Greetings, friends and colleagues. The CLGH has had a busy winter season of conversations both external and internal to its governing functions. Those of you at the AHA in January witnessed the official passing of the torch, as it were, as Leisa Meyer stepped down after three years as the Chair of the CLGH. Following Jeff Merrick, Vicky Eaklor and Marc Stein, Leisa was the fourth scholar to serve as chair and her departure was greeted with generous applause for a job extremely well done. Past chairs, the current chair, and other CLGH board members took the podium at the CLGH’s Saturday night reception at the William Way Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Community Center in downtown Philadelphia to thank Leisa for her work, guidance, and friendship. In addition to increasing the reach and influence of the CLGH within and beyond the field of history, Leisa was instrumental in formalizing the Joan Nestle Prize and in acquiring ten more years of funding from the Gerber/Hart Library for the Sprague Prize. Most significantly, however, Leisa took the CLGH to an entire new organizational level: with assistance from William Peniston, she secured TAX EXEMPT STATUS from the IRS (as of April 6, 2006). That’s one small step for a queer; one giant leap for queerkind! Thank you, Leisa.

This year’s AHA featured a nice selection of CLGH venues. Discussions during the 2005 AHA about discrimination against LGBTQ historians before, during, and after hiring processes led to a 2006 roundtable co-sponsored by the CLGH, the AHA Professional Division, and the Coordinating Council for Women in History. Entitled, “Out There Or In Here? The Chilly Climate Revisited,” the program included formal remarks by two of our members – Lisa Hazirjian and Marc Stein. “Desiring Men: Identity, Masculinity and Homosexual Practices in Metropole and Colony” was the title of a formal CLGH panel session with papers by Heike Schmidt and Charles Upchurch, introductions by Leisa Meyer, and comment by Karen Krahulik. Jens Rydström, the 2005 recipient of the John Boswell Prize, held a poster session on Nationhood and Gay Marriage in Scandinavia. And, in addition to its ceremonial aspects, the reception at William Way GLBT Community Center included a screening of Gay Pioneers followed by a Q & A with Barbara Gittings and Glenn Holsten. Despite these lively and well-attended events, several members of the CLGH felt that much more could have been done to promote the CLGH and LGBTQ history by AHA host committees. For example, the CLGH table was in a remote location that even those with explicit directions were hard-pressed to find. This unfortunate almost “closeted” position led to a steep drop in new membership applications as well as to low levels of random foot traffic. Moreover, despite our in-depth knowledge of Philadelphia’s local LGBTQ history, the official AHA local history guide neglected to include a single reference to Philly’s queer past. We are working now to address these issues for future AHA meetings (please contact me directly if you can contribute in this regard to the 2007 AHA in Atlanta).

Finally, the CLGH held two business meetings at the AHA. Its annual board/member meeting covered a broad range of topics from the status of our not-for-profit 501c3 application to our need for an official treasurer position. Regarding the latter, I am pleased to say that the Governing Board and the Chair are in the process of formalizing a treasurer position for the CLGH. We believed it was best to see our current structure accepted by the IRS for non-profit status before changing our by-laws to include a treasurer, but now that it has been accepted we can begin to fine tune. (Please see the bylaw amendment ballot in this newsletter.) The second business meeting focused on strategic planning for a capital campaign to raise funds for the proposed CLGH Dissertation Prize. Co-chaired by Charles Middleton and Martha Vicinus, this committee is at the very beginning of its campaign plan (in other words, stay tuned!). A number of other important issues rose to the surface during and following the AHA, including extended discussions about Marc Stein’s presentation and article, “Post-tenure Lavender Blues,” on bias against gay studies topics at the selection (rather than review) phase of NEH fellowship and research awards (see Inside Higher Education http://insidehighered.com/news/2006/01/09/neh and History News Network http://hnn.us/articles/19941.html). This topic and others such as the “hostile job market/climate” require ongoing conversations and we need for all CLGH members to advocate in whatever means available to them for greater equity regarding LGBTQ scholars and scholarship in the field-at-large. The roundtable was a great start, the dissertation prize will support young scholars in the discipline, but, still, there is much work to be done!

Finally, I want to draw your attention to the two ballots enclosed in this newsletter. The proposed bylaw amendment and the positions of the CLGH Board of Governors are vital for the CLGH to continue to grow and thrive as an organization. I ask that you select with care to ensure the future success of the CLGH.
CLGH On-Line Directory

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

To confirm or update your listing, please send the following information to Karen_krahulik@brown.edu
Name
Title
Department
University
Address
Telephone (w)
Telephone (h)
Telephone (fax)
Email Address
Website Address

CLGH Email Announcements List

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

Membership Information

For your current membership status, please check the address label on the envelope in which this newsletter was sent. Lifetime members are indicated with an “L”; all others have a two-digit year code that indicates the last year for which your membership was paid. Members who have paid the 2006 membership fee will see “06.”

As of April 2006, CLGH had 273 members, including 66 lifetime members; the last newsletter was sent to 81 sibling organizations, libraries, research centers, etc. Members who have not paid since 2003 will be removed from the CLGH mailing list in 2006 (unless they renew their membership or write to Karen_krahulik@brown.edu requesting that the fee be waived).

