercialized sexual media in American culture.

In a slight departure from the rest of the book, Chapter 7 explores the rise of anti-porn feminism, which allied the moralism of the New Right with liberal condemnation of the exploitation of women. Strub identifies lesbian feminists as key resisters to the feminist anti-pornography movement, noting that sexually explicit works for, by, and about lesbians were among the most commonly targeted by obscenity prosecutions even after the era of “porno chic.” As anti-porn feminists gained access to academia and popular media, feminist-inspired critiques became a mainstay of conservative rhetoric. As true in many aspects of 20th century U.S. politics, the left and right identified similar structural ills, even if the underlying motivations for their critiques were wildly divergent.

In his final chapter, Strub explores how the conservative ascendency created what he terms a “vanilla hegemony,” a political climate that effectively prevented even cultural liberals such as Bill Clinton from pushing back against stricter obscenity regulation. As in 1940s and 1950s Los Angeles, sexual subcultures found themselves the targets of obscenity law because liberals refused to take a strong stand for the constitutional right to prurient free expression.

Perversion for Profit draws on published sources in popular and subcultural media, including feminist small presses, as well as archival collections of conservative and liberal organizations. Its use of legal cases is amply researched and solid, making it potentially useful as a reading for legal history courses. The sources are generally well-cited, and they include important pointers to the papers of the Committee for Decent Literature, the sex-workers’-rights organization COYOTE, and anti-pornography groups Women Against Violence Against Women (WAVAW) and Women Against Pornography (WAP).

Many members of the Committee for LGBT History, and queer historians more broadly, will find this book of interest. Though the book’s major focus is not specifically on homophile, gay, or lesbian sexual representation, Strub highlights the government repression of queer sexual expression as a consistent feature of anti-obscenity crusades; this makes a significant contribution to LGBT history. Given his argument that “[i]n the fundamentalist worldview homosexuality itself qualified as pornographic” (194), one wonders whether transgender-oriented media, sexually explicit or not, faced obscenity prosecutions at similar rates. Also, given the role of publications like Physique Pictorial in the consolidation of “gay” political identities, some discussion of transgender sexual representations might have broadened his argument’s relevance to the history of transgender political organizing. Strub’s handling of religion could use more nuance; he makes occasional slippages between “evangelical” and “fundamentalist” and extends relatively little attention to liberal Christians’ stances on sexualized media. Finally and unfortunately, a few editing errors mar the book, most notably a mistitling of 2 Live Crew’s famously-prosecuted 1989 album As Nasty As They Wanna Be. Yet Strub’s exploration of the historically-specific “political capital of moralism” (116) will be useful to a broad range of scholars studying conservative resistance to LGBT civil rights and cultural visibility. By demonstrating how the deregulation of pornography paradoxically bolstered the rise of the New Right, Strub has done the historical profession a valuable service. This is a fine book worthy of a wide scholarly readership.

Justin Spring, Secret Historian: The Life and Times of Samuel Steward, Professor, Tattoo Artist, and Sexual Renegade (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2010)

Reviewed by Catherine Batza (University of Illinois at Chicago)

Justin Spring’s Secret Historian chronicles one man’s incredible sexual and professional adventures in the 20th century United
States. Making impressive use of an archival windfall most historians only know in their dreams, Spring traces the unlikely lives of Samuel Steward and his pseudonyms Phil Andros, Phil Sparrow, and others. Spring is a skilled biographer and writer and his book provides direction to, if not much analysis of, Steward's surprising, depressing, and sometimes stilltlling life story.

Born in 1909, Sam Steward grew up under the watchful eyes of his two maiden and deeply religious aunts in the boarding house they ran in Woodsfield, Ohio. This was an unlikely setting for the life that followed. In his teens, Steward began his work as a “sexual renegade,” record keeper, and writer; these pursuits sustained and directed him for the remainder of his life. Spring depicts Steward as a witty if often depressed man who constantly struggled to combine his passions for sex, documenting, and writing in a society that deemed having homosexual sex, collecting homosexual paraphernalia, and distributing homosexual writings criminal. Around the age of 13, Steward started a meticulously maintained “stud file,” a coded, indexed, and cross-referenced card catalogue of all of his sexual encounters. As a young adult, he pursued a career in academia, living a highly compartmentalized double life. Frustrated by what he felt to be the exploitation and moral prudery of academia, he then created a new, somewhat less incompatible, double life for himself as a tattoo artist and Kinsey research contributor. He gained satisfaction from intimate, although rarely sexual, physical interactions with the men requesting tattoos, as “a great deal of its allure came directly out of his gut sense that what he was doing was profoundly bad, sinful, and wrong” (211). Meanwhile, his contributions to Kinsey’s sex research brought him intellectual gratification. Eventually, in his 50s, Steward combined his three interests by drawing from his own extensive sexual history to write gay pulp fiction and pornography. This unconventional career trajectory – from Catholic university English professor to tattoo artist, pornographic fiction writer, and finally Gertrude Stein biographer – drew an equally motley crew of friends and correspondents, ranging from Stein to the Hell’s Angels’ motorcycle gang and from Alfred Kinsey to Thornton Wilder.

