The CLGH Governing Board elections of the spring were successfully concluded introducing Horacio Roque Ramírez and Lisa Hazirjian as new members of our Board. I want to take a moment to thank the outgoing members of the Board, Karen Krahulik and William Peniston, for their efforts on behalf of the CLGH. William Peniston was critical to our still-ongoing attempt to gain non-profit status for the organization. Our application for this status has successfully made it through the first round of assessment and is currently with the IRS field office in Dallas, TX awaiting the 2nd and final round; I am hoping it will be approved before I step down as chair in January 2006. On that note, Karen Krahulik has agreed to continue, with your agreement, the work she began as a member of the CLGH Board. I direct your attention to the enclosed ballot for electing the next chair of the CLGH and also to Karen’s personal statement accepting this nomination. I think she will be a vital presence to facilitate our continuing efforts to make the CLGH a more visible presence and resource to our members and also to the lives of lgbttq people.

On that note, this will be my last chair’s column for the CLGH newsletter. Reflecting on the past three years I have worked to continue the very successful efforts of my predecessors in expanding the growth and visibility of the CLGH. I leave the CLGH with one aspect of this work still in progress. At our business meeting in January we constituted a subcommittee to explore the possibilities of creating and funding a CLGH dissertation prize. Members present felt that the successful creation of this prize would not only bring greater visibility to our organization, but most significantly, might serve as an initial attempt to address the need for more focused recognition of work being done by graduate students in the area of lgbttq history/studies. Several specifically linked the creation of such a prize possibility to the importance of senior scholars’ mentoring of those just starting out in the profession. In addition to the establishment of a CLGH dissertation prize, we are presently facing the issue of how to maintain and expand the CLGH budget that funds our annual activities, including the prizes we offer. The subcommittee investigating these issues consists of: Margot Canaday (canad002@umn.edu), Jennifer Brier (jbrier@uic.edu), Charles Middleton (cmiddleton@roosevelt.edu), and James Green (James_Green@brown.edu). Should you be interested in participating in this effort please contact one of the subcommittee members or myself – we would love to have your input and ideas!

I have also tried to more substantively connect and network with our sibling organizations in other academic disciplines and continue the efforts of previous CLGH chairs to maintain and expand our links with lgbttq community organizations. The CLGH’s first-time co-sponsorship of a session at the AHA with the Coordinating Council for Women in History this year signals one small success in these efforts. This co-sponsored session is in the form of a roundtable on hostile climate and discrimination in employment situations, titled “Out There Or In Here? The Chilly Climate Revisited.” In addition, on Saturday evening (1/7) the CLGH will be co-sponsoring a film screening of Gay Pioneers (see below for details) and reception with the GLBT Archives of Philadelphia held at the William Way GLBT Community Center. I would like to take this opportunity to thank CLGH members Marc Stein and Jennifer Manion for their work in making this event possible.

Overall I have found this position extremely energizing and have appreciated the opportunity to get to know so many of you, whether through face-face encounters at our annual meetings or more virtual encounters in cyber space through the medium of email. I also deeply appreciate the work each and every one of you is doing in making this organization meaningful for all of us, especially in these increasingly difficult times. I looked over my first newsletter and realized that many of the things I said in that initial effort are still quite meaningful today, so I will end where I began with the following: Our organization’s strength and vitality lies in its membership. I call on you to continue your involvement and hope to see new questions posed, issues raised, and creative solutions and strategies suggested by you in the coming months and years. Thank you for this opportunity. I wish you all very well.
CLGH On-Line Directory

The CLGH Directory of Members is now online. For reasons of privacy the membership director is not directly accessible from the CLGH homepage. You can access the membership directory at:
http://www.usc.edu/isd/archives/clgh/membership/membershipdirect123454321.html

To confirm or update your listing, please send the following information to ldmeye@wm.edu:

Name
Title
Department
University
Address
Telephone (w)
Telephone (h)
Telephone (fax)
Email Address
Website Address

CLGH Email Announcements List

The CLGH email announcements list continues to provide information on LGBTQ history to CLGH members. Please contact ldmeye@wm.edu if you are not receiving CLGH email announcements and would like to, if you are receiving CLGH announcements and would like not to, or if you need to change your email address. Email addresses that result in returned mail on a regular basis are deleted from the list.

CLGH Newsletter Information

Send newsletter material to:
Kevin Murphy
Department of History
University of Minnesota
267-19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
kpmurphy@umn.edu

Send book review material to:
Ian Lekus
Dept. of History
University of Georgia
237 Leconte Hall
Athens, GA 30602-1602
lekus@uga.edu

Membership Information

For your current membership status, please check the address label on the envelope in which this newsletter was sent. Lifetime members are indicated with an “L”; all others have a two-digit year code that indicates the last year for which your membership was paid. Members who have paid the 2005 membership fee will see “05.”

As of October 15, 2005, CLGH had 248 members, including 71 lifetime members; the last newsletter was sent to 78 sibling organizations, libraries, research centers, etc. Members who have not paid since 2003 will be removed from the CLGH mailing list in 2006 (unless they renew their membership or write to ldmeye@wm.edu requesting that the fee be waived).
Membership Information Cont.

If your membership is not current, please use the form enclosed to re-join the CLGH. Membership fees are used primarily to support the four prizes awarded by CLGH, finance the copying and mailing costs associated with the newsletter, and pay expenses related to the annual AHA/CLGH meetings.

If you have the names and addresses of potential new CLGH members or the mailing addresses of organizations that you think might like to receive copies of the CLGH newsletter, please send them to ldmeye@wm.edu. Also I want to clarify and reaffirm that the CLGH is open to anyone who wishes to participate in our organization. You do not have to self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual or queer nor does your work need to address LGBTQ history.


CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS: CLGH 2006 Prize Competition

The Committee on Lesbian and Gay History will award two prizes in 2006:

The Gregory Sprague Prize for an outstanding PAPER or CHAPTER on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, and/or queer history written in English by a graduate student at a North American institution (the Sprague Prize is underwritten by the Gerber/Hart Library, Chicago, IL).

The Audre Lorde Prize for an outstanding ARTICLE on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, and/or queer history written in English by a North American.

Papers and chapters written and articles published in 2004 or 2005 are eligible. Materials may be submitted by students, faculty, authors, readers, or publishers. Self nominations are encouraged.

Send one copy to each of the three members of the Prize Committee by 30 December 2005.

Professor Vicki Eaklor (chair)  Professor Nan Alamilla Boyd  Don Romesburg
Division of Human Studies  Women’s and Gender Studies Dept.  1 27th St.
Alfred University  Sonoma State University  San Francisco, CA 94110
Alfred, NY 14802  1801 East Cotati Avenue
Rohnert Park, CA  94928-3609

For further information on CLGH and CLGH prizes, please contact Leisa Meyer, CLGH Chair, Associate Professor of History, History Department, College of William and Mary, P.O. Box 8795, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795; 757-221-3737; ldmeye@wm.edu; or visit the CLGH website at www.usc.edu/clgh.
CLGH Chair Nomination Results and Chair Election

In the election and nomination process carried out in the last newsletter there were two nominations for CLGH Chair. One of these nominees declined the nomination and one nominee, Karen Krahulik, accepted. Her statement accepting the nomination follows. Please use the enclosed ballot to indicate your vote on Karen Krahulik’s candidacy for a three-year term as chair of the CLGH beginning January 1, 2006.