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

If you have the names and addresses of potential new CLGH members or the mailing addresses of organizations that you think might like to receive copies of the CLGH newsletter, please send them to Karen_krahulik@brown.edu. The CLGH is open to anyone who wishes to participate in our organization. To join the CLGH, one need not self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer (LGBTQ) nor does one’s work need to address LGBTQ history.

CLGH 2006 Prize Award Announcements
The Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Prize Committee is pleased to announce that the 2006 Audre Lorde Prize for an outstanding article on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, transsexual, and/or queer history published in English in 2004 or 2005 was awarded to Marc Stein for his article, “Boutilier and the U. S. Supreme Court’s Sexual Revolution,” Law and History Review (Fall, 2005), Vol. 23, No. 3, 491-536. The CLGH Prize Committee awarded honorable mention to Peter Boag for his article, “Go West Young Man, Go East Young Woman: Searching for the Trans in Western Gender History,” Western Historical Quarterly, 36 (Winter 2005), 477-497. The CLGH Prize Committee is pleased to announce that the 2006 Gregory Sprague Prize for an outstanding published or unpublished paper, article, book chapter, or dissertation chapter on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, transsexual, and/or queer history completed in English by a graduate student in 2004 or 2005 was awarded to Camille Robcis for her article, “How the Symbolic Became French: Kinship and Republicanism in the PAC Debates,” Discourse, 26.3 (Fall 2004), 110-135. The CLGH Prize Committee awarded honourable mention to Howard Hsueh-Hao Chiang for his dissertation chapter, “Effecting Science, Affecting Medicine: Homosexuality, the Kinsey Reports, and the Contested Boundaries of Psychopathology in the United States, 1948-1965.”

The 2006 CLGH Prize Committee included:

Vicki Eaklor
Division of Human Studies
Alfred University
Saxon Drive
Alfred, NY 14802

Nan Alamilla Boyd
Women’s and Gender Studies
Sonoma State University
1801 East Cotati Ave.
Rohnert Park, CA 94928-3609

Don Romesburg
Division of Human Studies
Alfred University
Saxon Drive
Alfred, NY 14802

In reaching its decision, the Prize Committee prepared the following commendations:

Winner, Audre Lorde Prize, Committee on Lesbian and Gay History, 2006
“In ‘Boutilier and the U. S. Supreme Court’s Sexual Revolution,’ Marc Stein challenges the common interpretations of Supreme Court rulings on such issues as abortion, birth control homosexuality, interracial marriage, and obscenity, 1965-1973. Rather than developing a “libertarian and egalitarian vision of sexual citizenship,” he asserts, the Court instead rejected such a vision in favor of one essentially conservative, “based on the supremacy of adult, heterosexual, monogamous, marital, familial, domestic, private, and procreative forms of sexual expression.” While Stein examines such famous cases as Griswold v. Connecticut and Roe v. Wade, his centerpiece is the lesser-known 1967 Boutilier case, which upheld the principle of excluding and deporting homosexuals from the U. S. Stein’s research is exhaustive, his methods are interdisciplinary, and his arguments are lucidly presented and accessible to both students and scholars in history, law, and the social sciences. His detailed recounting of the Boutilier case alone is impressive, but he goes far beyond the case to provide a model of LGBTQ scholarship by teasing out both smaller and larger issues that are vital to our understanding of the Supreme Court today.”

Honorable Mention, Audre Lorde Prize, Committee on Lesbian and Gay History, 2006
“Peter Boag’s 2005 essay, “Go West Young Man,” provides a historiographical approach to questions of transgender subjectivity in U.S. Western history. Why, he asks, do Western historians ignore female-to-male transgender subjectivity? He cites several reasons, including the desire to recuperate women into U.S. Western history, the historiographical impulse toward progressive narratives that configure cross-dressing women as proto-feminists attempting to usurp male social and political power, and the collapse of gendered meanings onto a strictly polarized set of sexed bodies. In other words, Boag suggests that U.S. Western history might apply a more complex mode of gender analysis to the characters and bodies that inhabited the 19th-century U.S. West. In doing so, “whole new possibilities for understanding gender open up.” Boag thus offers a refreshing approach to the history of the U.S. West, one where sexed bodies and gendered beings exceed the binary models 20th and 21st century scholars seem all to eager to accept.”
Winner, Gregory Sprague Prize, Committee on Lesbian and Gay History, 2006
“Camille Robcis effectively combines historical theory and practice in her sophisticated treatment of debates over domestic partnership laws and same-sex unions in France. In her analysis she not only recounts events and arguments, but also deftly explains the cultural importance of notions of symbolic order, kinship, and Republicanism, and the ways and means by which anthropological and psychoanalytic theories entered French political discourse. Robcis’ article is exemplary in bridging gaps left all too often between very specific contexts and larger historical issues; in this case, she aids our understanding of late 20th century French politics while offering clues into a more pervasive resistance to same-sex marriage, even as people and governments acknowledge selected rights for LGBTQ people.”