Steward’s papers and writings provide a new perspective for historians of gay community and sex in the middle decades of the 20th century, as they are related neither to a political organization nor to correspondence between longtime lovers. Rather, Spring has mined Steward’s own account of gay sexual culture as well as his struggles with an oppressive and persecuting state and society. Given that he lived from 1909 to 1993, Steward’s writings chart the ways that many men who were sexually active with other men experienced the Comstock laws, World War II, McCarthyism, the shifts of the 1960s and 1970s, and the early AIDS crisis.

Secret Historian is an engaging, rich, and beautifully written biography. However, even as an accomplished and skilled biographer Spring fails to bring the context and analysis to Steward’s life that a historian would. Spring casts Steward as an already liberated hero who refused to “submit to a form of social oppression he knew to be unjust” (410). Yet Steward’s internal battles with addiction, religion, self-destruction, loneliness, and marginalization reflect themes common to many homosexuals in the pre-gay liberation period. Without a more thorough cultivation of Steward’s historical context Spring’s portrayal of a heroic Steward is an over-simplification that often conflicts with Steward’s own actions and introspections. Nonetheless, Spring’s work makes many contributions to the field of LGBT history. Reiterating work by John Howard, Marc Stein, Anne Enke, Jennifer Pierce, and E. Patrick Johnson and others, Spring illustrates that homosexual life flourished beyond the coastal confines of New York and San Francisco (as the vast majority of Steward’s nearly 5,000 sexual encounters occurred in other sites). Chicago’s prominence in Steward’s life also lends weight to the growing body of literature that highlights that city’s rich LGBT history.

Secret Historian’s greatest gift to LGBT history lies in that it whets the appetite for future scholarship in the field. Readers of Secret Historian will undoubtedly finish the book wanting to know more, if not about Steward, than certainly about the worlds in which he lived, worked, and cruised. While Chauncey’s Gay New York and Kevin Mumford’s Interzones introduced the complex sexual cultures of pre-World War II New York and Chicago, Steward’s biography suggests that there remains much more to understand about the intersections of race, class, gender, and sexuality during this period. Steward’s position as an accepted interloper among his tattoo clientele offers new dimensions to the questions of how people crossed economic and racial boundaries for primarily sexual purposes. Spring also sheds new light on the significance of Alfred Kinsey, as the researcher’s importance both in Steward’s life and Spring’s book cannot be overstated. Kinsey served as a father figure to Steward and inspired him to become more meticulous and detailed in his record keeping as he left academia for the tattoo parlor. Spring excavates material both from Steward’s records and some of Kinsey’s, and while Spring laments about being barred access to many of Kinsey’s documents, he also demonstrates how one can circumvent this obstacle with other archival materials. Further, Spring reveals that postwar legal decisions about sodomy and censorship proved in many ways far more liberating for Steward, or men of Steward’s generation, than Stonewall or gay liberation. This interpretation warrants greater exploration as it adds age to the race, class, and gender trifecta of analysis generally explored by existing scholarly literature. Through Steward’s older lens, gay liberation appears as a long awaited movement that ultimately excludes him. Finally, Steward’s life provides a rare window into the small but vibrant S/M communities of the post-war period as well as their relationship to gay liberation. These possibilities for further research literally jump off the pages and suggest a rich future for LGBT research.

Secret Historian is an incredible, if ultimately depressing, biography and a treasure trove of potential research topics; it will prove invaluable for both graduate students and scholars. However, the book’s broad appeal and easy prose does not make up for the lack of analysis and minimal historical context needed to work well in most undergraduate history classes. Despite the limited historical analysis and context, Secret Historian displays Spring’s prodigious skill as a researcher and writer as he recreates the riveting and tragic life of Steward, a man obsessed with sex, documentation, and writing.


