

In This Issue

1 Chair's Column

Karen C. Krahulik

2 CLGH Panels and Events – 2008 AHA Meeting

3 CLGH Name Change

3 Reviews

Patrick Moore, *Beyond Shame: Reclaiming the Abandoned History of Radical Gay Sexuality*

Gay Sex in the 70s. Director Joseph F. Lovett
Reviewed by Matt Johnson

M. Jacqui Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred*

Reviewed by Julian B. Carter

George Chauncey, *Why Marriage?: The History Shaping Today's Debate Over Gay Equality*

Reviewed by Lisa Gayle Hazirjian

Steve Endean, *Bringing Lesbian and Gay Rights into the Mainstream: Twenty Years of Progress*, Vicki L. Eaklor, ed.

Reviewed by Fred Fejes

Estelle B. Freedman, ed., *Feminism, Sexuality, and Politics: Essays by Estelle B. Freedman*

Reviewed by Marcia M. Gallo

Matti Bunzl, *Symptoms of Modernity: Jews and Queers in Late Twentieth-Century Vienna*

Reviewed by James W. Jones

Marcia M. Gallo, *Different Daughters: A History of the Daughters of Bilitis and the Rise of the Lesbian Rights Movement*

Reviewed by Jennifer Brier

Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Culture*

Reviewed by Sharon Marcus

Karen C. Krahulik, *Provincetown: From Pilgrim Landing to Gay Resort*

Reviewed by Nan Alamilla Boyd

Walter L. Williams and Yolanda Retter (eds.), *Gay and Lesbian Rights in the United States: A Documentary History*

Reviewed by Terence Kissack

Sharon Marcus, *Between Women: Friendship, Desire and Marriage in Victorian England*

Reviewed by Claire Potter

Chair:

Karen C. Krahulik, karen_krahulik@brown.edu

Book Review Editor:

Ian Lekus, iklekus@gmail.com

Newsletter Editor:

Kevin P. Murphy, kpmurphy@umn.edu

Chair's Column Karen C. Krahulik

Welcome back to the CLGH for another academic year of provocative events, papers, and announcements. Behind the scenes, the elected and appointed officers within CLGH have been busy proposing and implementing new initiatives to strengthen our organization and its functions. You might notice, for example, that the layout of the newsletter you are reading at this very moment is different. Kevin Murphy, our dedicated newsletter editor, has made subtle but substantive changes to the format and the content. Last spring he featured Karl-Heinz Steinle (The Schwules Museum in Berlin) and Jennifer Tyburczy (The Leather Archives and Museum in Chicago). If you have ideas for future issues, let us know and we will do our best to incorporate fresh material. In the meantime, I'd like to draw your attention to the provocative set of reviews Ian Lekus has edited. The book review section is often lauded as the most engaging feature of the CLGH Newsletter.

We will also be doing our best to recruit new members to the CLGH. Most of us know at least one, two, three, maybe more historians who would like to join the CLGH, but simply never found themselves in the right place at the right time. In the spring 2007 ballot, our membership voted to amend the CLGH by-laws to include the position of "Secretary." Charles Upchurch, assistant professor at Florida State University, has agreed to fill this post and will take the lead on all facets of membership, including our new dues schedule (which was approved via the spring 2007 ballot, but will be re-presented in the spring 2008 ballot because the '07 ballot contained an error). Similarly, we have two new Governing Board members who have pushed us in new directions administratively. Please welcome Martin Meeker, the winner of the 2007 CLGH Boswell Award, and Susan Stryker, who holds the Ruth Wynn Woodward Endowed Chair at Simon

Fraser University, to the Governing Board. Martin is working with fellow board member, Horacio Roque Ramírez, to reignite and revamp the CLGH website, while Susan has teamed up with Lisa Hazirjian and Horacio to facilitate forthcoming discussions about a possible CLGH name change.

In consultation with the Governing Board, it was my fearless (some might say foolish) decision to bring the motion for a name change back to the membership table. You'll see details of how we intend to proceed inside this issue of "The CLGH Newsletter," another title that may be worthy of rethinking. Before turning the page, however, I have one more vital message. Martin B. Duberman will be receiving a special award from the AHA this coming January (official announcement at the AHA), and the CLGH is working collaboratively with the *Radical History Review* to honor this historic occasion. (Please note the special CLGH Friday night reception in the AHA program). Board member, Mark Meinke, and I have been working on an exhilarating AHA/CLGH schedule of events, and we hope to see many of you there (details on p. 2)!

American Historical Association Annual Meeting,
Washington, D.C., January 3-6, 2008.

Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Panels & Events

Friday, January 4

9:30-11:30 a.m. Omni, Diplomat Ballroom.
Session 1, joint with the AHA and the Coordinating Council for Women in History.
Roundtable on Transnationalizing Histories of Women, Gender and Sexuality: The View from the Journals
Chair:
Antoinette Burton, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Topics:
The Global and the Intimate in the Women's Studies Quarterly; Victoria Rosner, Texas A&M
Transnationalizing the Journal of Women's History; Jean M. Allman, Washington Univ. in St. Louis
Gender and History: Transnationalism in Translation; Michele Mitchell, New York University
Feminist Studies and Transnational Networks; Claire G. Moses, University of Maryland at College Park
Forgiving Foucault: Transnationalizing the Journal of the History of Sexuality; Mathew Kuefler, San Diego State Univ.

12:15-1:15 p.m. Omni, Chairman's Boardroom.
CLGH Business Meeting

2:30-4:30 p.m. Omni, Forum Room.
Session 2.
American Gay Power in a Queer Modern World

Chair:
Karen C. Krahulik, Brown University
Papers:
Gay Power; David Eisenbach, Columbia University
Imagining a Gay World: The American Homophile Movement in a Global Perspective; Craig Loftin, University of Southern California
Homo-Coming: Sexuality, Race, and Intimacy in the Japanese Writings of Yone Noguchi; Amy Sueyoshi, San Francisco State University
Comment:
Howard Hsueh-Hao Chiang, Princeton University

6:00-7:30 p.m. Omni, Governor's Boardroom.
CLGH and *Radical History Review* Joint Reception

Saturday, January 5

11:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m. Hilton, Monroe West.
Session 3, joint with the AHA.
Before and after Kinsey: Sexual Science and Sexual Medicine in Mid-Twentieth-Century United States
Chair:
Lynn Gorchov, Denison Univ.
Papers:
Reading with Prok: Sources for Alfred Kinsey's Sexual Behavior in the Human Male (1948); Donna J. Drucker, Indiana Univ.
Sex, Medicine, and "Doctor" Kinsey: The American Medical Profession and Sexual Behavior in the Human Female (1953); Carolyn Herbst Lewis, Univ. of California Santa Barbara
From Sick Desire to Normal Behavior: The Kinsey Reports, the Mental Health Profession, and the Contested Psychopathological Status of Homosexuality in Mid-Twentieth-Century America;
Howard Hsueh-Hao Chiang, Princeton Univ.
Comment:
David H. Serlin, Univ. of California San Diego

11:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m. Marriott, Washington Room 6.
Session 4, joint with the AHA.
Sex, Surgery, and History: Perspectives on Intersex from the Middle Ages to the Twenty-First Century
Chair:
Leah DeVun, Texas A & M
Papers:
Medieval Hermaphrodites: Intersex in Medical, Legal, and Philosophical Discourse of the European Middle Ages; Irina Metzler, Univ. of Bristol
Intersexuality and "Corrective" Surgery in the Early Modern Period; Kathleen Long, Cornell Univ.
History for the Future: A Personal Account of Using History to Change the Medical Treatment of Intersex; Alice D. Dreger, Northwestern Univ.
Comment:
Anne Enke, University of Wisconsin-Madison

2:30-4:30 p.m. Marriott, Washington Room 6.
Session 5, joint with the AHA.
The Politics of Sexual Scandals across Time and Space
Chair:
Katherine B. Crawford, Vanderbilt Univ.

Papers:

Darkness in New Light New England: Punishing Bestial Acts in the 1790s; Doron Ben-Atar, Fordham Univ. and Richard D. Brown, Univ. of Connecticut
The Legal Scandal of "Personal Status" in French Algeria; Judith Surkis, Harvard Univ.
Gossip, Scandal, and the Sexual Solicitation of Boys in Colonial Mexico; Zeb Tortorici, UCLA
The Litmus Tests: The Role of Public Scandal and Race in Sexual Misconduct Cases in Colonial Ghana; Carina E. Ray, Fordham Univ.

Comment:

Katherine Crawford

2:30-4:30 p.m. Marriott, Washington Room 4.
Session 6.

Legal Liberation? Intersections of Gender, Sexuality, and Race in Twentieth-Century U.S. Equal Rights Campaigns
Chair:

Regina Kunzel, University of Minnesota

Papers:

"Into the Law": The Odell Waller Case and the Early Civil Rights Activism of Pauli Murray; Dayo F. Gore, University of Massachusetts at Amherst
Defending a Psychopathic Gay Alien: Genealogies of Legal Strategy in Boutilier v. the INS; Marc Stein, York University
Managing the Costs of Life: Feminism, Biopower, and the Debate over Pregnancy Disability, 1974-78; Deborah Dinner, Yale University

Comment:

The Audience

5:30-7:30 p.m. Omni, Congressional Room.
CLGH Reception with Local History Presenters

Sunday, January 6

8:30-10:30 a.m. Marriott, Maryland Suite C.
Session 7, joint with the AHA.

Global (S)Exchange: National Ideals and Transnational History

Chair:

Pete Sigal, Duke Univ.

Papers:

The Feminized Coronela and the Invisibility of Transgender in Postrevolutionary Mexico; Gabriela Cano, Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana
"White Goddess": Christine Jorgensen's Racial Imaginary; Susan Stryker, Simon Fraser Univ.
Sex in Change: Configurations of Sexuality and Gender in Contemporary Iran; Afsaneh Najmabadi, Harvard Univ.

Comment:

Joanne Meyerowitz, Yale Univ.

11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. Marriott, Hoover Room.
Session 8, joint with the AHA.

Sexuality and the Postwar Metropolis

Chair:

Karen C. Krahulik, Brown University

Papers:

Glamorous Girls, Gambling Playboys, and Queers: The Search for Naughty Inspiration in America's Postwar Mecca; T. Vaughan Tremmel, Univ. of Chicago

Black Politics and the Campaign for Chicago's Gay Rights Ordinance, 1973-88; Timothy Stewart-Winter, Univ. of Chicago
Home, Church, and School: The Politics of "Straightness" in Postwar Santa Clara County; Clayton Howard, University of Michigan
Comment:
Karen C. Krahulik

CLGH Name Change

Response Requested

Since the inception of the Committee on Lesbian and Gay History in 1979, the scope of our members' scholarship and the language of our fields of study have undergone significant transformations. These shifts have prompted peer organizations—such as the MLA's former Gay & Lesbian Caucus, now the GL/Q Caucus—to develop a new name that better represents the full scope of scholarship they promote. The CLGH needn't follow every academic trend, of course. But enough of our active members have voiced concerns about the limitations of the organization's current name that we believe the issue demands greater consideration in the form of a membership-wide dialogue and vote to occur over the next six months.