From Karen Krahulik:

I am pleased to accept a nomination to be chair of the CLGH, an organization that continues to bridge my historical research to that of the broader AHA. Unlike many of my peers, I have held administrative leadership positions throughout my academic career. During graduate school, I founded and ran an oral history project in Provincetown, Massachusetts, which received funding from the Mass. Foundation for the Humanities. And for the past six years I transformed a cramped and under-funded suite of offices into a thriving university center. Although I am a productive academic and a competent administrator, I excel when the two positions are combined into one. During my non-tenure-track tenure at Duke, I’ve finished my doctoral dissertation, published a series of articles, published a history of Provincetown with NYU Press, increased the membership of our constituents (paying particular to race and class differentials), increased our endowment by over 150%, supervised a staff of two full-time and seven part-time employees, and managed a website, newsletter and multiple funding accounts. Folding the responsibilities of the CLGH chair into those of my current administrative position is entirely feasible. More importantly, I welcome the opportunity to contribute to an organization that is critical to young and seasoned scholars alike. My platform does not seek to change the current status of the CLGH, although after assuming the role of chair, I may send out requests for feedback regarding different options or directions. Instead, I wish to offer my history of activism as a politically savvy and successful academic/administrative leader who brings to every table a queer politics that is mindful of differences across race, ethnicity, gender, nationality, religion, ability and class.

Karen C. Krahulik
Duke University
Director, Center for LGBT Life
Adjunct Assist. Professor, Women’s Studies

Note: Karen will be taking on a new challenge as Associate Dean of the College at Brown University beginning January 1, 2006.

CLGH Governing Board - Election Results and Call for Nominations – Please extend a warm welcome to our new governing board!

Congratulations to Lisa Hazirjian and Horacio Roque Ramírez who were elected to three-year terms (1 May 2005 to 30 April 2008) on the CLGH Governing Board! Lisa and Horacio take over for Karen Krahulik (2002-2005) and William Peniston (2002-2005) and join Margot Canaday (2003-2006), Marcia Gallo (2003-2006), Nan Alamilla Boyd (2004-2007) and James Green (2004-2007). Please join me in offering my deepest appreciation to Karen and William for all the work during their service on the board. The function of the Governing Board is to further the goals of the CLGH and assist and advise the CLGH chair. Governing Board members are expected to take responsibility for at least one CLGH project each year (including, for example, organizing a session for the annual convention, serving on the prize committee, writing a book review for the newsletter, working on maintaining and increasing CLGH’s membership, improving the CLGH website, etc.).
Call for Nominations!

Nominations are now being accepted for candidates to serve two three-year terms (1 May 2005 to 30 April 2008) as members of the CLGH’s Governing Board. Self-nominations are encouraged. If you nominate someone other than yourself, please be certain that your nominee is willing to serve. Send nominations via email to ldmeye@wm.edu. Elections will take place via ballot in spring 2006. The deadline for nominations is 15 March 2006.

Call for Submissions, AHA Annual Meeting, 4-7 January 2007, Atlanta, GA

The CLGH will be organizing lgbttq history sessions for the AHA convention in Atlanta, GA, 4-7 January 2007. The AHA deadline is 15 February 2006; please contact ldmeye@wm.edu if you are interested in presenting a paper, submitting a proposal, chairing a session, or commenting on papers. The 2007 convention theme is “Unstable Subjects: Practicing History in Unsettled Times” and the CLGH is particularly interested in promoting proposals that deal partially or fully with pre-20th century and non-U.S. topics and in encouraging proposals that cross national and disciplinary boundaries. The AHA is also encouraging participants to consider alternative ways of presenting scholarship, including sessions in which papers are made available electronically in advance of the meeting, thematic workshops, roundtable discussions, poster presentations and other experimental formats. Please take advantage of the CLGH email announcements list and website membership directory to find appropriate co-panelists and presenters. Information on submitting proposals can be obtained at: http://www.historians.org/annual.

AHA/CLGH Annual Meeting, 5-8 January 2006, Philadelphia, PA

CLGH - 2006 AHA PROGRAM

Friday, Jan 6

9:30 - 11:30 - Designing Men: Identity, Masculinity, and Homosexual Practices in Metropole and Colony (joint with AHA), Marriott, Room 401.
Chair - Leisa Meyer, College of William and Mary
Commentator - Karen Krahulik, Duke University

Presenters:
“The Governor Has not Been Sexually Active”: Homosexuality and Sexual Crime in German East Africa,” Heike Schmidt, San Diego State University
“Masculinity and Madness: Princely Tales from Colonial India,” Shruti Kapila, Tufts University.
“Rethinking Links between Masculinity, Identity, and Same-sex Desire for Nineteenth-Century Britain,” Charles Upchurch, Florida State University.

11:30-2:30 - The ever-interesting and important CLGH display at the affiliated society display area. Last year we actually signed up 13 members while we “(wo)manned” the table.
Saturday, Jan 7

9:30 - 11:30 - Out There or In Here? The Chilly Climate Revisited (a joint session with the AHA Professional Division and the Coordinating Council for Women in History), Commonwealth Hall Section B

Chair: Mary Lindemann, Professor, History, University of Miami and Member, AHA Professional Division

Roundtable Discussants:
Lisa Hazirjian, Visiting Assistant Professor of History, Case Western Reserve University
Lynn Weiner, Professor of History, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Roosevelt University
Marc Stein, Associate Professor of History, York University, Toronto
Denise Youngblood, Professor of History and Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, University of Vermont, and Member, AHA Professional Division

12:15 - 1:45 - Business Meeting –

5:00-8:00 - Film Screening and Reception at Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Archives of Philadelphia located at the William Way GLBT Community Center.

DIRECTIONS: From the conference headquarters (Philadelphia Marriott and Loews Philadelphia hotels): Walk one block to 13th Street and head south (a left if you are coming from 12th Street). Walk 5 blocks to Spruce Street and make a right (heading toward Broad Street). The William Way GLBT Community Center is located at 1315 Spruce Street.

5-6:15 - Film Screening - Gay Pioneers

6:15 - 8:00 - Catered Reception at the William Way GLBT Community Center Featuring catering by “A Full Plate” and co-sponsored/hosted by Cathleen Miller, representing the GLBT Archives of Philadelphia.
CLGH DISSERTATION BIBLIOGRAPHY:

CLGH has assembled a bibliography of more than 90 LGBTQ history dissertations and dissertations-in-progress (arranged in chronological order). The bibliography is based on information supplied by CLGH members and other LGBTQ historians, and it includes dissertations described by their authors as “fully” or “partially” focused on LGBTQ history. The complete bibliography is available on the CLGH website (www.usc.edu/clgh). If you have updates, corrections, or additions, please send them to ldmeye@wm.edu. Newly added dissertations and dissertations-in-progress include the following:


PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS BY MEMBERS:

**Gail Bederman,** “Revisiting Nashoba: Slavery, Utopia, and Frances Wright,” *American Literary History* 17, Fall 2005.


**Chet DeFonso,** “Gay People in Michigan,” *Marquette Unitarian Universalists* (February 2005).


**Vicki Eaklor,** ed. *Gay Rights Into the Mainstream: Twenty Years of Progress* (Haworth Press, 2006). She is currently under contract with Greenwood Press to write a reference volume, *A GLBT History of Twentieth Century America.* In February 2005 she delivered two papers at the “Lesbian Lives XII” conference in Dublin, Ireland and in June commented on a panel at the Berkshire Conference of Women’s Historians.