Reviewed by Sara Smith (UC Santa Cruz)

My Desire for History is an important and incisive contribution to queer studies and queer history. John D’Emilio and Estelle Freedman have done a superb job of curating Allan Bérubé’s writings, crafting a poignant tribute to their friend and colleague, an activist-scholar and community historian who died suddenly and
tragically in 2007. Readers of this newsletter will almost certainly know Bérubé for Coming Out Under Fire (1990), still the definitive treatment of the transformative impact of World War II on gay men and lesbians. Thanks to D'Emilio and Freedman, we can now (re)read Bérubé's other influential published works, alongside unpublished excerpts from his never-finished book project on the Marine Cooks and Stewards Union, a radical, anti-racist, democratic, and queer-inflected labor union whose heyday lasted from the 1930s through the 1950s.

My Desire for History is organized into four sections, each of which exemplifies Allan Bérubé's valuable contributions to queer studies. But first the reader is treated to D'Emilio and Freedman's informative and biographical introduction. The editors recount Bérubé's coming to political awareness in the 1960s, first in the anti-Vietnam war and then in the gay liberation movements, before considering his career as an independent community historian who helped to create the field of gay and lesbian history. One of the strengths of the introduction is its emphasis on the grassroots nature of the founding of this new field in the 1970s, born out of the tumult of feminist and gay liberation movements. Bérubé was one among a number of activists and independent scholars who helped get queer history off the ground, including by establishing the San Francisco Gay and Lesbian History Project in 1979.

Part I, “A Community Historian: Exploring Queer History,” comprises Bérubé's writings about the history of San Francisco. Bérubé's political commitments pushed him to employ history to provide lessons about contemporary political issues, and as a community historian, he believed in bringing this history to a broad audience rather than confining it to academic venues. “Lesbian Masquerade,” for instance, tells the story of “women who passed as men” in nineteenth-century San Francisco and is an adaptation of a slideshow lecture he showed around the country (41). This essay was also first published, as many of his writings were, in the popular press – in this case the Boston-based Gay Community News in 1979. Bérubé wrote another selection, “Resorts for Sex Perverts: a History of Gay Bathhouses,” as the AIDS epidemic deepened in the mid-1980s. He counters calls to shut down gay bathhouses by arguing that, historically, bathhouses helped to create gay community and thus are important sites of resistance. Rather than shaming gay people for their sexuality, “bathhouses should be used as a community resource to promote safe sex and safe sex education” (79).

In Part II, “A National Historian: Reexamining World War II,” D'Emilio and Freedman include four pieces that showcase Bérubé's insight into the significant impact of the war, not only as it occurred but also carrying into the early Cold War. Thus, “the Military and Lesbians during the McCarthy Years” explores the repressive atmosphere of McCarthyism that induced the military to purge thousands of lesbians from its ranks. This chapter also demonstrates the importance Bérubé placed on including lesbians in a history with the potential to be exclusively male-centered.

Part III contains a few of the most interesting and expressive essays of the book, pieces that are both self-reflective and theoretical. For example, “Caught in the Storm: AIDS and the Meaning of Natural Disaster,” is a personal reflection on the meaning of the epidemic from the perspective of a survivor. Bérubé's partner, Brian Keith, died of AIDS in 1987. Bérubé published “Caught in the Storm” in 1988 at a time when militant AIDS activism was intensifying, and takes issue with attempts to impose meaning on the epidemic by both left and the right. As he eloquently wrote, “few of us respond to this epidemic without fear and confusion, without love, without anger, and without aching to know why. It is the rough patchwork of all our responses, not the disease itself, that gives meaning to our lives as we weather this terrible storm” (158).

The chapters in part three reflect Bérubé's scholarly and political evolution over the years, as he became determined to place the categories of class, race, and ethnicity at the center of his analysis of queer history and queer politics. One of the most incisive essays in the book is “How Gay Stays White and What Kind of White It Stays,” originally published in 2001. Bérubé takes on the difficult task of critiquing the excessive whiteness of the “gay movement” and “gay communities,” arguing that we must address white privilege and commit ourselves to anti-racism. He expresses distress at the ways in which the gay movement has been constructed as white and male, not only by the political right, but also the movement itself. Political “whitening practices,” as Bérubé calls them, involve a narrowing of goals and strategies from “fighting for liberation, freedom, and social justice to expressing personal pride, achieving visibility, and lobbying for individual equality within existing institutions” (203). The inevitable result is that struggles against racism become elided as not strictly gay. However, as Bérubé convincingly argues, “when anti-gay barriers and attitudes are broken down but no other power relations are changed, we (gay white men) are the ones most likely to achieve full integration into the present social and political structure. All it takes sometimes is being the white man at the white place at the white time” (244).