The CLGH Board of Governors and Chair greatly desire the involvement of our general membership in this process. We urge all interested parties to attend our annual business meeting, scheduled for 12:15–1:15 p.m. in the Omni Chairman's Boardroom at the American Historical Association conference in Washington, DC, where we'll debate the issue of changing the organization's name and discuss possible alternatives and their implications for the organization's future direction. Recognizing that not all those with an interest in this question may be able to attend the conference, we also invite members to submit their comments in advance via email to Board member Susan Stryker at rwwchair@sfu.ca. Please send your comments no later than 15 December 2007 in order to ensure inclusion in the AHA dialogue. We welcome critiques and/or defenses of the current name, and especially suggestions and justifications for alternate names. We see this dialogue as a preliminary step toward a vote on the question of whether to change the organization's name, and, if so, what to change it to—questions we intend to pose on the ballot in the spring 2008 newsletter.

REVIEWS

Patrick Moore, *Beyond Shame: Reclaiming the Abandoned History of Radical Gay Sexuality*. (Boston: Beacon, 2004).

Gay Sex in the 70s. Dir. Joseph F. Lovett. 2005. Color, 67 minutes. Distributed by Wolfe Video.

Reviewed by Matt Johnson, Independent Scholar

Dedicated to the memory of Eric Rofes (1954-2006)

In her essay "The evidence of experience," Joan W. Scott claims that histories of social minorities, and histories of sexual minorities in particular, reify the subjects they invoke when instead they should question how those subjects are constituted in the first place.¹ Unfortunately, the constitution of sexual subjectivity is perhaps least liable to the evidentiary interrogation Scott advocates. Thirty years after the publication of Michel Foucault's *La volonté de savoir*, individual sexual experience is still widely perceived as irreducibly authoritative. Consequently, as much talk as there is about sex, there is comparatively little talk *about the talk* about it. This is no less true of LGBT studies generally and LGBT history in particular. Eschewing earlier conventions in the writing of sexual histories (the "sex lives of the rich and famous" model), LGBT studies scholars continue to define sexuality in progressively broader terms. The insights afforded by this strategy are invaluable, but they do often have the perhaps unintended consequence of precluding discussion of sexual desire. Queer desire is successfully implicated in histories of political organizations and social movements, but the fact of that desire and its expression are typically taken as a given in the analysis. Very few people, in other words, are writing histories of sex.

To be fair to historians, there are formidable obstacles that inveigh against the writing of such histories. Locating sex in the historical record is challenging. When it is located and subjected to analysis, the historian must toe a narrow line between public defamation of sexual subjects on the one hand and charges of anachronism and prurient interest on the other. Legal proscriptions and social taboos on the public elaboration of sexual behavior, further compounded by the injunction to not take this lode of evidence at face value (even when the subjects who offer the evidence do just that), make its circumscription by way of analyzing *sexuality* considerably less fraught. Thus, while we

have comparatively extensive knowledge about, for example, the institutional elaboration of gay life in the 1970s, we are able to do little more than gesture toward the sexual culture that helped fuel that institutional ascendancy.

Fortunately, histories of that particular sexual culture are beginning to appear, principally in non-scholarly settings where not all of the same injunctions on the valuation and analysis of evidence apply. This means, unfortunately, that these histories suffer from the pitfalls scholarly histories go out of their way to avoid. However, they are instructive, not only because they address issues which scholarly studies thus far largely have not, but also because they say a great deal about how queer people historicize their lives and their sex, fitting the evidence of their own experience to an overarching popular historical narrative.

From the vantage point of 2007, that popular narrative is unthinkable without the intervention of AIDS. Both Patrick Moore's *Beyond Shame* and Joseph Lovett's *Gay Sex in the 70s* explicitly identify the Stonewall riots (June 1969) and the identification of the first cases of what would eventually become known as AIDS (June 1981) as chronological delimiters on their domain of inquiry. Both also limit their consideration of gay male sex in this period almost exclusively to lower Manhattan. (Moore does give a nod to San Francisco with a chapter on the celebrated fisting club, The Catacombs.) This is a justifiable choice, but one which is unheralded by either Moore or Lovett; as is so often the case in stories told by New Yorkers, New York's experience is simply taken to be universal.

The opening sequence of *Gay Sex in the 70s* shows a man sorting through a pile of irregularly shaped pieces of ceramic tile to which he has attached photographs of dead friends and lovers. When asked by an off-camera interviewer to characterize the time and place in which these men thrived, his responses are surprisingly coy and euphemistic (for a film about sex, anyway), alluding to both "Rome" and "Pompeii". The reputed decadence of these cities becomes a referent for the condition of gay New York in the 1970s. By implication, New York has since been meted out a punishment for its excesses – promiscuity, arcane sexual practices, drugs, and perhaps most significantly, the hubris of unabashed, unapologetic sexual expression. Its punishment parallels that of Rome and Pompeii, destroyed by plague in place of fire and ash. According to their creator, the photographic tiles are "pottery shards",

evidence of a “lost civilization.”

The tone established by this initial encounter might prompt the viewer to see the stated mission of *Beyond Shame* – “to rescue gay America’s past, present, and future from a disturbing spiral of destruction and AIDS-related shame,” according to its jacket blurb – as entirely justified. While Lovett’s film is clearly intended to be a eulogistic documentation of 1970s sexual culture, the intervention of AIDS is nonetheless invoked here as a necessary key to a narrative of prodigality and recompense for same. It is unclear whether such a narrative is characteristic of those men who have seen both sides of this story (AIDS and the “Time Before”), but it does lend strength to Moore’s supposition that contemporary gay life is subsumed in this narrative, an interpretation of events which enforces sexual shame on some of the very individuals who promulgate it.

Lovett takes that interpretation as a given, and offers little in the way of argument or analysis to complicate it. The film’s backbone is a series of numerous interviews with participants in sexual venues defined by that place and time (principally the West Side piers, bathhouses, nightclubs, and Fire Island), including some notable personalities of the period (Larry Kramer, Arnie Kantrowitz and Lawrence Mass, among others). The interviews indirectly narrate a host of archival material, encompassing disco music, documentary film and video, period pornography, still photographs, and ephemera, much of it from the interviewees’ own collections. A few of the men interviewed offer more engaging interpretations of this evidence, including the idea that having sex was an important part of community building, and that the sexual solidarity of the 1970s translated into an ability to organize when the crisis came. Some champion the notion of contemporary youngsters losing themselves in sexual abandon (while somewhat contradictorily urging caution), and one man fantasizes about the eventual resurgence of the sexual culture in which he came of age. But at its heart, *Gay Sex in the 70s* is a showcase for the interviewees’ nostalgia as well as a mirror for our own, and advocates little else.

With *Beyond shame*, meanwhile, we have a return to argument and advocacy with a vengeance. Moore is a novelist and founding director of the Estate Project for Artists with AIDS; it merits noting that the book began its life as a report commissioned by the Estate Project. He persuasively claims that “... a vibrant sexual culture stimulates other types of

creativity” (xiii) and sees the recuperation of 1970s sexual culture as essential not only to the health of contemporary gay male communities but also to the health of creative and artistic enterprises more generally. A little surprisingly, given their relative prevalence on the continuum of gay male sexual behavior, he singles out leathersex and sadomasochism as exemplary of this sexual culture:

... the leathersex or S/M world was the furthest from mainstream culture and therefore the most influential as a vanguard. It had developed specialized theatrical spaces for explorations that were so extreme as to be better related to art than sex. The aesthetics of this world were revolutionary ... (117).

Moore assumes the Baudelairean posture that the life of the artist is coextensive with his or her work, and consequently argues that novel sexual cultures constituted one variety of artistic experimentation, which informed and inspired other projects in turn. One need only think of Robert Mapplethorpe’s X portfolio to appreciate the cross-pollination between artwork and sexual practice which Moore is referencing.

Like *Gay Sex in the 70s*, *Beyond Shame* sees the epiphenomenon of AIDS as both a singular agent of historical change and a categorical, unbridgeable rift. Unlike Lovett’s film, Moore’s account does more than allude to life post-1981, analyzing the fall of what he views as a seminal sexual culture and enumerating the consequences of both that loss and the deliberate forgetting around it. To that end, he advances a breathtakingly cartoonish series of mutually antagonistic dyads -- the 1970s versus the 1980s, West Village versus East, leather versus drag, “high” art versus “low” – in which the former element is exalted and the latter castigated. In Moore’s narrative, “the more authentic world of leathersex” (118) is identified exclusively with the West Village in the 1970s and characterized by a vital, communal sexual and artistic culture. This gives way to the East Village of the 1980s, which is assessed as vapid, desexualized, individualistic and profit-driven, co-opting this earlier “radical” sexual culture for personal gain while divesting it of its unsavory associations with dirt, sex and AIDS. He has some choice invective for some unlikely targets, including Andy Warhol and Cookie Mueller (of John Waters’s *Female Trouble* and *Desperate Living*) who, together with the formidable lineage of drag queens who emerged from the floor shows at the Pyramid and Boy Bar during the 1980s, are somehow

representative of everything the sexual culture of the 1970s stood against:

Using drag as a nonthreatening way of indicating gay life in popular culture allows mainstream America to avoid their more difficult feelings about actual gay male sex. I believe that in fifty years' time we will look back at drag and camp as the minstrel shows of gay culture - amusing but ultimately sinister and degrading, an easy way for straight culture to avoid the realities of our sexuality (120).

It is hard to know where to begin a refutation of this spectacle of interpretive excess. Indeed, one wonders whether or not a rebuttal to something so facetious is worth the trouble. (Does Moore really believe there were no drag queens in the West Village prior to 1981? Does he think that we will believe it?) To his credit, Moore owns that his history is a "polemic" (xxvii) which is "written accessibly and employs a strong narrative" (xxii). He also acknowledges the hazards of his narrative approach:

The use of parallel arcs in history is irresistible but brings with it the danger of warping the shape of those arcs to fit more persuasively together. Still, this danger is worth the risk in understanding the cultural impact of AIDS (82).

I would argue that Moore's treatment is not worth the risk he identifies. It reduces complex and interrelated cultural phenomena to Manichaean abstractions, discretely bounded by chronology, geography and stylistic convention. Moore's absolutist typologies tend to obscure the social world which AIDS acted upon, a world in which the boundaries between these entities were far more permeable than he seems able to imagine. His lack of imagination is most poignantly betrayed by his relation of a visit to Assotto Saint's apartment, "a study in contradictions" (164), where he espies a leather cap and a feather boa jauntily juxtaposed among the poet's bric-a-brac.