TOPICS/ISSUES CORNER
By Doris Malkmus

The LGBT Religious Archives Network (LGBT-RAN); a grassroots resource group and virtual archives, has opened a remarkable online exhibit on the Council on Religion and the Homosexual in San Francisco at: www.lgbtran.org/Exhibits/CRH/Exhibit.asp

The LGBT - RAN collaborated with the GLBT Historical Society in San Francisco to create this online exhibit to honor the anniversary of the New Years Eve Ball in San Francisco in 1964-1965. The exhibit uses a wide array of organizational documents, correspondence, audio and video clips, newspaper and magazine articles, full text publications, brochures and photos to portray the formative years (1964-1968) of the gay liberation movement when mainstream denominations joined forces with homosexual activists to demand human rights. The exhibit is organized as a virtual museum with the artifacts grouped in exhibit rooms so that the viewer is led through the exhibit in much the same way he or she would walk through a historical exhibit. The origins of the Council on Religion and the Homosexual (CRH) lie in the interaction of clergy from the Glide Urban Center and homosexual persons they encountered on the streets of San Francisco’s Tenderloin neighborhood. A weekend retreat for dialogue between religious and gay/lesbian leaders in the early summer of 1964 led to the formation of CRH. A police raid on a CRH-sponsored dance at California Hall on January 1, 1965, thrust CRH into the public spotlight. In the immediate years following, CRH was on the forefront of educating religious groups and leaders about homosexuality and generating religious support for legal and social reforms for homosexual persons.

LGBT-RAN is proud to have recovered stories of this relatively unknown group for this exhibit. Contemporary college students, having been raised in an era of the “religious right,” might find it difficult to believe the progressive activism of some mainstream churches in the 1960s. The original sources of this exhibit provide compelling images and soundtracks from the leaders of the homosexual movement and clergy. The digitized artifacts, saturated with the cultural inflections of those revolutionary years, give a sense of immediacy and believability to the unlikely marriage of religion and homosexuals in the 1960s.

This exhibit was designed to meet the needs of the specialized researcher as well as a casual web surfer or student with very little background in LGBT history. The exhibit is divided into six rooms: Clergy and Homosexual Persons Converge in San Francisco; Council on Religion and the Homosexual Organized; Police Raid at New Year’s Day Ball; Clergy express Outrage and Spark Resistance; CRH Thrives; and the Legacy of CRH. Future exhibits on different elements of LGBT religious history on the LGBT - RAN web site will be shown using this “virtual exhibit hall.” Suggestions on other potential exhibit themes or help in creating another exhibit are welcome.

The LGBT – RAN website has also added a powerful Oral History exhibit. Audio files of interviews with early feminist leaders, along with transcripts, biography, and photographs are available. Interview subjects include three WICCAN priestesses, an early evangelical lesbian, and the founder of the Conference for Catholic Lesbians. These initial interviews have been and will continue to be augmented by oral histories of other LGBT leaders contributed by the interviewee. To date, an oral history of Rebecca Alpert, Reconstructionist Rabbi, and Charlotte Doclar, lesbian nun have been added. Soon to come are interviews of George Hyde, minister of a gay congregation in Atlanta, Georgia, during the 1940s, and Michael Cole, founder of the Christ Chapel movement in the Southwest.

These exhibits expand the original materials available on the LGBT – RAN website and complement the Collection Catalog of LGBT religious collections and the Pioneer Gallery of LGBT religious leaders that can be found on the website at http://lgbtran.org.
Reviews


Reviewed by David D. Doyle, Jr., Southern Methodist University

Compelled by his students’ repeated question (why are gays and lesbians so despised a minority?), along with his own dismissal from the U.S. military for homosexuality, historian Jay Hatheway undertook to recover the origins of this visceral hatred in American culture. Beginning his investigation in the Cold War era, Hatheway quickly discovered his research drew him further back, toward the nineteenth century. It is here within the emerging medical literature on homosexuality where the heart of this study rests. Ultimately, it is the careful reading and compilation of this literature that will constitute the value of the book.

Early chapters provide the American cultural and historical context for the work that follows on the professionalization of medicine, the German discovery of homosexual identity, and the widespread American adoption of these ideas at the turn of the last century. Final chapters present a nascent homosexual identity as a product of negotiations between men (and by implication at least, women) with same-sex desires and the increasingly respected and assertive medical profession. However, the middle three chapters more than anything represent the center of the work—and Hatheway’s most valuable contribution to the current historiography. Beginning with a meticulous review of the work done in nineteenth-century Germany, he sets the stage for the dissemination of these medical and scientific ideas in America by the turn of the new century. Indeed, the chapter detailing specifically how these European works were picked up by American physicians is the best I have seen on the subject. While Ronald Bayer’s 1987 work touches briefly on this era, as does Byrne Fone’s larger study on homophobia, Hatheway by far does the most thorough job.¹

The argument that the medical establishment, in search of both legitimacy and cultural and moral authority, used the warning against the newly diagnosed sexually deviant identity is convincing and warrants attention. Similarly, Hatheway argues forcefully and repeatedly that the American (and to some extent European) physicians were never real advocates for those with same-sex behavior; rather, they always found this behavior to be deviant and unacceptable.

These valuable contributions notwithstanding, a significant number of methodological problems and unexamined assumptions compromise the work. As other historical studies have illustrated—although not with such careful precision—early descriptions of people with what we would call a homosexual identity, along with the concomitant homophobia, emerge from the medical field in this era. Nonetheless, Hatheway’s complete dismissal of Christianity as a significant contributor to homophobia necessarily constructs a distorted picture. In his only reference to religion, the author writes, “my experience suggested that the homophobia I endured was much deeper than the Bible. It was an ‘ur’ emotion so profound as to almost defy explanation” (p. 1). All anti-homosexual (or anti-sodomy) hatreds are summarily rejected as well under the premise that “each historical epoch must be taken on its own terms.” Indeed, one must distinguish between historical context and studying one era—or more correctly, one segment of that era—within a historical and cultural vacuum. A related flaw in the analysis is Hatheway’s notion that same-sex sexuality was perceived as “un-American,” aberrant, and straying too far from our “exceptionalist promise” (pp. 9, 198). This assumption is viable if only sodomy laws and cases are addressed, and becomes impossible to sustain when the long tradition of romantic friendship is examined. Works such as those by Caleb Crain, Richard Fox, and Martha Vicinus, among many others, clearly illustrate the centrality of same-sex attractions to American civilization.²

¹ The argument that the medical establishment, in search of both legitimacy and cultural and moral authority, used the warning against the newly diagnosed sexually deviant identity is convincing and warrants attention. Similarly, Hatheway argues forcefully and repeatedly that the American (and to some extent European) physicians were never real advocates for those with same-sex behavior; rather, they always found this behavior to be deviant and unacceptable.