This essay is not only insightful theoretically, but draws strength from Bérubé's talent for making his writing approachable even when addressing a potentially difficult-to-understand topic. Bérubé uses his own experiences to understand the gay white, and mostly male, communities and groups of which he was a part, and displays an impressive skill for using self-reflection to draw larger lessons. Bérubé writes, “I hope that, by occupying the seeming contradictions between the ‘antiracist’ and the ‘gay white male’ parts of myself, I can generate a creative tension that will motivate me to keep fighting” (225). This straightforward revelation of his political commitments and the personal and accessible nature of his writing make him unique in the scholarly world.

The fourth and final part of the anthology, “A Labor Historian: Queering Work and Class,” includes some of Bérubé's most valuable contributions to queer studies. In “‘Queer Work and Labor History,” originally published in 1996, he points out that labor historians have analyzed how work has been both racialized and gendered, but not how “work has increasingly been 'homosexualized' as queer work, or 'heterosexualized' as straight work or even antigay work, such as military service” (261). Fifteen years later, it remains true that labor history, with the important exception of work by scholars like Miriam Frank, largely excludes queer work. Similarly, while queer historians have examined the formation of working-class queer communities, they have not looked at queer work itself or labor organizing by queer workers. This section of My Desire for History provides an essential corrective to both queer and labor history.

D'Emilio and Freedman have also honored Bérubé's work by including some of his unpublished research on the queer and radical Marine Cooks and Stewards Union (MCSU). In the selection “Trying to Remember,” which explores the stories of both gay and straight men in the MCSU, Bérubé experimented methodologically by injecting himself as the interviewer into the narrative. This personalizes the experience of conducting oral

Reviewed by Pamela Edwards (Shepherd University)

*A Saving Remnant* has much to offer historians of the twentieth century as well as those specializing in the recent LGBT and queer past. Duberman's book is closely allied with John D'Emilio's *Lost Prophet: The Life and Times of Bayard Rustin* both in terms of time period and in the distinct distance all three of these gay American leftists kept from the gay and lesbian movement as it took shape in the 1970s and 1980s. This is not to say that Rustin, Deming, or McReynolds did not support gay and lesbian rights groups, but they never became leaders or prominent spokespersons for these organizations or made gay and lesbian politics their foremost concern. Instead, like Bayard Rustin, Deming and McReynolds' lives help to document the diverse history of the American left, which is too often missing from the mainstream national narrative. Further, they fulfill Duberman's goal of revealing the presence of homosexuals among the “saving remnant,” or “that small number of people neither indoctrinated nor frightened into accepting oppressive social conditions . . . [those who] openly challenge the reigning powers—that be and speak out early and passionately against injustice . . . to awaken and mobilize others to join in the struggle for a more benevolent, egalitarian society” (xi). Duberman's pride in the American left comes through across the text, as does his pride in the prominent role played by gays and lesbians in these courageous efforts to “reconstitute the world” (Adrienne Rich).

Barbara Deming and David McReynolds were friends and colleagues whose activism spanned from the 1930s into the twenty-first century. As the feminist movement took shape, Deming became an outspoken theorist who struggled for the right to create women-only spaces where female voices could be heard outside patriarchal systems. Her activist feminism was closely aligned with her ongoing devotion to the anti-nuclear and peace movements. As Duberman emphasizes, she was as much—perhaps even more—a strategist for nonviolence as she was for feminist concerns. Meanwhile, McReynolds enconced himself in the War Resisters League (WRL) for over thirty years and identified strongly with the Socialist Party, running as its candidate for U.S. President in 2000.

As in D'Emilio’s biography of Rustin, Duberman’s biography of Deming and McReynolds introduces the reader to conscientious objectors imprisoned during World War II, protests against nuclear weapon testing in the 1940s and 1950s, international peace activism during the most belligerent years of the Cold War, and the very earliest efforts to stop American involvement in Vietnam. All these events took place years before the mass student movements of the late 1960s. Deming and McReynolds participated in all these efforts, and their radical lives help to illustrate and document an alternative understanding of the recent past. Their activism demonstrates alternatives to every mainstream political decision or direction and reveals the breadth and continuity of leftist radicalism in the United States from the 1950s through the present.

However, while *A Saving Remnant* effectively adds to this alternative narrative, D’Emilio’s *Lost Prophet* does a better job of contextualizing the actions taken and the lives led by this leftist minority. Without a firm grounding in the broader context, the significance and the incredible difficulty of what these men and women on the left sought to achieve and the powerful forces that they went up against does not come through as clearly as it might. In Duberman’s biography, Deming and McReynolds’ life stories too often become a listing of events unattached to the broader insanity of Cold War saber rattling, the debate over nuclear weaponry and energy, or the people living and dying through wars in Korea, Vietnam and all over the globe. Similarly, Duberman does not convey the significance or full extent of their involvement in an international network of peace and disarmament organizations.