It is worth considering that Moore's visceral responses, both positive and negative, are attributable to his own subject position, the unassailable evidence of his experience. "For older generations of gay men, looking back to the 1970s involves nostalgia; for younger men, the 70s elicit envy" (48). Moore situates himself squarely as a member of a younger generation, and one senses that, more than anything, his narrative is profoundly influenced by his own sense of disenfranchisement

at having missed the party:

While I have not written this book as a memoir, it has been shaped by certain facets of my life. My fascination with the sexual culture of the 1970s derives largely from the fact that I did not experience it directly ... By the time I arrived in New York, the sexual culture that I had heard so much about was already very much in decline and what remained was joyless. To my great disappointment, the ascendant culture of New York at that moment was the East Village art scene, which always seemed vacuous to me (xxii-xxiii).

He points out that in the mid-1980s he and his lover lived on University Place – a street located, not coincidentally, midway between the West and East Village. His geographic positioning reflects his social positioning insofar as he was disconnected from both the social worlds he describes, deriding what appeared accessible and fetishizing what seemed prematurely and permanently foreclosed while at the same time profoundly misunderstanding both.

It's rare to see leathermen and s/m practitioners in a heroic or even a sympathetic role in discussions of gay sex, let alone in gay history. A more typical treatment is that of *Gay Sex in the 70s*, which barely references leathersex, and then only disparagingly as something inherently suspect and dangerous, evoking early folk theories of AIDS contagion in gay communities which identified s/m practices as "riskier" even when it rapidly became clear that whips and chains were not spreading the disease.² In light of this history, I happen to think Moore's project commendable, and I was initially disposed to regard his effort favorably. And however scandalous his willful ignorance of drag, it's hard to fault him for not having done some homework when it comes to leather. He cites interviews with activist and writer Guy Baldwin as well as Tom of Finland Foundation president Durk Dehner, both of whom were prominent denizens of the s/m subculture of the 1970s. But the details of his account strain its credibility. The Chicago Hellfire Club's annual Inferno run is dubbed "Chicago's Hellfire event", which is misleading in multiple ways – the event is not called "Hellfire", nor is it held in Chicago, but instead at a private campsite in Michigan.³ And Moore states that New York's Hellfire Club and J's Hangout, both sex clubs in the Meat-Packing District, were still open upon the book's publication in 2004, when in fact they had closed two years before.⁴

These register as trifling complaints, errors identifiable only to those with insider knowledge of some small and fairly arcane social worlds. Yet in those domains, these minor gaffes are enough to mark someone as an outsider, leaving the informed reader with the impression that Moore has only a passing acquaintance with the subject about which he feels so passionately. One might be forgiven for wondering whether Moore is appropriating leather and s/m as rhetorical devices, strip-mining a subculture for its radical chic (much as he accuses East Village artists of doing) with somewhat less understanding and sympathy than he professes.

Perhaps the clearest hallmark of Moore's disingenuousness is his failure to acknowledge those that have survived to carry the tradition of this "radical" sexual culture forward. Leatherfolk and s/m players are probably more numerous and more public now than they have ever been, involving queer people on both sides of the generational divide Moore describes, even if their sexual styles occupy a less primary position in the consciousness of the overall gay community than they did thirty years ago. Moreover, leather institutions are some of the most resilient in gay life. Many of them, some founded as early as the mid-1950s, have continued into the present and have survived in the face of formidable odds – not only AIDS and the loss of physical locations such as bars and s/m play spaces (arguably due to the redevelopment of urban neighborhoods which had also housed dwindling industrial economies, rather than sexual shame, as Moore claims), but also intensifying social scrutiny and legal prosecution. Clearly, the sexual cultures Moore mourns are not moribund, nor are their histories neatly bracketed by the twelve years between Stonewall and AIDS. To state that "David [Wojnarowicz] was perhaps the only through line connecting the sexual artists of the 1970s with contemporary gay men" (106) is utterly fatuous, especially in light of his own research. What does Moore suppose Baldwin and Dehner are doing with their Saturday nights?

One should not discount the fact that contemporary kink communities are indeed grappling with certain issues Moore raises, notably the co-option of an "authentic", "outsider" sexual culture by "mainstream" and commercial interests, as well as nostalgia for a highly mythologized "Time Before," the truth of which remains largely unknown. Yet the question must be asked: to what end Moore's preoccupation with history and with authenticity? Does he imagine that the two are the same? What does Moore believe the cultivation of a "more authentic" sexual culture would accomplish? He

argues that gay men's reclamation of ownership of our unique, artful sexual legacy, in all its messily ecstatic particulars, as well as reclaiming our ownership of AIDS (an argument which is heir to a debate about AIDS and representation almost as old as the pandemic itself) will contribute to curtailing HIV infection among younger gay men, notably black men, in the United States. Certainly, sharing sexual knowledge across generations appeals strongly to a sense of community building and historical continuity. And yet the efficacy of this kind of knowledge-sharing is limited, just as intergenerational and interracial contacts (even between adult gay men) are limited as well as highly suspect. It seems that, as far as HIV risk is concerned, younger gay men would be better served by a less disingenuous sexual education than is currently practiced in the United States, one which acknowledges their existence and their appetites, than they would be by the cultivation of a particular historical consciousness, which, whatever its benefits, has the problematic effect of characterizing younger men's preoccupations and experiences as "inauthentic."

From the perspective of a gay man significantly younger than Patrick Moore, the semantic gap between "authenticity" and "truth" is a curious one, and a gap which neither *Beyond Shame* nor *Gay Sex in the 70s* are able to bridge. Younger gay men inevitably identify with our elders' experience, but are simultaneously and perpetually denied a claim on that experience – denied it not willfully, but through an accident of birth and through fortuitous advances in the treatment, if not prevention, of disease. Blessedly, some of us have been spared the pain and loss that earlier generations have known. Yet in only being able to approximate knowledge of that pain and loss, as well the exultation which preceded them – as mediated through books and plays, pictures and stories – there is something about the men who are rearing us which remains a mystery, and that always will. Perhaps that mystery is inevitable, an object lesson in the limits of historical knowledge. And much as we may envy our elders their knowledge, we must also be grateful for our ignorance, grateful to not know all that they know.

¹Joan W. Scott, "The Evidence of Experience." In *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, edited by Henry Abelove, Michele Aina Barale and David M. Halperin. (New York: Routledge, 1993: 397-415).

²Gayle S. Rubin, "Elegy for the Valley of Kings: AIDS and the Leather Community in San Francisco, 1981-1996." In *In Changing Times: Gay Men and Lesbians Encounter HIV/AIDS*, edited by Martin P. Levine, Peter M. Nardi and John H. Gagnon. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997: 101-44).

³Bob Guenther, "Inferno." *Leather Times* no. 2 (2006): 5-11.

⁴Jay Shockley, "Gansevoort Market Historic District Designation Report." (New York: New York City Landmarks Preservation Commission, 2003: 88).

M. Jacqui Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005).

Reviewed by Julian B. Carter, California College of the Arts

While I was reading *Pedagogies of Crossing*, I kept dreaming (actually dreaming) of the subways in New York. You enter in one place, pop up somewhere else, and if you don't pay attention to the transfer points you may suddenly find yourself someplace unexpected. The book produced in me the same mixture of fascination, frustration, boredom, and breathless pleasure as using the subways, a perhaps inevitable response to the sheer density of human experience when its rich variety is stuffed into a fairly small space and set into motion.

Travel, both literal and conceptual, is the core metaphor through which Alexander structures *Pedagogies of Crossing*. Both the rewards and difficulties of this book lie in its textual enactment of the transnational feminism it studies. Subjects don't stay in their customary frames of reference and relationships, but travel and mingle in unconventional ways, both within and across chapters. The militarization of the American economy and the bureaucratization of American universities are caught shaking hands, and domestic violence legislation in the Bahamas turns out to be unexpectedly intimate with anti-immigration sentiment in California. In short, this is a book to experience, the way one undergoes a philosophical thought-experiment or an especially complex series of subway transfers, rather than a book one consumes principally in order to gain information. There are times when the experience is not as rewarding as one might wish, given the labor of the undergoing. Too, other scholars have explored similar ground in a way that is likely to be more immediately accessible to historians who lack previous familiarity with the styles of analysis common in transnational and U.S. Third World feminism. Recent examples include *Haunted by Empire*, an anthology in which Ann Laura Stoler

argues explicitly for the value and scholarly rigor of the counterintuitive juxtapositions Alexander uses without explanation.¹ Or, for those interested in exploring more global and less historical perspectives, Gayatri Gopinath's *Impossible Desires* (reviewed in this issue) is another recent work more explicitly focused on gay and lesbian subjects than is *Pedagogies of Crossing*.²

Although gay and lesbian history is not its main focus, *Pedagogies of Crossing* has valuable contributions to offer the field. One is an excellent bibliography that can direct researchers to a wealth of critical work on sexuality and gender in a transnational frame. Given the disproportionate emphasis on white, First World subjects in gay and lesbian historical analysis, Alexander's twenty-page listing of sources of relevance to people of color and those outside the U.S. is alone worth the price of the book. Some historians will also be engaged by Alexander's thinking about the relations of the past to the present. For instance, in a chapter remembering *This Bridge Called My Back* twenty years after its publication, Alexander theorizes memory in a way that resonates with much lesbian historical work on the usable past. The book's final essay is not primarily historical (it engages the boundary between the sacred and the secular) but it too raises fascinating questions about the different kinds of memories available in each register and the analytic consequences of academics' tendency to occlude the sacred.

Gay and lesbian historians will find more direct reflections of their dominant interests in the chapters of *Pedagogies of Crossing* in which Alexander builds on John D'Emilio's famous "capitalism thesis" to map the various paths through which sexuality follows capital in its global transformations.³ This is one of several thematic threads that run through the volume, and it forms the chief content of three of the book's seven essays. In "Erotic Autonomy as a Politics of Decolonization," Alexander interrogates the 1991 passage of the Sexual Offenses and Domestic Violence Act in the Bahamas, asking why the state found it necessary to link the criminalization of domestic violence, spousal rape, prostitution, nondisclosure of HIV status to sexual partners, and consensual lesbian and gay sex. Alexander begins to answer that question by situating nationalist politics of sexuality in relation to the history of feminist activism in the Bahamas. She suggests that the "popular feminist mobilization of the mid-1980s" (29), which aimed to protect women against sexual violence, generated

a widespread public willingness to see domestic sexual abuse as a political matter connected to larger political issues such as “state enforcement of compulsory motherhood” and “the colonization of citizenship” (32). The state then co-opted this popular analysis and used it to help forge Bahama’s national image as a “modern” state (able and willing to protect women and children from sexual violence and its citizens from sexually transmitted disease) in the same legal gesture that certified Bahama as a “traditional” state (unwilling to tolerate the erotic perversities associated with the decadent United States). Alexander argues that the Sexual Offenses and Domestic Violence Act thus records the historical/political situation of the Bahamas as what she terms a “neocolonial” state. She goes on to connect neocolonial status—centrally performed through the regulation of sexuality—to a particular capital formation centered on tourism that actively promotes the Bahamas as heterosexual, clean, and oriented toward servicing wealthy whites. Neocolonial states, she concludes, can and do sponsor particular forms of heterosexuality as part of their effort to attract international capital.