² These valuable contributions notwithstanding, a significant number of methodological problems and unexamined assumptions compromise the work. As other historical studies have illustrated—although not with such careful precision—early descriptions of people with what we would call a homosexual identity, along with the concomitant homophobia, emerge from the medical field in this era. Nonetheless, Hatheway’s complete dismissal of Christianity as a significant contributor to homophobia necessarily constructs a distorted picture. In his only reference to religion, the author writes, “my experience suggested that the homophobia I endured was much deeper than the Bible. It was an ‘ur’ emotion so profound as to almost defy explanation” (p. 1). All anti-homosexual (or anti-sodomy) hatreds are summarily rejected as well under the premise that “each historical epoch must be taken on its own terms.” Indeed, one must distinguish between historical context and studying one era—or more correctly, one segment of that era—within a historical and cultural vacuum. A related flaw in the analysis is Hatheway’s notion that same-sex sexuality was perceived as “un-American,” aberrant, and straying too far from our “exceptionalist promise” (pp. 9, 198). This assumption is viable if only sodomy laws and cases are addressed, and becomes impossible to sustain when the long tradition of romantic friendship is examined. Works such as those by Caleb Crain, Richard Fox, and Martha Vicinus, among many others, clearly illustrate the centrality of same-sex attractions to American civilization.
Such shaky foundations inevitably imperil otherwise useful analysis. Hatheway’s first sentence reads: “This is not a book about homosexuality, or of homosexuals per se, nor was it written for academics who specialize in this field and whose insights are far greater than mine” (p. 1). While generally adhering to these guidelines—i.e., concentrating on the medical field’s descriptions and understandings of male same-sex desire—the book too often wanders off track to speak of nameless generalized homosexuals. This conflation represents a significant analytical difficulty. After presenting turn-of-the last century medical literature intent on pathologizing same-sex identity, the author characteristically confuses the real patient with the doctors’ view: “For their part, many homosexuals assumed that they were freaks into whom nature had placed the wrong essence. Some disparaged their condition, and some embraced it wholeheartedly” (p. 8). In another example, one of the few references to women found in the book similarly confuses real people with the ideas about them emerging from medicine, arguing that, “whereas the male homosexual was developing an identity that delineated him from nonhomosexual males, the female acted alone without identity, a solitary pervert, but no less congenital for all that” (p. 162).

In one of the most revealing of these passages (passages that permeate the entire book), the author explains that with the exception of a very limited number of writers...and Whitman—who, in any event, only indirectly made references to physical relations between men—the issue of homosexual identity was essentially a medical one. The development of a homosexual identity, therefore, took place within the context of the discovery of a new pathology that was vigorously studied so that it might be controlled by the authority of the scientific community in order to stop degeneration in its tracks (p. 163).

If one were to accept George Chauncey’s analysis—not to mention the now-proliferating historiography—that physicians merely recorded what they saw in cities, Hatheway’s constructs cannot add up. Not only does he find the homosexual identity emerging almost wholly from within the medical literature, but he fails to distinguish real historical actors from imagined or diagnosed pathologies. Of almost equal importance is an inadequate understanding of the far-flung friendship networks that men and women with same-sex desires maintained throughout the United States—and Europe as well. This informal network of friends exchanged information and ideas while providing necessary emotional support. Limiting his knowledge of emerging lesbian and gay identity to that found in the medical literature, Hatheway only mentions those in working-class “red-light” districts, and ignores middle- and upper-class subcultures, as “American homosexuals were largely invisible to all but the emerging medical community that acted as the mediator between homosexuals and the American population at large” (p. 6).

This complete focus on the subcultures identified by the physicians is problematic and prevents a clear understanding of the broader culture. For instance, Hatheway dismisses the middle- and upper-class writers who had an enormous influence on American culture, and who served as a great source of strength to people with same-sex desires. He concentrates instead entirely on the urban subcultures found by the authorities:

The homoeroticism of the romantic novelist was superceded by the growth of homoerotic communities, particularly with large cities such as New York. In opposition to the isolation of the novelist, the new communities were places where both men and women might develop an entire subculture that publicly catered to their needs and desires (p. 55).
In speaking of these nascent subcultures, the book mentions only those in the working-class neighborhoods, and does not discuss social class divisions whatsoever—a serious misrepresentation. In writing of those who celebrated same-sex desires—and who were well known by middle and upper class American readers—Hatheway concludes, “In the main, the writings of these men, especially the English, were generally unknown in the United States outside a small circle of individuals around Walt Whitman” (p. 163). “As pathologized people, homosexuals were condemned to live their lives under the stigma of disease. Marginalization and ostracization were endemic...” (p. 197). When the book does mention social class, it is generally to dismiss its importance: “For the most part, homosexuals lived silent lives, particularly those who came from the middle and upper classes” (p. 198). With such public visitors as Oscar Wilde, along with numerous upper-class men who claimed a central part of mainstream American society, such unexamined assertions ring hollow. Depending so completely on the parameters established within the medical literature inevitably precludes an accurate picture of homosexuality’s visibility in late nineteenth-century American life.


Reviewed by Vicki Eaklor, Alfred University

David Johnson’s book was one of ten works that received the 2004 Myers Outstanding Book Award for advancing human rights, an honor that is well-deserved. Johnson has performed an invaluable service in this carefully documented account of the Lavender Scare of the 1950s. Coinciding with the more famous Red Scare, the Lavender Scare targeted those in federal government service known or thought to be homosexuals. The two phenomena were more than coincidental, however; communists and homosexuals, if not interchangeable, were defined in similar ways and the victims of similar fears of subversion of an American Way. The outlines of a Cold War antigay crusade have appeared in previous works, but as Johnson notes, it generally is not accorded much significance in the works of postwar historians, and more often is ignored altogether. Building especially on the groundwork of John D’Emilio, Johnson’s thorough and meticulous account, utilizing twenty-seven interviews as well as exhaustive primary documentation, should change the way postwar politics in the U.S. is presented.

The dynamics of the antigay purges paralleled those of anticommunism. As Johnson states, “The typical case involved a homosexual confronted with circumstantial evidence that he had associated with ‘known homosexuals’ or been arrested in a known gay cruising area” (p. 3). Under the cloud of this “guilt
by association,” almost all of those “accused” (an
apt term, given the climate and the consequences) of
homosexuality resigned. Because gay men and lesbi-
ans—then usually called “perverts”—were assumed to
be mentally and/or morally deficient, the U.S. govern-
ment deemed them automatically unfit for employ-
ment.