Honorable Mention, Gregory Sprague Prize, Committee on Lesbian and Gay History, 2006
“Howard Hsueh-Hao Chiang argues persuasively that in the mid-twentieth century, Kinsey’s statistical methodologies and divorce of sexual identity from behavior pushed mental health experts to cast doubt upon dominant pathologizing psychoanalytic models of homosexuality. By elaborating upon Kinsey’s distinct influences on clinical psychologists and psychiatrists, Chiang shows how much the mental health profession had already liberalized around the issue of homosexuality in the decades prior to its 1973 declassification as a mental disorder. By so doing, he challenges the centrality historians have granted gay and lesbian activists as the chief oppositional force to psychoanalytic hegemony. Chiang’s blending of discourse theory with a precision about “expert” heterogeneity serves as a valuable model for teasing out the processes through which various social actors compete for cultural authority through the bodies and minds of LGBTQ people.”

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS: CLGH 2007 Prize Competition
The Committee on Lesbian and Gay History will award two prizes in 2007:
• The John Boswell Prize for an outstanding book on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, transsexual, and/or queer history published in English.
• The Joan Nestle Undergraduate Prize for an outstanding paper on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, transsexual, and/or queer history completed in English by an undergraduate student

Papers and books published in 2005 or 2006 are eligible. Materials may be submitted by students, faculty, authors, readers, or publishers. Self-nominations are encouraged.
Send one copy to each of the three members of the Prize Committee by 30 December 2006.

Ramón A. Gutiérrez
Professor of Ethnic Studies and History
University of California, San Diego
Ethnic Studies Department, 0522
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, California 92093-0522
email: rgotierrez@ucsd.edu

Jennifer Evans, Assistant Professor of History
Department of History
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
Canada
email: jevans@ccs.carleton.ca

Daniel Winunwe Rivers
Ph.D. Candidate, Stanford University
10320 Cherry Ridge Rd.
Sebastopol, CA 95472
email: dwrivers@stanford.edu

For further information on CLGH and CLGH prizes, please contact Karen C. Krahulik, Chair, CLGH, Associate Dean of the College, Brown University, Box 1939—UH 201, Providence, RI 02906; 401-863-2030; Karen_krahulik@brown.edu; or visit the CLGH website at www.usc.edu/clgh.
CLGH Governing Board Election

Enclosed you will find a ballot to select members of the CLGH Governing Board. Please complete this ballot and nomination form and return by 1 June 2006 to Karen C. Krahulik, Associate Dean of the College, Brown University, Box 1939, Providence, RI, 02912.

CLGH Governing Board Election

There are two three-year terms open. These full-term openings will replace Margot Canaday and Marcia Gallo as they depart from the Board after multiple years of wonderful service to our organization and community. Please join me in extending our deepest gratitude for Margot and Marcia’s efforts. One last note, we have always tried to have at least one candidate on the board whose work is with/in libraries and/or archives. William Peniston, who went off the board last year, was that person for three years. I ask that you consider this intent as you look over the statements of the nominees for this year’s election.

Governing Board Nominees Statements

Mark Meinke

CLGH is committed to working with, strengthening, learning from, and partnering with the community archives, historical societies, and libraries that have become an important element of capturing, preserving, and promoting LGBTQ history in this country. I would like to be a part of that and to strengthen those links. I would also like to work to bring local organizations into more frequent collaboration with CLGH.

Perhaps because of the transience of our population and the many competing involvements, Washington DC never evolved its own LGBTQ historical organization. In November 2000, I created Washington, DC’s Rainbow History Project out of personal frustration at not being able to identify archival materials and sources on our metropolitan LGBTQ history. Over six years, we have created a virtual archive on our website and have become a reference point, long missing in DC, for historians whose work needs to connect with DC’s gay history. Our initial projects, collecting oral histories and defining the social context of our community, have created a base on which we are building more structured portraits of our history.

Having led Rainbow History for five years, and been a member of CLGH for four, I find the interdependence of community-based archival/historical groups and historians of our community intuitively obvious. CLGH provides a unique platform for community groups and professional historians to dialogue on mutual needs, exchange ideas and support, and strengthen the sometimes tenuous hold our LGBTQ history has on the public mind. I would like to see more community organizations become involved with and supportive of CLGH.

Paula Jabloner

I recently started working at the Computer History Museum in Mountain View, CA where I manages all aspects of the document collection. Additionally, I am the CHM lead on planning and implementing digitization projects including directing CHMs prototype project to provide online access to computer company marketing brochures set to go online in July. Previous to CHM, I was Senior Archivist at History San Jose and Project Director for Silicon Valley History Online, a collaborative LSTA funded digitization project at SiliconValleyHistory.org. From 1995 to 1998 I was the Archivist at the Gay and Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Historical Society of Northern California, Prior to this, for two years, I was the American Civil Liberties Union Project Archivist at Princeton University. Additionally, from 1997 to 1997 I was Co-Chair of the Society of American Archivists Lesbian and Gay Archives Roundtable (LAGAR) and from 2004 to present I have been on the executive committee of LAGAR.