Those looking for an exploration of LGBT community activism will find bits and pieces of interest in this dual biography. McReynolds was aware of the homophile movement in the 1950s and apparently dropped into a few gatherings, but he could not get excited about the cautious approach of its leadership. Duberman suggests that McReynolds stood outside of the gay male community for most of his life, seemingly unable to identify with the bar scene in New York and tending to distance himself from most cultural expressions of queerness. Likewise, while he welcomed the Stonewall rebellion and the more public and political activism it fostered, he participated only in passing and only much later in his life. Barbara Deming is more readily connected to lesbian rights and, more specifically, to the women’s land movement of the 1970s and 1980s. She and her partner are widely recognized for their organization of Sugarloaf Women’s Village and for their close association with Blue Lunden and other prominent lesbian feminist activists who shared and helped to foster a woman-centered worldview. Thus her commitment to lesbianism, as for many women in this era, was closely tied to, if not indistinguishable from, her commitment to feminism and women's rights. It should be noted that both Deming and McReynolds experienced discrimination because of their homosexuality, including tensions with their parents and families of origin, difficulties in finding publishers, and struggles over pathological definitions of homosexuality presented by psychologists. Moreover, they were both “out” at a time when most homosexuals were not so courageous.

The most significant sections of the book may be Duberman’s exploration of the correspondence between McReynolds and Deming on the subject of feminism. While the tension between feminism and other sectors of the American left has been
addressed elsewhere, Duberman provides unique insights into how two prominent spokespersons squared off on the issue, as well as how they often became frustrated with one another. McReynolds resisted Deming's feminist critique of the War Resisters League (WRL) and interpreted the idea of women's land as separatist and unacceptable. Deming was upset by his response and attempted to clarify her views, as she was prone to do, engaging him in debate through correspondence. One wonders, briefly, about Duberman's objectivity in presenting this dialogue when he notes that “Barbara's view... was that not enough attention was being paid, especially to contemporary feminists.” To decide what ‘enough’ meant would have required several Solomons” (205). But he allows Deming to address McReynolds’ accusation that she was a lesbian separatist in her own voice: “I have never given myself that name... I do feel strongly that for a time women must talk above all among ourselves, act above all together” (206).

Duberman examined extensive archival materials to craft this book, including the Deming collections at both Boston University and Harvard’s Schlesinger Library and McReynolds’ papers at the Swarthmore Peace Center. Fourteen other archival collections are listed in the endnotes, which are also extensive. A Saving Remnant contributes to the expanding effort to document LGBT contributions to the historical narrative and could be a useful addition to graduate seminars considering post-World War II politics, civil rights activism or peace studies. LGBT studies seminars, graduate or undergraduate, might find this dual biography an instructive way to explore relationships as well as tensions between lesbians and gay men within activist circles, particularly as they relate to feminist theory and activism.


Reviewed by William A. Peniston (The Newark Museum)

Brian Joseph Martin opens his book Napoleonic Friendship with this sentence: “Napoleon wept.” By this short dramatic statement, he captures the emotional intensity that Napoleon Bonaparte felt for many of his leading comrades-in-arms. It was an intensity based upon “increased intimacy, mutual respect, and fraternal support” that military theorists, including Colonel Charles Ardent du Picq (1819-1870) and Marshal Hubert Lyautey (1854-1934), have argued was conducive to “stronger armies and greater success in combat” (5). Throughout the nineteenth century, many artists, novelists, and memoirists celebrated this model of military friendship – a model based in part on ancient and medieval stories. Martin analyzes these artistic and literary depictions, discussing the homosocial, homoerotic, and homosexual aspects of Napoleonic friendship and making a remarkable contribution to historical, literary, military, and queer studies.

In the first part of the book – the first three chapters – Martin examines the artwork of Jacques-Louis David, the careers of three of Bonaparte’s top generals, and memoirs by three ordinary soldiers. His analysis of David’s paintings is brilliant, providing an insightful reading of his portrayal of fraternal oaths in ancient history and literature and his heroic interpretation of Napoleon’s career. All of this work resonated powerfully with the citizen-soldiers of the French Revolution. Too bad he did not include illustrations of the artworks themselves. Whereas David’s paintings provide “a visual vocabulary for military fraternity” (27), Napoleon’s own relationships to Marshal Lannes, General Duroc, and General Junot provide “exemplary and cautionary models for men throughout Napoleon’s armies” (41). The former two men were lifelong friends of the Emperor whose deaths in battle deeply moved him. His private grief was very publicly displayed on these occasions, and it added to the myth of his intense devotion to his men. Junot’s friendship was a little more one-sided, especially toward the end of his career when his head wound became the cause of some rather erratic behavior. As the Governor of the Illyrian Provinces, Junot once appeared at a state function with nothing on except his military medals. Subconsciously (or consciously), he was displaying his war wounds to the assembled dignitaries. As Martin so eloquently summarizes, “The scarred body that astonished the Illyrian ladies that evening was the body of a battered lover who had sacrificed his youth and vitality to a violent and abusive man” (63). In this remarkable sentence, Martin points out that the soldiers’ love for Napoleon was not always reciprocated. Furthermore, he suggests that this love sometimes blurred the boundaries between the homosocial, the homoerotic, and the homosexual.