In a later essay, “Imperial Desire/Sexual Utopias: White Gay Capital and Transnational Tourism,” Alexander explores capital’s ability to travel along the gay tourism circuit as well, and ties her research on this subject to Martin Manalansan’s work the better to ponder the implications of gay male tourism for the “queer natives” whose global circulation contradicts the imperial assumption that the essential character of the indigenous person is dictated by a fixed geographical location (70).⁴ After an apparent detour through two chapters on the university as a political arena, these themes of capitalism, tourism, and heterosexuality resurface in the essay that offers Alexander’s most explicit engagement with issues of history and historicity. In “Transnationalism, Sexuality, and the State: Modernity’s Traditions at the Height of Empire,” Alexander shows that conventional understandings of chronology are problematic for transnational analysis. Adapting Stuart Hall’s notion of the palimpsest to describe the way in which traces of the imperial past continue to resonate in the transnational present, Alexander asks how the conventional hierarchical distinctions between tradition (past) and modernity (present) work to obscure the real relations between colonial, neocolonial, and neo-imperial formations.⁵ The point, she says, is not “to collapse historical moments and conceptual categories into one another,” but rather to acknowledge “palimpsestic time” the

better to “plot the routes of ideological traffic and proximity within and among” different state/capital formations (192, 194).

If this doesn’t sound like what most people mean by gay and lesbian history, it is nonetheless about nonheteronormative subjects as subjects of historical analysis. Alexander develops her account of “modernity’s traditions” through the U. S. Defense of Marriage Act and the multiple ways in which “tradition” and “modernity” were scribbled across one another in it. I found this account particularly compelling in its ability to explain the way in which DOMA produced an all but impervious ideological web in which an idealized concept of marriage expanded to occupy all legitimate time, from the ancient past to the generations yet unborn, so that gay and lesbian marriage seems to disrupt the flow of history itself. Characteristically, Alexander’s understanding of the way (hetero)sexuality serves specific state projects makes it impossible for her to limit her analysis to gay and lesbian subjects. Hence her discussion of DOMA is followed by a trenchant reading of welfare reform in terms of the state-sponsored heterosexualizing of the poor before she turns to the U.S. occupation of Iraq and the way that the figure of “the heterosexual patriot citizen” recalls the imperial role of the Great White Father, bearer of Christian modernity (239).

The restlessness of Alexander’s mind and analysis can have brilliant results, but it can also be wearing. At its weakest, her argumentative strategy works primarily through juxtaposition. Yet even when it is less than fully developed or persuasive in its argumentation, Alexander’s sweeping analytic range has a curious power. Her recurring influence on my dream life indicates her ability to stimulate the mind in ways, and on levels, rare in academic writing. *Pedagogies of Crossing* is written in and as part of a tradition of women of color theorizing that aims to stimulate and to suggest, rather than to tell people what they ought to think and believe. It therefore seems most appropriate to measure the book’s success according to the influence it has on its readers.

¹Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Haunted By Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).

²Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Culture* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005).

³John D’Emilio, “Capitalism and Gay Identity.” In Ann Snitow, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson, eds., *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1983).

⁴ Martin F. Manalansan IV, *Global Divas: Filipino Gay Men in the Diaspora* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2003).

⁵ Stuart Hall, "Cultural Studies and the Politics of Internationalization." In *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. by David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen (London: Routledge, 1996).

George Chauncey, *Why Marriage?: The History Shaping Today's Debate Over Gay Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 2004).

Reviewed by Lisa Gayle Hazirjian, Carnegie Mellon University

How can historians most effectively shape public discourse? Although not the main historical question animating George Chauncey's succinct treatise on the emergence of gay marriage as a hot-button issue in contemporary U.S. politics, it is one the book implicitly poses to fellow scholars of every ideological bent.

Why Marriage? seeks to move public opinion by teaching a handful of basic historical lessons to a general audience. Brief discussions of the proliferation of antigay discrimination from the 1920s to the 1950s, the emergence of gay and lesbian organizing in the post-World War II period, and the successive metamorphoses of the "gay movement" (29) since the 1960s lack the complexities and nuances academic readers crave. Yet for a general audience—and especially for students too young to remember a time Ellen DeGeneres wasn't formally out of the closet and too restless to appreciate an academic monograph on clashes over homosexuality in 20th century American political culture—this quick account does the important work of contextualizing recent LGBT demands for the protection of legal equality within a baseline history of antigay repression.

Importantly, the early chapters also lay the analytical foundation for Chauncey's discussion of marriage itself by introducing the idea that the regulation of sexuality has functioned as an instrument of social control. Recounting earlier efforts to defend social hierarchies—particularly white supremacy—by placing constraints on the right to marry, Chapter Three appropriately positions the current debate over gay marriage within continuing historical struggles over the social functions of marriage. Here Chauncey argues that the dissolution of legal restrictions on

one's right to choose one's spouse in such cases as *Perez v. Sharp* (1948) and *Loving v. Virginia* (1967) not only established the judicial precedents upon which the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court based its 2003 ruling extending marriage rights to same-sex couples, it also set in motion a cultural shift toward more widespread recognition of an inalienable right to the freedom to marry. Extending the argument that "four fundamental changes in marriage since the nineteenth century have made the right to marry seem both more imaginable and more urgent to lesbians and gay men" (59), Chauncey asserts that the loosening of strict gender roles within marriage and a decline in the power of religious authorities to impose their beliefs on others has opened greater cultural space for same-sex marriages. As with many of the 'steady march of progress' pronouncements in this book, such claims will ring a bit hollow to readers more acutely attuned to the enduring power of patriarchy and conservative Christianity to shape social norms in the United States. But even from this more critical view, Chauncey's most significant observation here holds true: today's 'defense of marriage' position is but the latest incarnation of staunch resistance to any shift in marriage that destabilizes gender norms.

Notably, the heteronormative family ideal's lasting imprint on U.S. social policy has been especially influential in catapulting marriage to the forefront of the national gay rights agenda. Summarizing a voluminous literature on the rise of this nation's semi-welfare state, Chauncey notes that "while every other industrialized society made health care and old-age security a right of citizenship, the tenuous 'security net' created in the United States in the twentieth century made access to many benefits contingent on employment or marriage" (71). As access to such rights and benefits has become a more pressing need for gay and lesbian couples—beginning in the 1980s with the devastations of the AIDS epidemic and the new imperatives of gay and lesbian parenting (and, one might add, rising as baby-boomer-generation same-sex couples reach retirement age)—the demands for equal legal status have grown louder and stronger. Historically, the narrative here feels like only part of the story, begging a fuller explanation of why other gay rights issues have, to many observers, disappeared behind the gay marriage controversy—or, to build on Chauncey's tantalizing formulation, how gay politics shifted from an emphasis on "securing the rights of *individuals* against discrimination in employment and on building *community* institutions and a collective culture" to "focusing on the rights of same-

sex couples” (94, emphasis in original).

Why Marriage? excels, however, at conveying the emotional and practical stakes in the struggle for marriage equality by offering compelling accounts of same-sex couples who have been denied hospital visitation rights, prevented by biological kin from making medical decisions or funeral arrangements, subjected by hostile courts to the invalidation of wills naming them as executors or beneficiaries—the list could go on—all in the absence of the legal protections of marriage. Personalizing the gay marriage debate by publicizing such stories has proven to be one of the most effective ways of shifting public opinion toward greater support for marriage equality for same-sex couples. For doing so within a broader framework that teaches the everyday voter to think historically about the ways that “marriage is constantly changing” (59), Chauncey is to be commended.

Yet as one who is endlessly frustrated by the narrow parameters of U.S. political discourse, I find myself wishing that Chauncey had persuaded Basic Books to publish a book that might really have shaken up the 2004 presidential campaign (for which this work was fast-tracked) by using the gay marriage debate to expand political dialogue on several related subjects. For instance, one could go much further (as many feminist scholars have done elsewhere) in critiquing public policies that tie social welfare provisions to marital status; marriage needn't be the only route through which Americans, regardless of sexual identity, gain access to such provisions. One could go much further in analyzing the religious dimensions of the gay marriage debate, from the desires of many same-sex couples to participate in the marriage rituals of their denominations, to the desires of many denominations that do not yet permit same-sex unions to remain free of state interference in determining which couples can and cannot receive their blessings, to the growing number of clergy within denominations committed to the fight for marriage equality who perform religious unions but refuse to sign marriage licenses—and the struggle of those who still officiate legal weddings to reconcile their theology of equality with an inherently unequal social system. And one could go much further in elaborating upon the fact that not even full marriage equality at the federal level would abrogate the need for comprehensive civil rights legislation to protect lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals from discrimination in employment, housing, education, immigration, medical care, family law, social welfare provision,

the criminal justice system, and so on.

I cannot help but wonder, though, whether such a wide-ranging volume would really do more to advance public discourse than this highly accessible, narrow little book. With *Why Marriage?*, Chauncey nods toward these larger issues (and others), providing fellow historians the openings we need as teachers to move beyond the familiar boundaries of the gay marriage debate in our classrooms, and to encourage the quality of dialogue among our students that our political culture so desperately needs.

Steve Endean, *Bringing Lesbian and Gay Rights into the Mainstream: Twenty Years of Progress*, Vicki L. Eaklor, ed. (New York: Harrington Park Press, 2006)

Reviewed by Fred Fejes, Florida Atlantic University

While researching a history of the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), Vicki Eaklor came across the papers of Steve Endean. Endean was one of HRC's co-founders and a major figure in gay political activism in the 1970s and 1980s. Among the papers, she found chapters of an unfinished autobiography and various writings on political activism. In what can only be described as a labor of love, Eaklor undertook the task of editing this material and arranging it into a book. The first part is largely autobiographical, while the second part comprises a series of chapters dealing with political organizing, strategy, and tactics. Thankfully, there is a good index. While no amount of editing can disguise the makeshift and sometimes disorganized nature of the material, the book—perhaps better described as a collection—provides a very important historical record of the life and activities of one of the key figures in post-Stonewall LGBT politics.

Endean was born in 1948 in Iowa, and started college at the University of Minnesota in 1968, just at the time that radical political energies of the 1960s were exploding. Part of that radical wave included the emergence of gay activist efforts across the country, particularly on college campuses. But while many gay activists thought of liberation and revolution, Endean's sense of politics was strongly anchored in the mainstream and the art of the possible. Coming to terms in late 1971 with his sexuality, he went to the Gay House in Minneapolis, one of the first drop-in gay counseling centers. A born organizer, Endean was the head of the board that ran the center within

a matter of months. From there he went on to organize and lead a series of efforts to win political recognition and rights for lesbians and gay men, including the 1974 passage of non-discrimination laws in Minneapolis and St. Paul. He worked with Minnesota legislators, among them State Senator Allan Spear, one of the nation's first openly gay legislators, in the effort to pass a statewide ordinance.