Kevin Murphy

I am Assistant Professor in the Department of History at the University of Minnesota, where I teach courses on the histories of gender, sexuality, and political culture. I am currently completing work on my first book Red Bloods and Mollycoddles: Political Manhood in the Progressive Era (Columbia University Press), which examines contests over the political meanings of masculinity in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century. I am working on a second book project Transatlantic Sex: Sexual Knowledge and Progressive Politics at the Turn of the Twentieth Century, which argues that new ideas about sexuality stood at the center of Progressive-era social and political thought and reform practice in the United States. I am also co-editing a thematic issue of the Radical History Review on homonormativities and have been working with the Twin Cities GLBT Oral History Collective on a book about queer politics and history in Minnesota.

I have been a member of CLGH since 1996 and currently edit the CLGH newsletter. As a CLGH Governing Board member, I would like to work on strategies for challenging the marginalization of LGBTQ scholarship and scholars by academic departments and granting agencies. I would also like to help develop the proposed CLGH oral history project.
Jennifer Manion
I am committed to teaching and writing history that analyzes sexuality and gender as constitutive of the narrative of US History. I have always viewed my work in academia as part of the larger movement for lgbt rights. I wrote an essay on this subject called, “Calling all liberals: Connecting Feminist Theory, Activism, and History,” in the volume Taking Back the Academy. My dissertation examines the function of sex, sexuality, gender, and race in the penal reform movement of 18th century Pennsylvania. I’ve been active in a wide range of local, national, and campus-based LGBT organizations. As a member of CLGH for the past few years, I’ve come to appreciate the importance of its existence and would like to help increase the committee’s visibility and membership.

Jennifer Manion is a PhD candidate in history and lecturer in women’s & gender studies at Rutgers University

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

The CLGH organized sessions at the 2006 AHA were lively and engaging. The abstracts from these sessions follow for your information:

ROUNDTABLE: Out There Or In Here? The Chilly Climate Revisited:
Joint Session of CLGH, CCWH, and AHA Professional Division

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

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

Session Description:
Harvard University president Lawrence Summer’s webpage features, prominently, a letter to the Harvard Community addressing his recent, ill-phrased, and internationally publicized statements concerning women’s roles and abilities in the sciences. “I deeply regret,” he writes, in an attempt to quell the firestorm of criticism his remarks generated, “the impact of my comments and apologize for not having weighed them more carefully.”

Those of us concerned with what often feels like a backlash against women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans-gender, and transsexual people in the academy, find in his letter both an acknowledgement that reactionary ideas about biology as destiny prosper and a reaffirmation that discriminatory practice results from something equally noteworthy: the profound impact of unexamined stereotypes in contemporary scholarship and professional practice.

Participants in this roundtable presented both data and anecdotal information about the nature and frequency of chilly climate issues in contemporary academia. Their argument was that forms of discrimination on the basis of sexuality, and gender, as well as a combination of these markers of identity, has not lessened with increasing representation of underrepresented groups in higher education. It has not lessened with more clear and supportive professional standards on the part of our scholarly societies. It lingers in ways both subtle and obvious. The goal of the roundtable was to explore, with the AHA Professional Division, the nature of the problem as well as ways in which the AHA can work more successfully to help foster equitable work environments for all its members.
Panel Presentation: Desiring Men: Identity, Masculinity and Homosexual Practices in Metropole and Colony

Panel Abstract:
This panel explored the linkages between same sex desire and identity in three distinct cultural contexts. Drawing on material from nineteenth-century Britain, early twentieth-century German East Africa, and early nineteenth-century India, each paper focused on how ideas of masculinity influenced individual self-representations and individual attitudes towards sexual acts with other men. Each paper found that race and class were key in determining how such sexual acts were interpreted by the participants, as well as in how they were dealt with by legal and state officials.

Chair: Leisa Meyer, College of William & Mary

Heike Schmidt, San Diego State University, “‘The Governor Has not Been Sexually Active’: Homosexuality and Sexual Crime in German East Africa”
Shruti Kapila, Tufts University, “Masculinity and Madness: Princely Tales from Colonial India”
Note: In Kapila’s absence, Krahulik read selections from Kapila’s published article on this topic.
Charles Upchurch, Florida State University, “Rethinking Links between Masculinity, Identity, and Same-sex Desire for Nineteenth-Century Britain”

Commentator: Karen C. Krahulik, Brown University

Poster Session:
Jens Rydström, Stockholm University, “Nationhood and Gay Marriage in Scandinavia”

What is/was a “poster session”? New for the 2006 Annual Meeting, the poster session was a venue for the most current developing historical research. Though relatively new to the humanities, poster sessions have long been utilized at professional meetings in scientific fields. In sessions with several panel participants, audience interaction is limited to brief discussion periods—usually only a few people are able to ask questions and each presenter may not have time to discuss their research fully. The two-hour poster session addressed this common problem, allowing for considered dialogue and engaging interaction.