Despite the similarities to McCarthyism in
its heyday, however, Johnson would prefer that we
separate the Red and Lavender Scares of the State
Department. First, homosexuals and communists were
both viewed as threats to national security, but the
mere suspicion that one was gay often was a “graver
transgression . . . than an admission of former mem-
bership in the Communist Party” (p. 169). Further,
although rationales against communists and homosex-
uals commonly were conflated—if a person was one,
they likely were the other—Johnson also points out
that this involved some confusion between concerns
for loyalty (communists) and those for security (ho-
mosexuals). Thus he adds depth to the more familiar
Catch-22 of the feds using the potential blackmail of
gay men and lesbians to stigmatize them as security
risks, justifying their dismissal, all the while having
created that very stigma. Second, the Lavender Scare
(like the Red Scare in Hollywood), actually began
before 1950, though ninety-one homosexuals were
purged that key year. Most important, the Lavender
Scare was institutionalized, in both breadth and lon-
gevity, in a way McCarthyism was not. The antigay
purging soon moved beyond the State Department and
the Eisenhower Administration brought the “apogee”
(p.146) of the Lavender Scare: in 1953, Executive
Order 10450 legitimized homophobia, making homo-
sexuality grounds for government hiring and firing un-
til the 1970s. Interestingly, all this was accomplished,
Johnson notes, first with “help” from the media—from
newspapers in particular—in reinforcing stereotypes
and fear, and then by the media’s silence regarding the
ongoing purges of the 1960s and 1970s.

Not everyone was unaware of these purges. If
this were only a study of the number of people fired
from the government, the rationales for it, and the rela-
tion to postwar politics, this would be a valuable book.
Johnson goes much further, however. He juxtaposes
the antigay purges with a treatment of the gay and les-
bian subcultures of Washington, D.C., and examines
the relationships among those subcultures, the purges,
and a blossoming gay and lesbian rights movement.
Joining his voice with those who would remind us of
pre-Stonewall activism, Johnson effectively traces
“Cold War origins of the gay rights movement” (p. 14)
by showing the interdependence between opposition
to a group and its organized action. Indeed, these last
chapters on the subcultures and the Washington Mat-
tachine Society vividly evoked the ever-present fear of
disclosure while showing the varied (and often class-
bound) responses to that climate, from self-denial, to
naming names, to organized opposition. Gays and
lesbians, especially in D.C., constituted “a community
under siege” for 25 years, but when organizing began
to result in U.S. Appeals Court victories in the 1960s,
Johnson can convincingly argue that “the purges
played a pivotal role in the formation of an organized
gay movement” both locally and nationally (p. 169).

This is an outstanding book with many
strengths. It is carefully and logically presented:
although the alternating of the purges and the gay/les-
bian history of D.C. seemed a bit shaky at first, by the
end the various components necessary for understand-
ing the Lavender Scare are laid out masterfully. The
narrative is slightly dry in places, no doubt a lingering
effect of the book’s previous incarnation as a disserta-
tion, but overall it is quite readable and includes great
pictures. Especially strong (or interesting to me, at
least) is the sophisticated treatment of the political
and social atmosphere, with the Scare portrayed in
symbiosis with more “famous” aspects of the Fifties.
Gendered ideas, for example, merged with partisan
politics and became part of the Republican effort to
discredit both the New and Fair Deals (Chapter 4’s
“Fairies and Fair Dealers” is my favorite chapter title).
Here is more evidence, if it is needed, that concepts of
gender inversion cannot be separated from the history
of homosexuality (or homophobia), and neither can be
divorced from political history if we are to understand
our past.
A secondary contribution is a nuanced look at the views of medical professionals and of medical ideas in flux. As we know, early organizers sought the support of legal and medical professionals as they strove to revise hateful stereotypes, and occasionally received it. More often, though, the impression remains of a medical establishment that perpetuated rather than changed the idea of homosexuals as degenerate. Psychiatrists here seem remarkably tolerant. Willing to criticize Eisenhower’s policies (p. 143), some argued against equating homosexuality with mental or moral disorder and in favor of the notion of fluid gender and sexuality (pp. 112-113). Concepts and identities have also been fluid and overlapping, and Johnson notes the same shift toward defining homosexuality in terms of sexual object choice rather than sexual role or gender that has become standard fare in LGBT studies of the 20th century (pp. 162-163).

By now it is obvious that *The Lavender Scare* is a crucial addition to the library of any reader, scholar, or student of U.S. politics in general and Cold War politics in particular. It is also especially and creepily relevant in the current context. In that current climate, in which GLBTQ people are again being stigmatized and scapegoated in the interest of partisan politics, the only difference between the old and new Lavender Scares may be simply the prolonged attention the new one is getting. Perhaps we really can learn from the past, and take Johnson’s subtle support for the strategies of earlier organizers to heart.


Reviewed by Victoria E. Thompson, Arizona State University

The chapters in this collection provide a sweeping overview of homosexuality in French history. Many of the articles focus on the role of homosexuality – real or imagined – in shaping communities. Several authors provide new information concerning the composition and workings of actual communities of homosexual men and women, while others explore how homosexuality functioned as a way to think about communal bonds.

In tracing the contours of communities of men who engaged in sex with other men, the chapters by Olivier Blanc, Michael Sibalis, and William Peniston reveal that homosexual subcultures flourished in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Paris. According to Blanc, affairs between elite men became more common and more visible in the late eighteenth century. Men who shared what was known as “the Italian taste” congregated in public areas such as the Palais-Royal into the nineteenth century. However, as Michael Sibalis informs us, the renovation of Paris during the Second Empire brought new areas into focus, such as the Bois de Boulogne. Both Blanc and Peniston, who studies working-class men, highlight how these communities provided political and economic support and friendship as well as sexual relationships.

The visibility of homosexual subcultures drew public attention to these communities. As a result, several of the authors in the collection are able to “map” gay and lesbian Paris at various points in time. Michael Sibalis draws on texts by police, judicial and medical authorities to identify areas frequented by homosexuals in the early nineteenth century. Leslie Choquette and Michael Wilson use literary and pictorial sources to map gay and lesbian Paris later in the nineteenth century. Choquette argues that gay men and lesbians shared many leisure spaces in the late nineteenth century, while Wilson demonstrates that...
the perceived ubiquity of homosexuality in late nineteenth-century descriptions of the capital was considered a sign of modernity.

While most of the articles focus on Paris, Robert Aldrich illustrates how homosexuality was also identified with the colonies. Aldrich argues that the affective and sexual relationships that French men forged with indigenous men led them to criticize French colonial policies. Using examples such as Jean Genet and André Gide, Aldrich argues that such political views may have been based in part on an awareness of the oppression that both colonial natives and homosexuals experienced in the French empire.

The colonies were not the only arena in which same-sex relationships functioned as a symbol of solidarity. The chapters by Leonard Hinds and Susan Lanser both discuss lesbianism as a model of a utopian community. Hinds argues that Madeleine de Scudéry rewrote contemporary accounts of Sappho to emphasize the benefits of “female homosocial bonding” (p. 28). By the eighteenth century, according to Susan Lanser, this utopian vision of an all-female community had become commonplace in libertine novels. However, rather than praising such communities, these novels reveal anxiety concerning the growing belief that women were fundamentally different from men.