From the experiences of the elites, Martin moves onto the memoirs of the rank and file. Specifically, he looks at the autobiographical writings of General Marbot, who began his military training as a common soldier despite his high-ranking family background, and Captain Coignet and Sergeant Bourgogne, both of whom were more representative of the Napoleonic conscripts. All three of them discuss their camarades de lit (bedfellows), intime amis (trusted buddies), familiar pays (hometown friends), and admired mentors. These four different types of relationships sustained these men during periods of prosperity as well as, and most significantly, during periods of adversity. Wounded at the Battle of Eylau in 1807 and again in Spain in 1809, Marbot was first saved by a soldier whom he mentored and then nursed by his own former drill sergeant. Meanwhile, Coignet and his bedfellows shared not only the warmth of their bodies but their food as well, and this shared intimacy helped them all survive the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian campaigns. Likewise, for Bourgogne, the inhumanity of war stood in contrast to a commitment to his fellow soldiers.

For the historian, the first part of Martin’s book is particularly useful because he manages to use a variety of sources – military guides on theory and practice, eyewitness accounts, memoirs and autobiographies, as well as artworks – to discuss military friendships in their broad historical context. Too bad he does not continue this approach throughout the rest of his book. Instead, he focuses on military novels and stories by Stendhal, Hugo, Balzac, Maupassant, and Zola, which treat military friendship at times in critical and at times in celebratory terms. Occasionally he treats the characters of these novels and stories almost as if they were historical persons. This is particularly confusing after the first part of the book, which does indeed deal with the lived experiences of individuals. It is important to realize that fictional characters can do certain things that living individuals cannot because their lives take place within the minds of the authors. Living individuals, on the other hand, are very much circumscribed by the historical realities of their times and places. Nevertheless, Martin is right to suggest that fictional characters resonate profoundly with readers when readers can come to believe, even momentarily, in the verisimilitude of the characters’ lives. Despite this blurring of the literary and the historical, his analysis of these works is quite astute, and demonstrates how the authors both drew upon and contributed to myths of Napoleonic friendship.
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For example, Stendhal’s character Fabrice del Dongo in the Charterhouse of Parma wants so badly to belong to a group of men devoted to one another and to a noble cause that he ran away to fight in the Battle of Waterloo, only to have one misadventure after another. He eventually finds his “band of brothers” later in life, in the monastery rather than the military. Meanwhile, Hugo’s characters Colonel Pontmercy and Sergeant Thénardier “represent the worst of veteran abuse in post-Napoleonic France” (143). Pontmercy dies an impoverished and lonely old man, forgotten by the country that he had served so well but befriended by the Abbé Mabeuf; Thénardier, the grave robber who saves Pontmercy’s life at Waterloo, survives as a profiteer. Their sons, Marius Pontmercy and Gavroche Thénardier, on the other hand, “announce the rebirth of republican fraternity” by fighting and dying side by side on the barricades of 1832 (183).

Balzac is the most prolific writer Martin examines, and most of his military characters embody the benefits and occasional pitfalls of Napoleonic friendships. Major Hulot is “distinguished, wealthy, and handsome,” an old bachelor who “lived his entire life in the service of his fellow soldiers” (173). Colonel Chabert is abandoned by his wife, who thinks him dead, but not by his veteran friends who provide him with “solace and shelter” (188). Major Genestas forms a lasting partnership with Dr. Benassis, whereas Colonel Bridau rejects the model of Napoleonic friendship out of frustration and resentment over his treatment in Restoration France. All four struggle diligently to find their way back into civil society, some successfully and some unsuccessfully, after the intensities of the wars.