The 2006 Program Committee encouraged meeting attendees to visit the posters on display in the Loews’ Millennium Hall between 2:30 and 4:30 P.M. on Saturday, January 7.

Saturday Evening Reception at the William Way Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Community Center
Reception plus film screening of Gay Pioneers

CLGH Dissertation Bibliography

CLGH has assembled a bibliography of more than 80 LGBTQ history dissertations and dissertations-in-progress (arranged in chronological order). The bibliography is based on information supplied by CLGH members and other LGBTQ historians, and it includes dissertations described by their authors as “fully” or “partially” focused on LGBTQ history. The complete bibliography is available on the CLGH website (www.usc.edu/clgh). If you have updates, corrections, or additions, please send them to Karen_krahulik@brown.edu. Newly added dissertations and dissertations-in-progress include the following:

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS BY MEMBERS – UPDATED 4/15/2006


Baggett, Holly. “Lesbians, Modernism and Mysticism: How the 1921 Ulysses Trial drove Lesbians to God.” Presented at Women’s Education, Research and Resource Centre, University College Dublin, LESBIAN LIVES XIII, 10-12 FEBRUARY 2006


Boag, Peter. “Go West Young Man, Go East Young Woman: Searching for the Trans in Western Gender History.” Western Historical Quarterly 36, no. 3 (Winter 2005): 477-97.


Solomon, Jeff. “Young, Effeminate, and Strange: Early Photographic Portraiture of Truman Capote.” *Studies in Gender and Sexuality* 6 (3), 2005


Stewart-Winter, Timothy. I gave a public lecture at Gerber-Hart Library in Chicago on February 21st called “Putting San Francisco’s Castro District in its Place: Notes on Gay Gentrification,” in a series of lectures by young scholars called “The Cutting Edge.”


Feedback Corner

As Chair of the CLGH, I have two special topics on my agenda for this calendar year and I’d appreciate any and all feedback on either topic (please send to Karen_krahulik@brown.edu).

**Item #1:** The first item includes following the lead of Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists (SOLGA) and negotiating with the AHA so that it, like the American Anthropological Association (AAA), makes clear in its publications whether employers advertising jobs do or do not have non-discrimination policies that include sexual orientation. Currently, the AHA includes a statement in its printed publications that stresses the importance of fair employment practices within the field at large. However, if a job applicant searches the online database, even this somewhat generic EEO statement does not appear. SOLGA and the AAA agreed on the following:

“Effective with the May 2000 edition of the *Anthropology News*, placement advertisements in the AN and on the AAA website will include statements about the hiring organization’s employment practices regarding lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered individuals. Advertisers will select the statement from each of the following sets that reflects their employment practices.

Statement 1.
A. “This employer offers employment benefits to domestic partners of employees.”
B. “This employer does not offer employment benefits to domestic partners of employees.”

AND

Statement 2.
A. “This employer prohibits discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation/preference and gender identity/expression.
B. “This employer does not prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation/preference and gender identity/expressio.

AAA will not be responsible for verifying accuracy of employer’s claims.

AAA will refuse to publish ads from employers that do not designate statements for inclusion with their ad.”

Source: http://www.aaanet.org/pspolicy.htm#lbgt

Please visit the AAA’s job/careers website http://www.aaanet.org/careers.htm to see what this looks like for both employers and job candidates.

**Item #2:** The Committee on Lesbian and Gay History Oral History Project
Is it time to begin collecting “our” history? My second agenda item focuses on a history of the CLGH. More specifically, I am interested in launching an oral history project that explores the academic trials and tribulations of senior scholars who have devoted substantial portions of their work to the history of LGBTQ subjects and themes. I imagine this may raise an eyebrow or two. For instance, how might one qualify (or not) as a “senior scholar”? Does this mean one is senior in their department, senior in the field, senior in age, none of the above? What will it mean for us to turn the microphones we have used to interview others unto ourselves? In more general terms, what kinds of topics do CLGH members believe must or ought to be considered regarding the project and/or individual interviews? The Board of Governors has offered useful advice already, but I’d like as well to include the voices of our membership-at-large.

**Announcement**

Founding Editor Walter L. Williams has announced a new web address for the INTERNATIONAL GAY & LESBIAN REVIEW at www.gaybookreviews.info online. This new site is more user friendly, making it easier to submit book reviews. Review authors retain copyright, meaning that they can submit their book review to another publication as well. Reviews previously printed in other publications are also welcome, with an acknowledgment that this review first appeared in that publication.
REVIEWS


Reviewed by Will C. Holmes, University of South Alabama

As John Howard notes in his afterword to Ben Duncan’s updated *The Same Language*, “when you tell your life story, you continually revise it” (295). When Duncan first told his life story to BBC listeners and British readers, he intentionally left out what Howard aptly calls “the culturally unspeakable” for most people in the Anglo-American world of the 1950s and 1960s (313). Fortunately, Howard convinced Duncan to engage in a “postmodern experiment in memory” and reevaluate his remembrances (296). This experiment allows an openly gay man writing over thirty years after the Gay Liberation Movement to analyze what he included and omitted as a closeted homosexual during the apex of the Cold War. Emphasized by italics, Duncan’s new perspectives fill in the gaps to reveal his homoerotic experiences as a boy in the American South and his introduction to gay circles in New Mexico, Oxford, and London. It also includes glimpses of Duncan’s life with his gay partner of over fifty years, Dick Chapman.