Anxiety permeates other treatments of same-sex relations, such as Michel de Montaigne’s essay, “On Friendship,” studied by Marc Schacter. According to Schacter, Montaigne’s difficulty in describing a loving relationship between men was due to the common belief that love was gendered female, and therefore considered irrational. The homoeroticism of Montaigne’s essay was combined with both misogyny and homophobia in complex ways. Conflicting attitudes toward homosexuality are also present in the late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century satirical manuscripts of the Chansonnier Maurepas. Lewis Seifert argues that these texts reveal a combination of “repugnance and fascination” with sodomy, which was regularly discussed but always portrayed in negative terms (p. 45). Seifert sees this contradiction as a sign of a debate concerning heterosexual masculinity, where the sodomite served as the “other” whose constant yet negative presence defined a new norm for elite men.

Nicholas Dobelbower’s chapter on the early nineteenth-century fascination with male couples who met in prison similarly reveals the importance of homosexuality in redefining the gender order. Dobelbower argues that these couples were defined as “families,” thus revealing the importance of the family model in Restoration culture. As in Michael Wilson’s analysis of nineteenth-century descriptions of Paris, homosexual couples were described as possessing the same emotional qualities – love, jealousy – as their heterosexual counterparts. At the same time, these homosexual families were identified with Jacobin egalitarianism, and thus presented as a threat to the new political order.

After World War II, homosexuals in France began to represent their own communities in larger numbers. The chapters by Georges Sidéris, Olivier Jablonski, Jean Le Bitoux, and Marie-Jo Bonnet all draw attention to the greater visibility of homosexuals in postwar Paris. The “folles” of the Saint-Germain-des-Prés neighborhood of the 1950s and 1960s, discussed by Sidéris, were at the heart of a subculture that promoted pleasure and freedom. Yet as both Sidéris and Jablonski demonstrate, the extravagance and effeminacy of the “folles” made them a target for both police authorities and for other homosexual subcultures preaching greater dignity. At the center of this movement was the periodical Arcadie, which as Jablonski demonstrates was one of a number of homosexual publications that appeared in the postwar period.

The flourishing of the gay press lay the groundwork for a radical gay movement that emerged in the late 1960s. Le Bitoux, a co-founder of the Homosexual Front for Revolutionary Action in Nice and a member of the Homosexual Liberation Group in Paris, analyzes the activities of this radical movement, arguing that although it ultimately disbanded due to internal divisions, “everything that marks the breadth of today’s French homosexual movement was initiated between 1975 and 1978” (p. 261). For Marie-Jo Bonnet, the author of the book’s final chapter and an
activist in Parisian feminist and lesbian movements, the precedents established by the gay rights movement of the 1970s were not all positive. Bonnet argues that the contemporary gay rights movement has marginalized lesbians. The effects of this marginalization are evident in both the passage of the PACS – the civil solidarity pacts that replicate the heterosexual model of the couple rather than calling it into question – and in Gay Pride, which reveals a hypermasculine consumer culture. Far from being a radical movement for change, Bonnet argues that the contemporary homosexual movement avoids calling into question fundamental aspects of modern society, such as inequality between the sexes and consumer capitalism.

This rich collection raises several questions worthy of further research. Did gay and lesbian communities flourish in cities other than Paris? If so, were they given equal symbolic weight by observers? Did the representation of these communities serve to reinforce existing (or emerging) cultural norms, or did they conversely express cultural anxiety? Did the visibility of these communities lead to increased tolerance or increased repression? Within these communities, what bonds forged solidarity and what factors led to division?

In order to continue to pursue these and other questions, inventive methodologies will be necessary. This is the battle cry of David Michael Robinson, who urges us to embrace speculation as a means of identifying texts and authors that can be claimed as part of the gay and lesbian heritage. The willingness and ability to read documents inventively is a strength of many of this volume’s chapters. For example, William Peniston reads police documents not to reconstruct criminality, but rather to bring to light the social networks among male homosexuals. The search for new documents also promises to reveal new insights into the history of homosexuality. Jeffrey Merrick’s discovery of criminal and judicial records concerning an executed sodomite in the eighteenth century reveals an unexpected degree of tolerance for sodomy at the end of the Old Regime. While at first glance this execution would seem to prove the opposite, Merrick’s thorough research and careful reading demonstrates that factors other than sodomy—including the physical violence of the attack in question and the public nature of the arrest—led to the execution. Finally, creative combinations, such as Olivier Blanc’s use of correspondence, the nouvelles à la main, and notorial acts, can provide new insight into the history of homosexuality. Overall, this is a rich collection that will be appreciated by many readers.


Reviewed by Scott Gunther, Wellesley College

William Peniston’s Pederasts and Others: Urban Culture and Sexual Identity in Nineteenth-Century Paris is the most comprehensive social history of nineteenth-century Parisian homosexuality available. His impressive study relies on a meticulous analysis of police archival records as well as reports from the Parisian vice police, magistrates and medical “experts” of the time.

The book is divided into three parts. The first, “The Forces of Authority,” examines the discourses of police, judges and medical “experts.” In the second part, “The Subculture,” Peniston very skillfully exploits data from 346 arrests involving 812 homosexual men in Paris between 1873 and 1879 to reveal an enormous amount of information about these individuals’ social origins, the geographic spaces they frequented, the types of relationships they were involved in, and the kinds of sexual practices they engaged in. The last part offers three detailed case studies that complement the numeric data from the second part quite well by providing deeper, more nuanced insight into the diverse interactions that people of different social positions had with the homosexual subculture.
The first part of the book begins with a brief legal history. Peniston explains that with the ratification of the Penal Code of 1791, France became one of the first countries in Europe to eliminate any mention of homosexuality in its laws. On its face, this anomaly of French legal history seems to indicate that nineteenth-century France was a relatively tolerant space for homosexuals. However, Peniston’s analysis shows that despite this apparent tolerance in French law, various forms of repression continued over the course of the nineteenth century, and in some respects became more severe. During this time, discriminatory laws proved somewhat unnecessary, to the extent that the authorities of the time were able to exercise effective control through discriminatory uses and interpretations of existing, nondiscriminatory laws. That is not to say that attitudes toward homosexuality remained entirely inert over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but rather that they did not change nearly as abruptly as the laws.

The legal history at the beginning of the book is followed by an analysis of statements from judges, police and medico-legal “experts” who were all seeking mechanisms for controlling homosexuality without having sufficient legal means to do so. Their testimonies demonstrate that despite the legal silence with regard to homosexuality, the nineteenth century cannot be understood as a time of widespread tolerance or acceptance of homosexuality in France. Based on these written testimonies, Peniston also shows how over the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, authorities’ understanding shifted from homosexuality as a sin to homosexuality as a threat to public safety (due in particular to the suspected connections between homosexuals and the criminal underworld) and finally to homosexuality as a physical disorder or mental illness.