He quickly attracted the attention of the leaders of the national lesbian and gay movement, and was appointed co-chair of the National Gay Task Force in 1976. Along the way, he became friends with Jim Foster, one of the people to address the 1972 Democratic Convention on gay rights; with Jack Campbell, the owner of a national chain of bathhouses and major gay rights fundraiser and contributor; and with David Goodstein, publisher of the *Advocate*, who played a "Godfather" role in gay politics in the 1970s and 1980s. In 1977, Endean went to Florida to work in the campaign against Anita Bryant. Less than a year later, he was back in Minnesota, working unsuccessfully against a Miami-inspired effort to repeal St. Paul's non-discrimination ordinance.

Deciding that the growing attacks on lesbian and gay rights spawned by the Bryant campaign could be best fought at the national level, he moved to Washington D.C. in the fall of 1978, and became the first director of the Gay Rights National Lobby, working to convince members of Congress to sign onto a national lesbian and gay rights legislation. Realizing that having a voice in Congress began with contributions to Congressional candidates' election campaigns, he organized the Human Rights Campaign Fund (HRCF, the precursor to today's HRC) as the first national lesbian/gay fundraising political action committee. Under his leadership, a number of political "firsts" were achieved: the first Congressional hearings on the impact of discrimination on lesbians and gay men; the first direct mail campaign fundraising to the national lesbian and gay community; and the first time a national political figure (Walter Mondale) addressed a lesbian/gay fundraising event.

The 1982 election was the highpoint of Endean's career in Washington. HRCF raised and distributed over \$125,000 to 140 supportive Congressional candidates, with more than 80% of them winning. With that success, HRCF was able to successfully lobby for the first federal funding of AIDS research, education, and prevention the following spring.

But, as is often the case in the byzantine world of political organizations, Endean's success was his own undoing. A number of major gay contributors such as David Goodstein feared losing control of the direction of the national gay political effort. Endean's leadership style came under attack in the pages of the *Advocate*, and he resigned his post in 1983. Down but not out, he went on to organize other political efforts. His experience at the national level taught him the importance of grassroots voices, and in 1986 he organized the Fairness Fund as a way to generate overnight constituent mail to Congress on AIDS and lesbian/gay rights issues. He continued to work on these efforts until the early 1990s, when he finally had to step back because of HIV-related illness. He died in August 1993 at the age of 45.

Reading this book, which covers events that are still fresh in the memory of many older lesbians and gay scholars and activists, makes one realize again how marginalized the lesbian and gay movement was in Washington in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Senator Ted Kennedy, the sachem of liberal America, endorsed the federal measure protecting lesbians and gay men from discrimination for the first time in 1983. The big dramatic challenge at a HRCF fundraising dinner was to get the main speaker, Walter Mondale, then a prospective candidate for the 1984 Democratic nomination, to say the word "gay" in his speech. The candidate was uncomfortable, both with the issue and with the crowd. However, a solution to the problem was reached: In his speech, Mondale acknowledged, "My good friend, Steve Endean, the Executive Director of the Gay Rights National Lobby." By such little crumbs, major political victories were counted. In any event, Mondale "screwed up all the advance planning" and omitted the word. However the speech did receive major publicity and was seen as a gay rights endorsement by Mondale.

The book effectively captures the tensions and the contradictions that are often part of politics at the margin. Endean helped create the HRCF as a way of raising large sums of money for campaign donations. While the "tuxedo and gown" celebrity-attended fundraising dinners he organized in a number of major cities were successful in pulling in the cash from wealthy lesbian and gay donors, it alienated the less affluent bulk of the nation's lesbian and gay population from the national political effort. After being forced out of the HRCF, he tried to create an alternative to the top-down form of political organizing typified by HRCF by creating the grassroots direct mail campaign. However, Endean never seemed to be aware of why many lesbians and

gay men had little faith in national efforts that relied on the endorsement of “mainstream” celebrities and expensive events.

Still, looking back at where we were politically in the early 1980s, we realize how far we have come, due in significant part to efforts of people like Endean. It was only fitting that on Steve Endean’s death, Walter Mondale commemorated him, saying “Your hard work, creativity and dedication to equal rights for all people have made an impact. You have helped build a foundation in Minnesota and in Washington upon which gay men and lesbians can create a more just and compassionate nation. Whether you know it or not, you were a very important person in shaping my views toward the gay community in our country.” such spaces become vehicles of an intimate event between self and state by virtue of the presence of flesh and carnality in such spaces. In one instance, Western voyeurism of infected flesh, the contrast of indigenous and Western attempts to “correct” putrid flesh, and Povinelli’s own silences in the face of an invasion of the intimacy of her carnal self all combine to create a complex and compelling vision of the sticky web that is relationship of the liberal diaspora to carnal self (58-63).

Estelle B. Freedman, ed., *Feminism, Sexuality, and Politics: Essays by Estelle B. Freedman* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).

Reviewed by Marcia M. Gallo, Lehman College, City University of New York

Feminism is not only alive but lively, passionate, and engaged when Estelle Freedman is the historian of record. In *Feminism, Sexuality and Politics*, we now have an accessible collection of her previously published classic essays. Freedman’s writings have covered topics ranging from women’s separatism to feminist networks and pedagogy, from constructions of sexuality to issues of historical interpretation, all of which are enhanced by the addition of her recent commentary on their origins and intent. There is also an introduction and two new essays, on the historical resilience of feminism and the relationship of historical interpretation to legal advocacy, to complement her earlier work, all in a volume of 253 pages, including generous notes.

Divided into two sections – one entitled “Feminist Strategies” and the other “Sexual Boundaries” – the collection showcases nearly three decades of

Freedman’s research and writing on history and social change. Her commitment to finding and making available “a usable past” is what has guided her exemplary work as scholar, teacher, and activist, and her essays not only communicate her dedication to her crafts but her willingness to examine, and re-examine, her own concepts and conclusions. In doing so, Freedman breathes life into the women’s liberation credo that “the personal is political” and keeps it relevant. Because she offers us her own experiences – and the insights that she has gained from them – over the last thirty years, she embodies the ideas she has explored and championed since the 1970s.

Groundbreaking and original, Freedman has never divorced her scholarship from her politics. In her Introduction, titled “Identities, Values, and Inquiries: A Personal History,” she begins by reminding us that “feminist history calls on us to imagine the world in new ways.” She then details how she has met this challenge personally, academically, and politically.

Growing up Jewish in central Pennsylvania during the early days of the Cold War “supplied critical lessons about social hierarchies along with a deep grounding in identity politics” yet also provided opportunities to imagine and experience “a broader worldview” (4-5). Her experiences as a student at Barnard and then at Columbia put her in the midst of movements for social justice, which by the late 1960s included demands for both racial and gender separatism. She writes, “my personal history fueled my historical curiosity about feminism” and it is this curiosity that led her to explore women’s activism post-suffrage, starting with prison reform (9). The first two articles in the collection, “Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870-1930” and “Separatism Revisited: Women’s Institutions, Social Reform, and the Career of Miriam Van Waters” are among Freedman’s best known, resurrecting the ways in which women – in the 1920s as well as the 1970s – consciously utilized same-gender organizational models to advance their political goals. The third article, “Women’s Networks and Women’s Loyalties: Reflections on a Tenure Case” speaks to Freedman’s own reliance on feminist friends and colleagues in her victorious fight for tenure at Stanford from 1981 to 1983.

As one of the early pioneers of feminist studies in the 1980s, Freedman brought the practice of consciousness-raising groups into the curriculum, and she details the lessons learned by her students as well as herself in the essay “Small Group

Pedagogy: Consciousness Raising in Conservative Times.” She also “tried to embed feminist politics within broader critiques of racial, class, sexual, and national hierarchies” and helped to broaden and redefine its scope (13). This commitment is the basis for her 2002 book *No Turning Back*, the topic of the final article in the first section, which places feminism within an international context. I must admit here that *No Turning Back* is a favorite of mine and my students at Lehman College; Freedman’s seamless and inspiring incorporation of scholarship and politics is evident not only in the fact that most of them actually read the book but also access the wonderful website she has created to accompany its use in classrooms. There they find not only historical documents but also links to current, global, activist women’s campaigns, and networks on a host of issues.

The second set of essays, “Sexual Boundaries,” grew from Freedman’s experiences of reading works of sexual theory in a feminist study group and her involvement in San Francisco’s Lesbian and Gay History Project in the late 1970s. She had chosen lesbianism after becoming a feminist and, “as with the revival of feminism, I wanted to know why lesbianism had remained invisible to me until the contemporary political wave” (15). Researching and then writing “the history of sexuality” with her friend and colleague, historian John D’Emilio, led to another path-breaking work: *Intimate Matters: A History of Sexuality in America*, published in 1988. Freedman’s article, “The Historical Construction of Homosexuality in the United States” illustrates the book’s central thesis: that changes in sexual identities and politics must be understood in the context of changes in socioeconomic systems.

The next two essays, “Uncontrolled Desires: The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960” and “The Prison Lesbian: Race, Class, and the Construction of the Aggressive Female Homosexual, 1915-1965” brilliantly trace the evolution of definitions of sexual deviance and the racialization and criminalization of same-sex desire. “The prison lesbian, like the male psychopath, seemed to supplant the prostitute as a threat to social order during a period when the white female chastity ideal was declining. The psychopath remained a racially stable diagnosis applied to white men, but the prison lesbian transformed from a primarily African American threat to include both white and black working-class women,” Freedman notes (141). These essays are followed by “The Burning of Letters Continues: Elusive Identities and the

Historical Construction of Sexuality,” which further emphasizes the complicating factors of race and class on sexual identity.

Freedman concludes the “Sexual Boundaries” section, and closes the book, with a cautionary note to both historians and legal advocates in “When Historical Interpretation Meets Legal Advocacy: Abortion, Sodomy, and Same-Sex Marriage.” Succinctly summarizing her years of experience as activist scholar, she reminds us that “history is at heart a study of change. One of our most important jobs as historians may be to educate not only our students but also judges, juries, and policymakers about that dynamic process” (195).

Estelle Freedman’s application of personal experience, historical research and political analysis not only broadens the meaning of “women’s history” but provides inroads for newcomers as well as useful insights for old-timers of all races, genders, and sexualities. I can’t wait to see what she does next.

Matti Bunzl, *Symptoms of Modernity: Jews and Queers in Late Twentieth-Century Vienna* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).

Reviewed by James W. Jones, Central Michigan University

Using two small but significant minority groups, Matti Bunzl traces Vienna’s – and with it, Austria’s – transformation from the modern (*i.e.*, late 19th-century) nation-state to postmodern heterogeneous national politic within a broader European identity. He argues that the nation-state defined itself in terms of who did *not* belong to it. In particular, those “others” were Jews and queers. What makes Vienna (and thus Austria) an especially interesting case study is that these definitions had lost their significance and their power at least a decade earlier in almost all of Western Europe and in the United States.