By the time he met Duncan in 2001, Howard’s *Men Like That: A Southern Queer History* and his editorship of *Carryin’ On in the Lesbian and Gay South* had made his and Duncan’s native region part of the discourse in gay and lesbian studies. In *Men Like That*, Howard brilliantly uses male homosexuality in rural Mississippi to show how queer sexuality has been variously comprehended along multiple axes and continuums. Demonstrating the limits of a monolithic “gay” umbrella, he contrasts the “men like that” who embraced an identity based on same-sex desire with the “men who like that” who occasionally performed homosexual acts. Likewise, in his revised *Same Language*, Duncan reveals the complexities of homosexual identities and acts during his pre-World War II childhood in Alabama and Texas, his brief stint in the Army shortly after the war, his three years at the University of New Mexico in the late 1940s, and his life as a young American expatriate in Oxford and London in the 1950s.

Looking back on several homoerotic encounters of childhood, adolescence, and young adulthood, Duncan contrasts himself and others who eventually embraced a same-sex identity to describe themselves with sexual partners who shunned the idea of a “gay” minority. Reinforcing the work of John D’Emilio, Allan Bérubé, and other scholars who have written about the importance of World War II as a catalyst for the emergence of gay communities in the United States and elsewhere, he recalls learning the word “gay” to describe himself from a World War II veteran at the University of New Mexico.

Duncan, who initially traveled to Oxford on a Henry Fellowship, portrays the same hysteria about homosexuals in 1950s Britain that Howard and others find in Cold War America. Adding to this hysteria was a medical and psychological diagnosis of homosexuality as abnormal and perverse. Duncan and his friends in 1950s London accepted this diagnosis much as their counterparts did in the United States. He recalls thinking, “our condition was medical, psychological, or a mixture of the two, but it was unquestionably wrong in some way, a kind of disease, and certainly incurable” (242). Just as homophile organizations like the Mattachine Society and Daughters of Bilitis reflected accommodationist perspectives of most gays and lesbians in 1950s America, Duncan and other gay men and women in Britain internalized 1950s attitudes: “The idea that two men in the act of exploring and caressing each other’s bodies might actually like, or even love one another was dismissed as an absurd, sentimental fantasy” (243). Thus, in order to survive the world outside the flat he shared with his lover, Duncan became “all things to all men and women. What the situation required I became” (157).

As gay and lesbian scholars have shown, politics and the law also contributed to the Cold War discourse concerning homosexuality. Shortly before the Johns Committee ferreted out homosexuals in late 1950s and early 1960s Florida, Home Secretary David Maxwell Fyfe pursued a drive against male vice in the late 1940s and early 1950s. As Presidents Truman and Eisenhower purged homosexuals from the federal government during the McCarthy years, the conservative British press fueled hysteria about a vast conspiracy of evil homosexuals “said to extend to the upper reaches of the government, especially the foreign office, the institutions of higher learning, and even to connections abroad, the whole constituting what one newspaper called Mauve International” (266). As closeted homosexuals like J. Edgar Hoover and Roy Cohn internalized the homophobia of the larger culture in the United States, gay newspaper editors like Gordon Robinson and gay members of Parliament like Conservative Henry “Chips” Channon routinely broke the anti-sodomy laws they upheld in Britain. Most amusingly, Duncan describes wild gay parties regularly attended by gay clergymen. These clergymen happily served under a virulently homophobic Archbishop of Canterbury who proclaimed homosexual indulgence “a shameful vice and a grievous sin from which deliverance is to be sought by every means” (243).
In 1967, thirty-six years before the United States Supreme Court declared state anti-sodomy statutes unconstitutional, British Parliament repealed laws that made homosexual acts between men illegal. Duncan depicts this repeal as an important catalyst for more unified and visible gay activism in Britain. As the Stonewall riots broadened the gay rights movement in the United States, Duncan and Chapman worked on behalf of gay equality in Britain. Despite these advances, Duncan cautions us about the complexities of gay community and identity: “What we call gay men seem to have almost as little in common as blond men or black-skinned men. I’m not sure now that I know what a gay man is, let alone a straight man” (279). “Gay” remains a contested term, but thanks to Duncan and other homosexuals of his generation it has become part of the culturally speakable.


Reviewed by Timothy Stewart-Winter, University of Chicago

“The gay movement began on the left,” declares the opening sentence of this powerful, provocative book. *Queer Wars* analyzes a series of writers and public intellectuals who are open about their gayness, and indeed advocate equality for gay people, but who have repudiated what Robinson sees as the queer movement’s roots in left-wing politics. Robinson notes perceptively that his subjects see themselves as symbols of the maturation of gay politics; indeed, he says, “[t]he developmental metaphor that associates radicalism with childishness and moderation with maturity is a fixture in the writings of all the new gay conservatives” (12). For Robinson, however, it is they who are childish—indeed, ungrateful for the sacrifices made by their elders. Gay conservatives, he finds, are “guilty” less of “grubby materialism” than of “ingratitude toward the achievements of the men and women of the Stonewall generation who made their very existence possible” (8).