During the Renaissance and the Reformation, homosexuality had been conceived of as a sin, an abomination before God, and was punishable by death until the early eighteenth century, when legal actors began to rethink their motivations and strategies for controlling homosexuality. The Enlightenment ideals of the early eighteenth century, encouraged a more rational and secular approach to punishment. By the middle of the eighteenth century, French judges and police relied on a new understanding of homosexuality as a disorder, as a socially unacceptable taste or leaning, one that needed to be controlled, particularly because of its suspected connection to crimes such as theft, extortion, fraud and blackmail. As Peniston shows, this shift in the understanding of the dangers of homosexuality, from a sin to a threat to public safety, required new forms of control and, in the decades following the Penal Code of 1791, homosexuals became subject to greater surveillance. By the mid-nineteenth century, police began to monitor homosexuals closely, to take note of their meeting places, and generally, to collect as much information about their behaviors as possible.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, doctors also began to take an interest in the threats posed by homosexuality and by the beginning of the Third Republic, a veritable medico-criminological science began to take shape. Perhaps French society was looking for new moral guidance in the form of scientific clerks to replace the old moral order’s direction, and found guidance in the new “experts” of morphology, phrenology, psychiatry, and medico-criminology. Peniston explains the corresponding shift in French authorities’ conception of homosexuality:

The doctors supported the criminal justice system by providing the police officers, the lawyers, and the judges with what they described as the physical evidence of same-sex sexual activities. They believed that these kinds of activities produced serious illnesses and physical deformities that required treatment and prevention. They also concurred with the other forces of authority in stigmatizing the men who engaged in such activities as dangerous members of society. Gradually this search for the physical signs of pederasty was replaced by new theories of same-sex sexuality that saw it as a form of mental illness. These new theories challenged the traditional view of same-sex sexuality as sin or crime and substituted for it the innovative idea of same-sex sexuality as illness (p. 65).
In the second part of the book ("The Subculture"), using data culled from police ledgers of the 1870s, Peniston develops two particularly interesting arguments. First, he shows that in the latter half of the nineteenth century, a new model for homosexual relationships was taking hold. Based on the ages of individuals who were arrested together, it seems that at least some Parisian homosexuals had moved away from the "classical" model of pederasty toward an egalitarian model where sexual relations happened between adult men and sexual roles were not limited to the passive-active dichotomy:

All of these statistics point out that the age difference between these men remained a significant factor in their relationships. However, instead of older men and younger boys... many of these men were adults in their twenties and thirties having sex with other adults in their twenties and thirties. Even the older men were having sex with men in their twenties and thirties. Hence, even though their age difference remained substantial—usually over eleven years—still a major change had occurred from the relationships of men and boys to the relationships of men and men (p. 114).

[In addition, the] distinction between active and passive partners was beginning to break down as forms of sexual activities, other than anal intercourse, became part of the broadened definition of pederasty or same-sex sexuality. The police or courts rarely noted this distinction between active or passive partners, although they did describe some of these men as "both active and passive pederasts."... The interchangeable nature of these men's roles was new to the modern period (p. 115).

The second argument, which is the primary focus of the book, is that Parisian homosexuals of the 1870s were part of an emerging identifiable homosexual subculture composed of "men in their teens, twenties and thirties, from the provinces, especially the north of France, working in mostly skilled, unskilled, service, or clerical positions" (p. 90). Peniston explains that:

Men who came into contact with the police in Paris in the 1870s had in common certain characteristics in terms of their origins, their ages, and their occupations, which allowed them to form complex and meaningful relationships with one another. These relationships gave them a sense of belonging and a means of finding emotional and material support (p. 68).

Based on the police reports, many of the men arrested shared certain coded linguistic behaviors (such as feminized nicknames), periodically demonstrated collective (though far from organized) forms of resistance toward the police, and demonstrated an awareness of a shared geography by frequenting specific cafés, bathhouses and cruising areas. Peniston adds that:

The male homosexual subculture of Paris in the 1870s had much in common with other groups in France, particularly bachelors and youths, especially in terms of work experiences, living conditions, and leisure activities. It was, nevertheless, significantly different. It deviated from the cultural norms, practicing a form of nonconformity which was tremendously creative (p. 69).

In the end, Peniston's argument for the existence of a homosexual subculture in nineteenth-century Paris is not only intriguing, but also persuasive, making an important contribution to the history of homosexuality in France. Pederasts and Others is a must-read for anyone interested in queer history, and will undoubtedly be of value to students and researchers of French cultural studies, sociology of law, and urban studies.

Reviewed by Martin Meeker, University of California, Berkeley

At the center of the Beat mythology is the deeply autobiographical nature of the published writings of Allen Ginsberg, Jack Kerouac, and William S. Burroughs. Of course, I’m not the first reviewer to point this out. In eulogizing Ginsberg in 1998, critic David Lehman observed, “His life was his greatest poem and he was its hero.” And indeed this was equally true for Jack Kerouac, who not only mythologized himself as Sal Paradise in On the Road (1957) but also lived much like a fictional bohemian. What might not be as well known, however, is the process by which autobiography and mythology, lived and imagined experience, became so intertwined in the lives and the writings of the Beats. In his brief and colorfully penned book American Scream: Allen Ginsberg’s Howl and the Making of the Beat Generation, Jonah Raskin, sets out to explore those processes. Raskin, a professor of communications and former “Minister of Information” for the Yippies, not only sets out to unravel the lived and imagined but also explain their mutual construction.

What better way to begin a book on the intertwined autobiographies and mythologies of the Beat generation than to offer another telling of what is arguably its seminal moment: the first public reading of “Howl” at San Francisco’s Six Gallery in 1955. As an amateur admirer of Beat literature and, even more, of Beat biography, I’ve read numerous accounts of this particular evening and always take pleasure in imagining being there – at a time and place when it was palpably obvious that something unique was happening. Reading Raskin’s version proved no exception in its ability to awaken the desire to experience that moment. The book itself is bracketed by this and another event important to the Beat mythology: the obscenity trial of “Howl” in San Francisco a few years later in 1957. Packed in the nine chapters between these two events, Raskin offers his reading of when and how a group of young men coalesced and morphed into the Beat generation. He also implicitly argues why it is that Ginsberg’s “Howl” should be read as the keystone or, perhaps, the Rosetta Stone of that generation, even more so than the spontaneous prose of Kerouac or Burroughs’s drug-adled stream-of-consciousness writings.

Like the novels of Kerouac and Burroughs, Ginsberg’s poems were rife with autobiographical references and with sometimes very explicit descriptions of the Beat circle of friends and fellow-travelers. “Howl” itself was dedicated to Ginsberg’s friend Carl Solomon, who appeared in the poem as the hipster “who threw potato salad at CCNY lecturers on Dadaism and subsequently presented themselves on the granite steps of the madhouse with shaven heads and harlequin speech of suicide, demanding instantaneous lobotomy.” Beat muse Neal Cassady also enters the piece as “the secret hero of these poems, cocksman and Adonis of Denver.” But, more than provide a literary Baedeker to “Howl,” which other authors like Ann Charters and Steven Watson have done quite well, Raskin devotes most of his pages to the intellectual, literary, and personal forces that inspired Ginsberg and his poetry.