In the final chapter, Martin discusses the short stories, novels, and poetry of Maupassant, Zola, and their contemporaries in the last third of the nineteenth century. Writing during the Third Republic and after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, these men were able to move beyond the ideal of Napoleonic friendship to portray more ambiguous relationships where homoeroticism and homosexuality were no longer well-guarded secrets. Especially in the relationship between Jean Macquart and Maurice Levasseur in The Debacle, Martin finds “a bridge between Balzac’s Napoleonic buddies and Proust’s First World War lovers, or more broadly between the warrior lovers of antiquity and the homosexual soldiers of modernity” (254). In some respects he overstates his case in this section, but does so in a very thoughtful way.

Martin’s book is well worth reading because he highlights the homosocial, homoerotic, and homosexual aspects of military life that have so long existed, despite the claims of some who wish to deny it. He does so in a way that provokes readers to rethink basic assumptions. Perhaps readers will be encouraged to reread (or to read for the first time) some of the memoirs and novels that he analyzes. If so, they will not be disappointed. Martin’s foregrounding of nineteenth-century literature will lead some to reexamine ancient and medieval texts, and his epilogue on Proust and the First World War will cause others to pursue the meanings of military friendship in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

2011 MEMBER PUBLICATIONS

Following are self-reported publications from 2011 by members of the CLGBTH in the broad field of LGBT history, including the history of gender and sexuality, LGBT studies, and queer theory.


Alex Warner

As a scholar of modern US sexuality, both my academic and personal public history work focuses on queer history and helping to ensure that that history is reclaimed, preserved and disseminated. I see the CLGBTH as an important organization that also works to that end and for that reason, I am running for a position on the Board.

Currently a Visiting Assistant Professor at the University of Iowa, I completed my Ph.D. in Women and Gender and U.S. History at Rutgers University in 2011. My dissertation, “‘Where Angels Fear to Tread’: Feminism, Sex and the Problem of SM, 1969-1993,” is the first academic study of lesbian sado-masochists. I am currently working on revising my dissertation for publication as a book project that explores the development of the lesbian SM community, its impact on the feminist and queer communities and American sexuality more broadly. I am also currently working on an invited chapter for a forthcoming anthology on the impact of pornography in the 1970s.

As part and parcel of my academic work, I have worked to ensure representation at various local and national conferences. At the recent 2012 American Historical Association (AHA) meeting, I hosted a tour for the CLGBTH of the exhibit on women’s history that I curated at the Leather Archives & Museum in Chicago. Last June, I organized a panel on Leatherwomen’s history for 2011 Berkshire Conference on Women’s History and, at the 2007 AHA meeting, I organized and presented at a panel focused exclusively on lesbian history.

Outside the classroom, I was a founding member of a graduate Feminist Activist Collective and graduate LGBTQ groups at Rutgers—and I am proud of our successful campaign to remove sexist and homophobic language from a Rutgers-supported eatery. I also helped start a transgender support group for graduate and undergraduate students, and was part of a campaign to educate Rutgers’ students and staff about transgender issues. Perhaps the most important thing I did at Rutgers followed the tragedy of Tyler Clementi’s suicide. I spearheaded a day-long teach-in/speak out held on National Coming Out Day, to increase visibility of LGBTQ and allied graduate students, students and faculty, so that LGBTQ undergraduates would know that they were not alone.

As an extension of both my social justice work and my scholarly pursuits, I have a strong passion for public history. Last year, I was honored to curate the first exhibit of the Women’s Leather History Project at the Leather Archives & Museum in Chicago. I also joined the staff of the LA&M and, as Project Historian, travel the country teaching about women’s Leather history. As a result, I have presented at many non-academic LGBTQ clubs and events, as part of my commitment to community education.

I want to serve on the Board of the CLBTH to help ensure its continued growth and response to the changing needs of our community. I am particularly interested in how the CLGBTH can increase diversity in our membership ranks and leadership and create more formal mentor relationships between successful scholars and the newly minted Ph.D.s and graduate students.
Rebecca L. Davis

I am an assistant professor of history (with a joint appointment in the Department of Women’s and Gender Studies) at the University of Delaware. I received my Ph.D. in American History from Yale in 2006 and held a postdoctoral fellowship at the Center for the Study of Religion at Princeton 2006-2007. My work examines the intersections of sexuality, religion, and marriage in twentieth-century American culture. My book, *More Perfect Unions: The American Search for Marital Bliss* (Harvard, 2010), illuminates the self-conscious construction of heterosexuality—and the prevalence of anxieties about homosexuality and women’s sexual autonomy—within the American practice of marriage counseling. I am a co-recipient of the 2012 LGBT-RAN History Award for a chapter about mid-20th-century liberal Protestants’ ideas about homosexuality, which I contributed to an American religious history anthology. I have also published a queer-theory interpretation of evangelical Christian marital advice guides and an article in the *Journal of American History* about companionate marriage. My current research considers the social, cultural, and political meanings attached to the unusual “conversions” of ex-spies such as Whittaker Chambers (who renounced homosexuality, the Soviet underground, and atheism simultaneously) during the early years of the Cold War. Last year I became a lifetime member of the CLGBTH.