Like Robinson’s landmark work on sexology, *The Modernization of Sex* (1976), *Queer Wars* is structured around a small group of key writers. His four main subjects are all professional journalists who have written both articles and books; their work “thus lends itself to the kind of close analytical reading that is my stock-in-trade as an intellectual historian” (2). The first two chapters discuss Bruce Bawer and Andrew Sullivan respectively; the third centers on Michelangelo Signorile and Gabriel Rotello, who consider themselves politically progressive but whom Robinson calls “sexual conservatives.” Robinson analyzes each in relation to three well-selected features of gay-right discourse: politics, gender, and sex. By “politics” he means gay conservatives’ rejection of both traditional economic redistributionism and the identity-based movements of the 1960s. The other themes refer to their repudiation of gender nonconformity, and their opposition to sexual excess and endorsement of monogamy.

Robinson makes no effort to hide his own views, and such praise as he can muster for his subjects is faint indeed: “I found their thinking more complex than I originally anticipated, and I’ve come to admire the passion and sometimes the rigor with which they argue their case” (7). Still, he accepts their ideas as having been formulated and expressed in good faith, and he is willing to find fault with their critics as well. He sees gay conservatism as having an “exact parallel” (4) in the rise of black conservative thought, and concludes that it “should be thought of as a luxury that comes with success” (5). He argues persuasively that the AIDS crisis of the 1980s stimulated not only radical activism, but also, by increasing the political integration of gays and lesbians, created a space for openly gay conservatives to emerge.

Robinson brilliantly and harshly skewers his subjects’ views. He understands well that, “For the most part, gay conservatism is a story about men and by men. Lesbians figure in it, if at all, mainly as foils, whose devotion to domesticity is held up as an example to their libidinous gay brothers” (3). He also observes that many gay conservatives seem to think it was radical propaganda, or even social constructionism, that made gay men promiscuous in the gay lib era. Of Andrew Sullivan’s discussion of Foucault, he writes, “We have to picture the patrons at gay bathhouses in the 1970s managing to shed their inhibitions only with the assistance of Foucault’s *History of Sexuality*. The idea is nothing short of daffy. The case that Nazism was caused by the operas of Richard Wagner is, by comparison, almost sober” (59).

In a fascinating passage, Robinson examines the exchange of epithets that followed Signorile’s disclosure that Sullivan’s enthusiasm for monogamy hadn’t stopped him from placing Internet ads for bareback sex with other HIV-positive men. He dissected the irony that Signorile proves ultimately less accepting of promiscuity than Sullivan, whom he calls “a theoretical puritan but a temperamental libertine” (70). (In an epilogue on *Queer as Folk* as a “counter-view” to conservative views of gay life, Robinson inexplicably declares that gay conservatism “goes entirely unmentioned” [152], missing the thinly veiled parody of Sullivan’s barebacking scandal in a Season Two episode.)

Of its protagonists, the book is least harsh on the
“sexual conservatives” who embrace left politics but suggest that gay promiscuity should be reined in when, as he puts it, life and health are at stake. Here Robinson tries to stake out a middle ground, suggesting that some have an “over-determined” antipathy, both medical and moral, toward promiscuity. Yet he is “fundamentally persuaded . . . that the sexual culture of the 1970s, above all, the anal multipartnerism of the baths, was the cause of the AIDS epidemic” (147). He complains that Michael Warner’s reply to Gabriel Rotello in The Trouble With Normal is “thin and slapdash and can’t compete with the carefully reasoned case Rotello mounts in Sexual Ecology” (142).

If I have a concern about Robinson’s analysis, it is not about his view of conservatives, but about his use of “the Stonewall generation” as a yardstick against which to measure them. In discussing the Sullivan-Signorile dispute, he contrasts “the remarkable level of personal antagonism that now characterizes disagreements between gay intellectuals” to “the Stonewall era, when we were so conscious of our shared history and oppression and our newly discovered ethos of brotherhood” (78). But are the gay political disputes of today really more contentious than those of the gay lib era—a time when the Bay Area Reporter’s masthead billed it “the Catalyst for All Factions of the Gay community”?

Queer Wars is compact, readable, and yet admirably comprehensive. Unfortunately, it lacks citations or notes, and some will wish for a more sustained discussion of the sociology and demography of gay conservatism than his approach provides. Still, Robinson’s decision to focus on his chosen texts arguably reflects the powerful influence of reporters and columnists on gay political discourse since the 1970s. His book will likely find many readers who find gay conservatism important, but lack the time to immerse themselves in the genre—or simply can’t quite stomach the thought.