This book builds upon on the author’s Ph.D. dissertation, but has been significantly revised based on Bunzl’s more recent ethnographic fieldwork. The book is composed of three major parts, with each part containing two chapters – one about Jews in Vienna and one about Vienna’s queer community. The parts proceed chronologically: 1949-1970s; 1970s through mid-1990s, mid-1990s through 2001. Each chapter begins with a defining moment in the

creation or change of the minority's identity. This is followed by a description of the relevant moments from the period of history and of press reception of the minority at that time. Some quotes from the people Bunzl interviewed in his field research are woven into these narratives, but often the chapter concludes with a discussion of his interviewee's responses to the events previously described.

In the first chapter, Bunzl describes three foundational myths that defined Jews vis-à-vis Austria: that Austria was a victim of Nazi Germany; that there was no anti-Semitism among Austrians; and that Jews are foreigners in Austria. The chapter also traces how politics and the mass media "constructed Jews as inherent outsiders of the imagined community" (40). It is shocking to note how the language used in mainstream publications (e.g., newspapers, publications of the Catholic church) even in the 1960s and 1970s parrots the anti-Semitic cant of Hitler and German fascism. Those familiar with this history will recognize the emblematic function of the few examples the author gives in this and other chapters, but those less conversant with the topic may wish the book provided more detail.

Austrian gays and lesbians were defined in those early decades by "laws and closets," the title of the second chapter. Some legal reform came in 1971: same-sex relationships between males who were both eighteen or older now was legal and the law no longer referred to lesbians. But other laws hindered public discourse by gay and lesbian people and the creation of an emancipation movement because they forbade or limited speech and assembly if such was construed to promote sexual relations between persons of the same sex. One is perhaps most surprised to learn that even in the mid-1990s, gays and lesbians still largely lived in the closet and that the public sphere had changed little from the 1960s. For example, at most gay bars it was still necessary to ring the doorbell or knock on the door in order to request admittance.

The Waldheim affair (1985-86) and the rise to power of the politician Jörg Haider ("a kind of Neo-Nazi, or at least an apologist for Nazism" [90]) galvanized the Jewish community into action. The third chapter describes the new steps that were taken largely by the younger generation who had forged a new kind of Jewish identity. Crucial to this formation were the Jewish youth groups such as HaSchomer Hazair and Bnei Akiba. These young people, "bearers of mediated Holocaust memory" (92), took on the role

of "active champions of social justice, challenging Austrian hegemonies from a position of defiant opposition" (92). Zionism was also a strong influence in creating this new identity. In addition, the author notes the increasing role of Russian émigrés in reshaping the Jewish community from the mid-1980s on.

A similar trend is found in the lesbian and gay community. Until the mid-1980s, at the earliest, gay bars could be raided or lose their licenses. Most bar patrons feared openly revealing their sexual orientation. The closet was too strong—reinforced by prevailing political attitudes, by gays' and lesbians' acceptance of their outsider status and by the commercial establishments that catered to a gay and lesbian clientele. "The movement" had no real basis among Austria's lesbian and gay populace because they did not define themselves as oppressed or they were willing to accept limits to their self-expression. What is thus surprising is not that the emancipation movement developed about a decade later in Austria than in Western Europe, but that it developed at all.

Change came in the 1990s when new groups focused not on politics but on transforming gay and lesbian culture. Examples include *Rechtskomitee Lambda* (aimed at legal change), *Safeway* (safe sex education) and especially its publication *XTRA!*, which "blurred the boundaries between lesbian/gay activism and the homosexual scene" (137). Gay and lesbian commercial establishments also developed in the 1990s, creating openly queer social spaces where the increasingly openly gay and lesbian populace could gather.

By the mid-1990s, the world had changed and so had its attitudes toward Austria, as well as Austria's role in that new world. Chapter five, "Museums and Monuments," details the creation of a completely new Jewish identity within the Austrian state. An example of the sea change taking place is Vienna's Jewish Museum, whose financial and political support from the city and exhibitions linking the past to the present "reimagined Austrianness as the partial product and reflection of specifically Jewish contributions" (164-5). Just as important was the role of the museum in creating a new Jewish self-identity: "in exhibit after exhibit, Vienna's Jews encountered affirmative representations that not only articulated but reinforced, in content and sheer existence, the tenets of the new Jewish visibility" (170). In addition, Austria was pressured by the European Union to face up to its anti-Semitic past when it became a member in 1995. Significant

steps were taken to achieve this: the creation of a “National Fund for the Victims of National Socialism” (1995), the Holocaust Memorial in Vienna (2001), and a variety of commemorations in the later 1990s at which state representatives clearly articulated the new attitude of respect and a desire to atone. “Austria’s Nazi past was no longer under negotiation” (179).

The companion chapter on developments from the mid-1990s to 2001 for Austrian queers seems less compelling and exposes some of the problems with the book’s conception and analyses. As in each preceding chapter, the narrative in “Offices and Balls” concentrates on important steps taken toward integration and the creation of a new, positive identity, both self-identity and identity as constructed by the majority. One step, described at some length, involved holding dress balls to bring attention to AIDS, but their significance seems to lie largely in the fact that the balls took place in a major public space and were attended by prominent politicians. Why they attended and what each group (politicians and queers) concretely gained is not detailed beyond reading the event as a sign of minority integration.

Vienna is held up as an Eden for lesbian and gay people. In the city hall there is an “Office for Nondiscrimination against Same-Sex Lifestyles,” which seems, according to the description given of its webpage, quite progressive and helpful. The problem is that the author does not delve into how that translates into reality. What is its budget? How exactly does this office achieve its lofty goals? How successful is it at doing so? In addition, the focus in each chapter on “mass media” remains almost exclusively a focus on print (newspapers and magazines). Certainly by the 1990s, television, film and the internet were enormous factors in creating attitudes toward lesbian and gay people.

No single study could analyze in depth all the forces at work and that was never Bunzl’s intent. In the conclusion, “Symptoms of Postmodernity,” Bunzl defines his central thesis as demonstrating the end of the European nation-state by means of the histories of these two minority groups. Nation and the nation-state have been replaced by “a constitutive pluralism” (216) in which difference is valued but, Bunzl argues, also reinforces their minority status. His book leaves the reader with a question of great significance: If the nation-state used the exclusion of minorities as fundamental way to define itself, what is the nation-state now when

it has redefined minorities both as part of itself and as “minorities” within itself? Simply saying that a heterogeneous society has appeared does not bring us to a more complete understanding of majority/minority relations today. Austria’s new “outsiders” — e.g., emigrants from Turkey and Eastern Europe or followers of the Islamic faith — prove that the basic problem has merely taken a new form.

Marcia M. Gallo, *Different Daughters: A History of the Daughters of Bilitis and the Rise of the Lesbian Rights Movement* (New York: Carroll & Graf, 2006).

Reviewed by Jennifer Brier, University of Illinois at Chicago

Until Marcia M. Gallo wrote *Different Daughters*, not only was there no full length monograph on the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB), one of the original activist groups that formed the homophile movement, but more importantly, most historical accounts of the DOB rendered the organization’s members as assimilationist, reformist, and even hostile to the political transformations that produced the gay and lesbian liberation movement of the 1970s. Gallo’s account of the DOB provides a powerful alternative to this narrative. Based on extensive oral histories with most if not all of the surviving members of DOB, as well as on archival research in the material DOB produced over its fourteen-year existence, Gallo suggests that, beginning in 1955, the lesbians who joined DOB not only became forerunners of the gay and lesbian liberation movement of the 1970s (a story we know from earlier historical accounts), but more importantly of the feminist movement of the 1960s as well. While these women may have gone to protests in skirts and blouses (a fact that other historians have used to suggest their gender and sexual conservatism), Gallo focuses on the kinds of arguments they made in meetings and printed material, all in an effort to show that even though they often walked that walk, their talk was considerably more radical and feminist than many have previously thought.

As part of her reclamation project, Gallo’s social historical research revises the generally held assumption that DOB was an overwhelmingly white and middle-class organization. While white women — most notably Phyllis Lyon and Del Martin, the white lesbian couple who called for the first meeting of the group with six other women — often took the lead, women of color were in no way absent

from the organization. Gallo's decision to treat DOB as a national organization made up of many local chapters allows her to paint a detailed picture of leadership from the bottom up and show more diversity in the organization. In San Francisco, Pat Walker, an African-American woman, not Lyon or Martin, served as president of the chapter in 1960. Ernestine Eckstein, who led the New York chapter, wanted the Daughters to see connections between the struggle for civil rights for African Americans and the homophile movement and called on members to embrace "public demonstrations and legal strategies" (124). Focusing on other members and leaders within DOB, Gallo resists the tendency to have Lyon and Martin wholly represent what was in fact a complex organization.

In addition to painting a more detailed picture of the membership itself, Gallo is also intent on describing DOB's extensive efforts to articulate the needs of lesbians in public discourse. In one of its most prescient and ultimately political acts, DOB became actively involved in sociological and psychological studies of sexuality. Beginning with its 1956 Statement of Purpose, DOB explicitly called for psychological and sociological research. But the members did not want to be merely subjects of study; instead, the women insisted on providing sociologists with serious and consistent input. In 1958, DOB conducted its own sociological survey, the first survey done by lesbians (47). The results were simply stunning in terms of providing evidence of how lesbians lived in the immediate postwar era. The DOB's commitment to collecting information on members and readers continued over the course of the 1960s such that most DOB activists considered "themselves experts" of lesbian existence (134). This suggests that DOB members were way ahead of their time in terms of how feminism would influence modern sexology specifically and sociology and psychology, more generally, by the mid-1970s. While Gallo provides a detailed narrative of DOB's sustained commitment to survey research, and describes how these kinds of studies exposed disagreements within the membership about the strategy of using research to make lesbians seem normal, she misses an opportunity to develop the argument about how this foreshadowed feminist critiques of social science.

In an entirely different arena – publishing – DOB left its feminist mark on public discussion. Gallo argues that DOB was not only the earliest predecessor of the lesbian and women's publishing movement of the 1970s, but also that *The Ladder* was one of the

first feminist journals of the postwar period. Gallo supports these claims with careful analysis of the sources. In her assessment of the first issue of *The Ladder*, Gallo quotes a piece written by Del Martin about how lesbians fared in relation to gay men: "While women may not have so much difficulty with law enforcement, their problems are none the less real – family, sometimes children, employment, social acceptance" (27). Martin refused to separate discrimination based on gender from discrimination based on sexual desire, a point that connected her claims to contemporaneous feminist arguments as much as homophile ones.