At the University of Delaware, I teach the only history course on sexuality; my course serves as a gateway to the Sexuality and Gender Studies minor for many students. Because students at UD have so few options for exploring the history of sexuality, I offer this course every year. In my research and teaching I integrate the histories of same-sex desire, gender norms and their subversion, sexual technologies and regulations, marriage and heterosexuality, and sexual politics. I am the Co-Chair of the Women’s Caucus at UD, which works to advance gender equity for all employees (staff and faculty), particularly in areas of salary equity, promotional opportunities, and parental/family leave policies.

The CLGBTH serves as a bridge among scholars with shared research interests and related professional concerns. Because so many of us are the only ones within our departments (or even our colleges) who teach and/or research on the history of sexuality, the CLGBTH website, newsletter, and meetings provide crucial opportunities for participation in a broader conversation about LGBT history and queer politics. I welcome the opportunity to give back to an organization that has helped me connect to a wider community of scholars who research and teach LGBT history.
Tamara Chaplin

It would be my great privilege and pleasure to serve on the Governing Board—and I’d like to thank Nicholas Syrett for nominating me. As an Associate Professor of Modern European History with faculty affiliations in Gender and Women’s Studies, French, and Holocaust, Genocide and Memory Studies, I am a scholar of contemporary France at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. I research and teach the histories of gender and sexuality, queer studies, feminist and critical theory, popular culture and the media, human rights and modern Europe. My second book project, Sappho Comes Out: Lesbian Life in Postwar France is an examination of how lesbians have made claims on the French public sphere in the post-WWII era. Taking as its focus women whose primary affective and erotic ties are with other women, this book historicizes “lesbian identity,” paying attention to the multiple ways in which lesbian experience emerged, was lived and politicized during a period of stunning social, economic and technological change.

To my delight this research (and related work on the history of sex education) has already been well received nationally and internationally. Since 2008 I have given talks internationally and published articles in collections in both English and French. Another article, about the first lesbian Internet site entitled, “Lesbians On-Line: ‘Les Goudous Télématique’ and the French Minitel,” is now under submission with the Journal of the History of Sexuality.

As a queer historian and a feminist, I am committed to the perspective that the discipline of history can serve as no less than an instrument of human insight and liberation. Both inside and outside the classroom I maintain that knowledge is political, and that the production of scholarship is a moral undertaking. In this quest I follow the work of my mentors, Bonnie Smith (Rutgers) and Joan Scott (Institute for Advanced Study) with whom I trained at Rutgers University in one of the country’s top programs in women’s and gender history, where I also completed a minor field in the history of gender and sexuality. I have taught graduate and undergraduate courses and directed dissertations on gender, sexuality and queer history at the University of Illinois for almost a decade. I am also involved with UIUC’s Queer Studies Reading Group, have worked with the LGBTQ Ally Training Program and spoken at rallies and events on behalf of the LGBTQ community. Last January I discussed the challenges associated with doing research on homosexuality and the media in a roundtable on “The Historian and Television History” at the American Historical Association in Chicago where I also commented on a CLGBTH panel. I serve as a board member of the newly constituted French archive for LGBT history, L’Institut Arc-en-ciel, Centre d’archives et de documentation LGBT under the direction of Louis-Georges Tin.

Despite the vital work of organizations like the CLBGTH and L’Institut Arc-en-ciel, LGBTQ history remains regrettably marginalized—and the experiences of queer students, faculty and professionals remain woefully underserved—by traditional scholarly institutions. Our society as a whole is the poorer for this, and our constant challenge is to change that. I believe that my research, teaching experience and professional history would make me a dynamic addition to the CLGBTH board. I hope that you offer me the opportunity to contribute my scholarly potential and political passion to our community.
Governing Board Elections:

The mission of the CLGBTH Governing Board is to further the goals of CLGBTH and to assist and advise the CLGBTH Chair. Governing Board members are expected to take responsibility for at least one CLGBTH project each year.

Select TWO candidates for three-year terms (June 30, 2012 – June 29, 2015)

_____ Alex Warner
_____ Rebecca L. Davis
_____ Tamara Chaplin

Please return completed ballot by June 30, 2012 to: Don Romesburg, Department of Women’s & Gender Studies, Sonoma State University, 11 Rachel Carson Hall, Rohnert Park, CA 94928 or via email at romesbur@sonoma.edu.