Raskin’s broad overview of these influences included loosely constructed (and thus not always fully realized) chapters on Ginsberg’s relationships with people close to him. There are paragraphs on family members (especially his mother, brother, and father), mentors (including Lionel Trilling and William Carlos Williams), friends and lovers, and even a brief but intriguing account of his professional relationship with a psychiatrist during the period in which he wrote “Howl.” Raskin also delves into Ginsberg’s early unpublished writings and correspondence to uncover his literary influences. He not only discusses the considerable impact of Whitman on Ginsberg’s poetry, but notes that for a period of time he largely abandoned Whitman in favor of the high modernism of Proust, Mann, Eliot, Joyce, and Kafka. Raskin devotes some space to the context of world war and Cold War
and how the twin forces of militarism and capitalism produced a critical political edge in Ginsberg’s poetry. There are also a few tantalizing but not fully worked-out sections on the role of space and place in which Raskin attempts to explain why “Howl,” which has a lot to say about New York, could have been written only in San Francisco. Of all the chapters detailing the sources of Ginsberg’s artistic vision, the chapter I found most compelling was the one appropriately titled, “This Fiction Named Allen Ginsberg.” In this chapter, Raskin explores the way in which the public persona of “Allen Ginsberg, Beat Bard,” constantly challenged, frustrated, and delighted Allen Ginsberg, struggling and dedicated poet, in the years and decades following the publication of “Howl” and the celebrity that came with it.

Other reviewers of American Scream have noted that Raskin treats Ginsberg’s sexuality cursorily, perhaps to the point of appearing squeamish. While I tend to agree with such observations, it is my sense that he does so less out of a discomfort with homosexuality and more because he seems driven to celebrate madness as a nonconformist, Beat quality. Like Norman Mailer’s fantasy of “Negro” anti-social behavior, Raskin values and objectifies the outsider status of homosexuals; he is interested in homosexuality not because Ginsberg lived it but because of its symbolic cache as the antidote to 1950s conformity. While I think there is some value in this perspective, I also suspect that if Raskin had paid closer attention to Ginsberg’s life as a homosexual per sé, he would have been less likely to fetishize the outsider status conferred by that identity and thus offer a more nuanced portrait of Ginsberg’s sexuality and of homosexuality in the 1940s and 1950s. After all, Ginsberg wrote that the best minds of his generation were destroyed, not elevated, by madness.

While American Scream makes for a good read, readers can find many of the same stories and much of the same analysis often done better in previously published books and essays. The real reason to read this book is, I think, the same reason that likely inspired Raskin to write it: a desire to dig in, hunker down, and get intimate with the poem and with the personalities and context to which it owes its existence. Ginsberg himself described the language in “Howl” as a “tragic custard-pie comedy of wild phrasing.” Such a description might also be applied to American Scream. For it is through the language of the poem and, dare I say, jouissance with the myths surrounding the production of it that gives Raskin his voice and his reason for writing this book. Raskin can’t turn back the clock, return to 1955, and join the happily drunken revelers during that fortuitous evening at Six Gallery, but he can write about it in a language and with a style that might help him get a little closer to that moment and the secrets it may contain. Indeed, while I’m no more likely to voyage back to Beat-era San Francisco, I can join Raskin for the ride as he looks backward.


Reviewed by Howell Williams, Florida State University

Will Roscoe’s Jesus and the Shamanic Tradition of Same Sex Love, is a product of Roscoe’s six years of working through the grief wrought by the AIDS epidemic. Roscoe combines a historical exploration of early Christian text, the figure of Jesus, and Siberian and Native American Shamanism with same-sex images and symbols in a contemporary queer rendering of spirituality. In short, Roscoe argues that Jesus, as specifically portrayed in the Gospel of Mark, exemplified and practiced a universal, ideal love: a same-sex love represented in mystical rituals by intimacy, “equality, reciprocity, mutuality, [and] identification” (169).

Roscoe begins by summarizing the secondary literature regarding the canonical Gospel of Mark and the Secret Gospel of Mark. Roscoe begins his study with Morton Smith’s 1978 work, Jesus the Magician, in which Smith attempts to associate Jesus with other healers in a historical context. Historian of Ameri-
can religion Amanda Porterfield recently observed in *Healing in the History of Christianity* (Oxford University Press, 2005) that “Smith made an important contribution to the historical study of Jesus by drawing attention to Jesus’ work as a charismatic performer” (28). While Smith expanded the comparative discussion of Jesus, Porterfield suggests Smith’s agenda dismissed theological claims to the historical Jesus and Smith never demonstrated why Jesus stood out among other wonder-workers of time (28-29).

In contrast to Smith, Roscoe reclaims his own theological understanding regarding the teachings and practices of Jesus; Jesus stands out not only because of his shamanistic qualities, but also because of his emphasis on the ethics of loving. Like Smith, Roscoe’s study is comparative, and he interprets early Christian rituals in social, cultural and historical concepts compared to Greek, Native American, Southwest Asian, and Eurasian esoteric and mystical rites. For example in chapter 6, Roscoe links Plato’s philosophy and Jesus’ teachings about love by their references to voluntary brotherhood and friendship; for each passionate love was also a form of spiritual possession. In chapter 8, Roscoe compares the Siberian Chukchi shaman’s demonstrations of selfless love to Jesus’ model of agape love. Roscoe chooses the traditional Christian founder Jesus in order to work against heterosexist readings of the Christian tradition to produce a work where same-sex love is at the center of the Christian narrative.

Roscoe proposes that early Christian rites were connected with androgyny, and in the second half of the text Roscoe develops a queer rendering of shamanism as related to the shamanic emphasis on selfless love and “the practice of uniting with the spirits by means of sexual desire, and through this union, aiding others” (127). Roscoe demonstrates through a comparative study of shamanism and healing practices that shamans designed rites to produce union with the divine and heavenly assent. The author then compares shamanic ritual means and spiritual healing ends to his understanding of same-sex love, relationships, ethics, and spirituality, especially realized by living through the AIDS epidemic. In conclusion, Roscoe argues that spiritual union, as demonstrated through practices and rites of loving, is a universal ideal.

While Roscoe’s narrative begins with a historical inquiry into the workings and rites of magicians, healers, and prophets in the ancient world, his narrative becomes increasingly personal until the reader is deeply familiar with Roscoe’s personal spiritual quest and experiences as a gay man. *Jesus and the Shamanic Tradition of Same Sex Love*, while somewhat historical, would be more aptly classified as theological and ethical.

Books on same-sex desire and religion cram entire library shelves, encompassing religious traditions ranging from Orthodox Judaism, such as Rabbi Steven Greenberg’s *Wrestling with God and Men, Homosexuality in the Jewish Tradition* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2004), to African-Inspired religious traditions, such as Randy P. Conner and David Hatfield Sparks’s *Queering Creole Spiritual Traditions, Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Participation in African-Inspired Traditions in the Americas* (New York: Harrington Park Press, 2004), not to mention everything in between. Most of the work on queer religious movements and spirituality has been limited to spiritual biographies, theological reflections, defenses or rejections of church doctrine, and a smattering of sociological and historical studies.

I by no means want to discount the importance of this work. In fact, the semi-autobiographical works and those revealing primary experiences detailing the tensions or reconciliations between religious and spiritual identity are often the “queerest,” in that they recognize the fluidity of religious and sexual identities. Such writings typically are interpersonal and focus on the experience of bodies: sex and love as the ultimate religious experience and experiment in self-awareness. Nevertheless, what is missing from queer studies and religion are coherent histories of the collective peoples and movements that not only convey individual, interpersonal experiences but also tell a broader, fuller history. Roscoe’s work is unique in that he fuses a study of ancient religious rites with his own personal spirituality, but this hybrid might be a stretch for historians.
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