Gallo uses evidence of more than a decade worth of activism to show the centrality of feminism for many DOB members before the birth of organizations such as NOW. While Gallo acknowledges what seemed like more individualistic goals of the first DOB members, ultimately she argues that DOB's "support to develop the self-confidence necessary to advocate for one's rights" made "social change possible for lesbians" (17). Gallo astutely claims that DOB matured over the course of ten years such that "in the mid-1960s, it was as though American culture finally caught up with what they had been doing for decades: defining themselves as autonomous, resourceful people who did not need men to feel good about themselves" (135). That DOB began its efforts in the mid-1950s and not in the mid-1960s, suggests, once again, that the standard periodization of "second-wave" feminism that begins in the early 1960s, is flawed.

While Gallo wrote this book for an audience beyond academic historians, such that narrative took priority over argument, it would have benefited from more explicit and consistent interpretation of the historical details. As I read *Different Daughters*, I found myself thinking about what books written to appeal to non-academic and academic readers should read like. I wondered if books targeting the former necessarily had to rely less on argument than narrative. How can historians committed to reaching larger audiences – a goal I believe many GLBT historians share – make arguments that work for academic readers without appearing overly academic and nitpicky to non-academic readers? In the case of *Different Daughters*, one model might have been to provide as broad a context as possible for understanding and comparing the work of DOB to other organizations. If we knew more about the Daughters in relation to other women activists working in the 1950s and 1960, Gallo could have made an even richer argument about women's activism in a period that all too often still appears to

be about conformity. She could then detail the extent to which the late 1950s and early 1960 were laced with opposition.

Despite this criticism, Gallo's account of the Daughters of Bilitis is necessary reading for anyone – academic historians, undergraduates, and non-academics – interested in GLBT history, the history of women's activism, and postwar American history.

Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Culture* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005).

Reviewed by Sharon Marcus, Columbia University

To date, the global turn has produced few histories of sexuality that move beyond the framework of the nation-state. We now have essays and monographs that trace the history of sexual discourses, laws, and practices in an increasing number of countries, but the individual nation remains the defining parameter of most work. Indeed, some of the best recent histories of sexuality have focused even more locally on distinct regions or particular cities within a nation. Apart from a few encyclopedic surveys of sexuality, most of which restrict their scope to Europe and North America, global histories of sexuality remain to be written.

Gayatri Gopinath's *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures* will be of interest to historians because it offers an example of how to think about sexuality beyond the nation-state. Buyer beware: this book makes no claim to do history or to address historians. Gopinath does not focus on change over time, is not concerned about the root causes of the events she studies, and concentrates on a few songs, novels, and films to make her argument.

Nor is this book a standard cultural history. Though Gopinath provides excellent background for understanding the historical contexts in which her materials were produced, circulated, and received, she is avowedly less interested in the documented responses of audiences and more interested in producing her own account of their latent possibilities. This way of reading, typical of contemporary cultural studies, has a history. In the nineteenth century, Matthew Arnold asserted that the task of criticism is to see the object as it really is, and Walter Pater subtly retorted that to do so

requires that one "know one's own impression as it really it is" by asking "[w]hat is this song or picture... to me." Perhaps not surprisingly, given Pater's own homoeroticism, his position now prevails in queer cultural studies, and Gopinath is exemplary of the field when she insists that her critical perceptions make a difference to the text's meaning.

Gopinath's subject is "queer female subjectivity in the [South Asian] diaspora," and she aims to unsettle the ways we think of both nations, diasporas, and even queer communities as patriarchal structures in which women are placid objects rather than disruptive subjects (6). Gopinath's argument is twofold. On the one hand, she seeks to show how both nationalist and diasporic cultures repeatedly make the nonheteronormative female subject "impossible" – illegible and unrepresentable (16). On the other hand, she wants to show that the erasure of the queer female subject never completely succeeds, and that "the heteronormative home . . . unwittingly generates homoeroticism" (15).

The book begins by showing that although the nationalist imaginary may equate diaspora with "perverse" sexuality, actual diasporic communities often intensify heteronormative masculinity. Her chief examples of this are the Bhangra and Asian Underground music scenes. Bhangra constructs the homeland as dependent on the diaspora, but marginalizes queers and women in the process by perpetuating ideas of "patrilineality, biology, and blood-based affiliation" (34). As Gopinath shows, "the progressive antiracist politics of Asian Underground music depends on the inaudibility of female diasporic cultural practices" (65). In a comparative move that structures most of the chapters, Gopinath contrasts the male bonding of Bhangra, which takes in public spaces such as clubs and streets, to the home as a site of female diaspora and queerness. Her examples here are the Giddha music that women perform in all-women's spaces at weddings, female British Asian DJs, and the heroine of Monica Ali's novel *Brick Lane*.

In the following chapters, Gopinath continues to contrast those who find no room for female homoeroticism in their concepts of home, nation, or diaspora, to textual moments that make it possible to imagine "female diasporic subjectivity" as "central to a queer diasporic project" (65). In her studies of films, Gopinath is especially interested in song and dance numbers which, as "moments of fantasy," allow queer female desires to emerge (101) as a force that "remake[s] the home as domestic and national

space” (133). And throughout, Gopinath severely criticizes the many extant works that find a place for gay male subjects but erase any signs of queer female desire.

In addition to providing a critical corrective to the ease with which culture and scholarship privilege “gay male subjectivity as the place from which to begin theorizing a queer diaspora,” Gopinath also provides over the course of the book an impressively transnational framework. *Impossible Desires* discusses literary works by V.S. Naipaul, Ismat Chughtai, Shyam Selvadurai, and Shani Mootoo alongside the films *East is East*, *Surviving Sabu*, *Utsav*, *Subhah*, *Monsoon Wedding*, *Hum Aapke Hain Koun!*, and *Fire*. The result is a study truly transnational in scope, one that includes works produced in India and Pakistan alongside others made by people from all over South Asia with ties to England, Canada, the United States, and the Caribbean. The result is both a spirited critique of the ways that lesbian desire is all too often erased even within queer studies and a methodological model for how to do transnational cultural history by focusing on producers, objects, and consumers who cross national boundaries.

Karen C. Kraulik, *Provincetown: From Pilgrim Landing to Gay Resort* (New York: New York University Press, 2005).

Reviewed by Nan Alamilla Boyd, San Francisco State University

Karen Kraulik’s comprehensive study of Provincetown, Massachusetts traces the history of Cape Cod’s Land’s End from its Mayflower beginnings in 1620 through 2004, when the legalization of gay marriage in Massachusetts promised this gay resort town a windfall of tourist dollars. In its early history, Provincetown transformed itself dramatically from an almost uninhabitable whaling outpost occupied by Yankee seamen and their families to a beach town that, at the turn-of-the-twentieth-century, built a fledgling tourist economy around its colonial history. This turn toward tourism facilitated an economic transformation that gained artists and, later, gay and lesbian entrepreneurs a place in the town’s social and political economy. Kraulik’s book is an historical study of space and place, and she answers the question of how a sleepy fishing village became one of the hottest gay tourist destinations in the U.S. by deftly analyzing shifts in power along race, class, and gender lines.

Kraulik’s monograph is organized chronologically, and while the first few chapters, which chart the town’s colonial and nineteenth-century history, function almost perfunctorily, the text speeds up as Kraulik gets to the heart of her argument. Kraulik interweaves the story of Provincetown’s emergence as a gay resort against the larger history of tourism in the United States. As such, Provincetown functions as a window into the micro-level dynamics of late-capitalist tourist enterprise. Provincetown entered the tourist trade in the mid-nineteenth-century, and, as Kraulik tells it, tourist interests pushed the town in unique directions. As its fishing and salt-production economies collapsed, for instance, the town capitalized on its colonial history and created a public image that attracted a new breed of leisure-seeking travelers. During the World War I years, privileged bohemians vacationed in beach-side cottages, experimented with new artistic styles (as well as homosexuality), and formed the nucleus of a fledgling artist colony that produced, among other things, the infamous Provincetown Players. An artsy, bohemian, and gay (pleasure-seeking) sensibility drew more tourists to town, both summer-time visitors and “boat crowds” – day-trippers from Boston who crowded the wharves. In the process, gay “wash-ashores,” or permanent migrants, slowly became a part of Provincetown’s civic life. Like the Portuguese migrants who preceded them, gay and lesbian migrants (“our queers”) laid claim to the town by investing in its economic vitality.

One measure of this vitality, and a particularly compelling aspect of Kraulik’s study, is the story of Provincetown’s lesbian entrepreneurs. Unlike other gay tourist towns (e.g., Key West, San Francisco, and Sydney), Provincetown has a recognizable and noteworthy lesbian presence. Kraulik grounds this phenomena in the lesbian feminist and women’s crafts movements that animated the 1980s and enabled women a foothold in Provincetown’s tourist economy. Couched in an analysis of how “consumer purchases can shape identities,” Kraulik uses oral histories to discuss how Provincetown businesseswomen like Womencrafts’ Alexea Pickoff and Vashte XX offered lesbian travelers a “space-specific sense of pride” (173). Women guesthouse owners later organized a group called the Women Innkeepers of Provincetown and hosted the hugely successful “Women’s Week,” an off-season bonanza aimed at lesbian tourists. Many “wash-ashore” lesbian entrepreneurs who opened restaurants or became successful in real estate translated their economic strength into political influence as they become active on Provincetown’s city council.

Krahulik's conclusions are complex. In the last two chapters, she discusses some of the fallout of Provincetown's increased dependence on gay tourism and gentrification. She notes the inflation of property values, the absence of businesses catering to year-round residents, the exodus of families, and the local tourist industry's increased reliance on transnational service workers from countries such as Jamaica. A fascinating aspect of her conclusion charts a contentious struggle between local teenagers, gay townies, and political elites over the often violent harassment of gay tourists through the 1980s. Krahulik identifies this as a struggle over gay citizenship, which is finally resolved in the 1990s when a shift in the town's political leadership enables the implementation of an effective anti-violence project. In the end, gay citizens win the struggle for space and place, but the town seems emptied of all but the hollow structures that support its brisk tourist economy. As such, Krahulik's *Provincetown* tells a prescient story of how gays and lesbians have won citizenship in the late-capitalist United States. It's a story worth thinking about as political entitlements in the U.S. are increasingly tied to marketplace activity.

Walter L. Williams and Yolanda Retter (eds.), *Gay and Lesbian Rights in the United States: A Documentary History* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 2003).

Reviewed by Terence Kissack, Independent Scholar

Anthologies hold a special place in GLBT historiography. In 1976, Jonathan Ned Katz published *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the U.S.A.*, an annotated collection of primary documents. Katz's work brought to light a wealth of primary materials and opened up lines of inquiry and areas of interest that still engage scholars. Though the theoretical framework for historical inquiry has developed markedly since the publication of Katz's work, many students of GLBT history continue to make use of these remarkable collections in their research and teaching.

Given the importance of Katz's work, it is not surprising that Retter and Williams tip their hat to him and other "pioneer collectors of historical documents" in their acknowledgements. Like *Gay American History*, *Gay and Lesbian Rights in the United States* brings together documents from a broad sweep of U.S. history—from the 1600s up to the year 2000—that the editors hope "will

help clarify the controversy over gay and lesbian rights in the United States." Selections range from descriptions of "Miami Indian Sodomy" penned by French explorer Pierre Liette in 1702 to remarks of Lorri L Jean at the Millennium March, a GLBT political gathering in Washington D.C. in 2000. Williams and Retter provide brief contextual frames for the primary documents collected in their anthology. In his somewhat discursive introduction, Williams lays out the larger themes and interpretive strategies of the anthology. And like most other anthologies, the primary documents are arranged by topic and chronologically. Unlike most anthologies, however, the editors have included selections from non-contemporaneous sources. For example, under the heading "José Sarria Runs for San Francisco City Council (1961)," the editors have placed an article entitled "Empress I José," from a 1985 issue of the *Bay Area Report*. The periodical article does contain several quotes from Sarria—though not from 1961—but the historical significance and specificity of Sarria's 1961 run for office is partially lost in the rather loose interpretive flow of the reporter's narrative.

Gay and Lesbian Rights in the United States holds an obvious advantage over any previously published anthology: they can mine the treasure trove of documents being created on a day-by-day basis. For those who want access to contemporary politics, this anthology will serve well. More than two-thirds of the documents date from after the founding of the Daughters of Bilitis and the Mattachine Society in the 1950s, and almost are post-Stonewall sources. Perhaps most unusually, not all of the texts included were penned by authors arguing on behalf of expanding rights for GLBT people. In fact, the editors have included a good number of homophobic texts, which illustrate the dialectical response from opponents of the growing GLBT rights movement. My favorite example of this type of text is a brief quote by conservative radio talk-show host Laura Schlessinger that, in the space of eight brief sentences, manages to craft a "gays gone wild" jeremiad trifecta of scriptural condemnation, children at risk, and biological reductionism.

The anthology is less successful when dealing with documents from early American history. I am puzzled, for example, by the inclusion of excerpts from the Declaration of Independence. It is true that, for example, homophile activists in the 20th century made use of the political language and claims laid out in the Declaration in their own political discourse, but that would seem to merit a note in a contextual introduction to a homophile

text, not the inclusion of a portion of the Declaration of Independence. Likewise, the editors have included selections from the Bible in the early section of the anthology, presumably to illustrate homophobic passages or passages wherein same-sex love is honored. But Biblical passages do not have meaning outside of a specific historical context. The meaning of the Ruth's relationship with Naomi or that of David and Jonathan, for example, has meant very different things to different readers across the sweep of time and place. Such passages have certainly been read as affirming homosexuality by some contemporary readers but it is not at all clear that Puritan readers of the same biblical passages would have come to same conclusion. Such flaws in *Gay and Lesbian Rights in the United States* mar the editors' accomplishments, but perhaps also offer instructors opportunities for productive classroom discussions about the value of historical specificity.

Reviewer's Note: I'd like to take this opportunity to honor the life and work of Yolanda Retter, whose recent passing is a great loss to our community and the field of GLBT archives".

Sharon Marcus, *Between Women: Friendship, Desire and Marriage in Victorian England*. Princeton, N.J. and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Reviewed by Claire Potter, Wesleyan University

Given the amount of critical literature that already exists on the Victorians, and given how foundational that literature is to the theoretical genealogy of queer history, it is hard to imagine reading something really new in the field – making it all the more exciting when you actually do. I first had the pleasure of hearing the central arguments of Sharon Marcus's *Between Women: Friendship, Desire and Marriage in Victorian England* as a provocative talk; her new book does not just demonstrate, in more detail, the evidence for those arguments, but expands on them beautifully. Marcus is an engaging and lively writer, whose capacity to theorize a variety of texts and archival sources is conveyed in highly readable, precise prose. She points out that despite interpretive advances, our understanding of Victorian sex-gender systems is constrained by assumptions about hierarchy and immutable difference. Thinking of these categories as mutually referential, overlapping, and constituted in part by female power, Marcus argues, can help us not just re-think history, but re-imagine our methodological

approaches to textual evidence as well.

Between Women emphasizes the erotic, pervasive, and often public quality of female intimacy. Adding new depth to our understanding of sexual love through an analysis of “female marriages” that threads throughout the book, she urges her readers to re-examine the erotic quality of female friendship as it did, and did not, reinforce the project of heterosexual marriage. Marcus also stretches her analysis to encompass the many female attachments that structured Victorian society: bonds between mothers and daughters, cousins, in-laws of various kinds, and potential in-laws. But it is the work on female marriage that gives this book freshness and a precision that it might not otherwise have had. Marcus is persuasive in showing that, among the middle and upper classes, committed alliances between women were neither exceptional and private, nor were they perceived as social arrangements in opposition to marriages between men and women. Rather, female marriages were sometimes seen as an ideal form of contract between lovers, serving as a model and an activist base for feminist reforms of English marriage law.

Using women's life writing, letters, the popular press, and fresh readings of familiar Victorian novels, Marcus speaks to the subsequent constraints of influential scholarship that altered the field of women's history and the history of sexuality when it was initially conceived several decades ago. One strand of thought, associated with the early work of Carroll Smith-Rosenberg (1975),¹ proposed that private, emotionally intense “female worlds of love and ritual” brought women together to do the work of birth, illness, death, and training women for their real destiny as the romantic partners for men. The other critical strain of thought that Marcus addresses has its origins in path-breaking work by Lillian Faderman (1981) and Adrienne Rich (1980, 1986) that sought to locate “lesbians” in a Victorian world of woman-loving women that preceded sexology and the possibility of lesbian identification.²

Building on work in the construction of identity that has dominated the field of gender and queer studies over the last decade, Marcus organizes her re-reading of Victorian women around three themes: female friendship and its various permutations; “femininity as an object of desire” (3); and marriage. In the first section she asks, given that the language of female friendship was persistently erotic, how might the particular trajectories of romantic love, erotic love, and companionate love be distinguished

from one another? Chapter 2 extends this argument by suggesting that female love not only did not hinder courtship and marriage between men and women, but also facilitated it. Here and elsewhere, Marcus turns the critical intervention made by Gayle Rubin's "The Traffic in Women" (1975) on its head, and argues that in the Victorian novel, *women* give men to each other.³ In perhaps the wittiest writing in the book, Chapter 3 captures the sense of play in the Victorians' sense of irony and *double entendre* and demonstrates their uses in three overlapping cultural spheres: fashion, doll culture, and advice by and for mothers about caning daughters. Marcus makes multi-layered use of her title for this chapter, "the Feminine Plaything," employing popular writing, illustrations and fiction to demonstrate that the desiring, sometimes pornographic gaze was not solely a privilege of masculinity, but also something women trained on each other.

Marcus's final two chapters make critical interventions in both political and cultural history by arguing that Victorian female marriage was constituted by a series of public, not private, acts that included, but were not confined to: shared households that were recognized by social peers; the use of the appellation "husband" as a term of endearment by one or both partners; and legal arrangements between two women to ensure that property could be jointly held and/or inherited. Rightly pointing out that a significant number of marriage reformers were women in female marriages, and that the idea of contractual marriage was perceived by many in England as a long-overdue reform for female citizenship, Marcus culminates the book by returning to themes raised in the first chapters. Women who committed their lives to other women, she argues convincingly, were not necessarily committed to maintaining closeted relationships, nor were they merely woman-loving women whose sexual lives must remain shrouded for lack of evidence. The "social recognition" accorded female marriages in Victorian society not only "played an important role in expanding the vernacular meaning of marriage" more generally, but also "conferred marital status on female couples... whose relationships exhibited marital features such as cohabitation, financial interdependence, physical intimacy, and agreements about fidelity" (227). A persistently amusing subtext of *Between Women* that Marcus does not highlight in this passage is that female marriages also seem to have demonstrated the patterns of *infidelity* that could be characteristic of bourgeois Victorian heterosexual marriage.

Between Women does not employ what we know about the construction of sexuality prior to the invention of the homo-hetero dyad either to erase or to prove "lesbian existence," which have been the projects of so many other authors. Instead, Marcus shows how central women, and women's agency, were to how marriage and marriage law were perceived by a range of individuals who understood kinship, desire and domesticity as critical locations for social and economic power. This last point strikes me as an important step forward, not just for thinking about the Victorians, but for reformulating how we understand the current confusion about whether heterosexual and gay marriage are "the same as" or necessarily "different from" each other. Different perceptions and uses of the term "marriage," Marcus argues, must be understood as relational and expressive of a society pushing against its limits. *Between Women*, in its inventive juxtapositions of eros, power, and sex, demonstrates that marriage – the modern refuge for couples of all descriptions seeking emotional and social safety – is perhaps our most contested and unstable institution.

¹Originally published in 1975, this article is anthologized in Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), pp. 53-75.

²Lillian Faderman, *Surpassing the Love of Men: Romantic Friendship and Love Between Women from the Renaissance to the Present* (New York: Harper Paperbacks, 1998). Originally 1981. A version of Adrienne Rich's "Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Continuum" originally appeared as "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (vol. 2 no. 5, Summer 1980), pp. 631-60, and a revised version, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and the Lesbian Continuum" is anthologized in *Blood, Bread and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979-1986* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1986), pp. 23-75.

³Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the Political Economy of Sex," in Rayna Reiter, *Toward an Anthropology of Women* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), pp. 157-210.

Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Membership Form - 2007

Name: _____ Position/Title: _____
Mailing Address (for Newsletter): _____ Affiliation: _____

Telephone (home): _____

Telephone (work): _____

Email: _____

Fax/Website: _____

Include the information above on CLGH's forthcoming on-line directory of members:

____ Name ____ Address ____ Position/Title ____ Affiliation ____ Telephone (home)
____ Telephone (work) ____ Email ____ Fax/Website

Use the following alternative address for the Directory:

I am interested in reviewing books for the newsletter in these areas:

Membership Categories (check one)

____ US\$ 5.00 Basic (Student, Retired, Unemployed) ____ US\$ 35.00 Patron
____ US\$ 10.00 Regular (Income Under US\$ 40,000/Year) ____ US\$ 150.00 Lifetime
____ US\$ 20.00 Regular (Income Over US\$ 40,000/Year)
____ Donation of \$ _____

Donations and dues support CLGH activities at the AHA annual meeting and other conferences, CLGH prizes, the CLGH newsletter, and other CLGH projects. Mail membership forms, dues, and donations (checks payable to "CLGH") to: Karen C. Krahulik, Associate Dean of the College, Brown Univ., Box 1828, Providence, RI, 02912. For further information, contact Karen Krahulik at Karen_krahulik@Brown.edu.

CLGH

c/o Murphy

University of Minnesota

Department of History

748 Social Sciences Building

267 - 19th Avenue South

Minneapolis, MN 55455