Reviewed by Matt Johnson, Brooklyn Museum Library; Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies

In July 2005, a Seattle man died of injuries reportedly sustained during sexual intercourse with a horse. His death led to the discovery of a circle of men known to one another via the internet interested in having sex with animals kept for that purpose on a farm in the foothills of the Cascades. Neighbors in the vicinity of the farm professed ignorance and aversion to this unusual variation on sexual procurement. If this example is any indication, as more people in North America and Europe have become socially distanced from agrarian life, bestiality appears to have become a vice more social than solitary, more deliberate than incidental.

Such a scenario is a far cry from the sexual contacts between men and farm animals recounted by Jens Rydström in Sinners and Citizens. Bestiality in Sweden a century ago was characterized by its episodic and opportunistic nature. Strict social prohibitions on masturbation, sex out of wedlock, and same-sex sexuality paradoxically made bestiality a marginally more acceptable sexual outlet for itinerant young male farm laborers, even if it was still subject to ridicule, opprobrium, and prosecution. Historically, bestiality was principally regarded as a crime against property by those who had little or no property of their own. It required the payment of an indemnity, as the animal implicated in the act was considered symbolically befouled and was therefore customarily destroyed. Offenders were also subject to terms of hard labor, as were homosexual offenders; punishments were often brief, if hardly inconsequential. The nefarious nature of the crime was strongly mitigated by its prevalence; so prevalent was the practice, Rydström notes, that Swedish has both a verb for bestiality as well as a noun to denote those who practice it.

Rydström’s examination of bestiality relies on a source base—abundant records of bestiality prosecutions from local and regional criminal tribunals—which may be unique in modern European history, since in most jurisdictions, bestiality has rarely if ever been prosecuted as such. Without question, this fascinating and unprecedented history will be welcomed by historians of sexuality more broadly conceived as well as historians of rural life. However, the bulk (if not the meat) of Rydström’s work is a straightforward history of male homosexuality in late 19th- and early 20th-century Sweden. Its detailed and engaging narratives affirm many elements of other contemporary histories of homosexuality in Europe and North America, as well as bring to bear an extensive Swedish-language secondary literature on the history of homosexuality in that country.

It was only with the advent of a social democratic government and an aggressive movement to reform Sweden’s sex laws in the interbellum that bestiality and homosexuality were reconceptualized as forms of mental illness requiring treatment. Reformers affiliated with the Swedish Federation for Sex Education (RFSU), acting in concert with the government, effectively relieved jurists of the responsibility of petitioning for reform. Increasingly, offenders were compelled to produce autobiographies (a staple of forensic medical and sexological texts), used by authorities to arbitrate their sanity and therefore their culpability. In cases of bestiality, this sometimes reveals
an intentionality and even an ardor for the objects of the perpetrators’ affections which elude the earlier accounts. In cases of homosexuality, these autobiographies were characteristically used to differentiate between sexual dispositions believed to be casual and instrumental versus those which were deemed constitutional; younger, receptive, and non-instigating partners were frequently seen as less culpable. Yet reformers’ desire to keep sexual offenders out of the penal system frequently led to their incarceration in mental institutions, a fate viewed by many as worse than hard labor, and certainly more difficult to escape.

It seems only logical that Rydström would be interested in drawing comparisons between these contemporary sexual histories, even though he assures us without much elaboration that he believes bestiality and homosexuality to be “very different things” (30). Rather than dwelling on similarities among the actors in his analysis, the author seeks to juxtapose the behaviors in which they engage. Yet while their sexual objects may have been at variance, it is striking how both these sexual delicts involve men of similar ages and backgrounds, and how despite changes in social perception and the law, men implicated in both these crimes were subject to disciplinary mechanisms that acted as incitements to discourse.

Despite the likelihood of its continued prevalence throughout the industrializing societies their writings described, bestiality garnered little attention from late 19th- and early 20th-century European sexologists. This assessment by Havelock Ellis is typical:

Most sexual perversions, if not in large measure the outcome of civilized life, easily adjust themselves to it. Bestiality ... is, on the other hand, the sexual perversion of dull, insensitive, and unfastidious persons. It flourishes among primitive peoples and among peasants. It is the vice of the clodhopper, unattractive to women or inapt to court them.2

Rydström’s work convincingly demonstrates that Swedish reformers, strongly influenced by such discourse, were equally disposed to regard the phenomenon of bestiality in a rapidly urbanizing society as anachronistic and therefore not worthy of the consideration which “cultivated perversions,” particularly homosexuality, merited. Homosexuality was viewed as a harbinger of modernity, its excesses and its discontents, while bestiality was an atavism, a “primitive” practice destined for eventual extinction.

It is in this small but significant respect that Rydström shows how 19th-century thinking about same-sex sexuality opens a cleft between itself and an earlier tradition dating from the later medieval and early modern periods. In the earlier model, “sodomy” was a complex rubric encompassing various forms of non-procreative and otherwise non- legitimated sexual practice, including among other activities same-sex sexual expression and sex with animals. As medicalization transformed “sodomites” into “homosexuals,” bestiality was divested of its symbolic relationship to same-sex sexuality. Bestiality was silenced socially through a silencing in legal as well as medical discourse. It retained its transgressive potential, but instead of being a transgression against morality, bestiality became a transgression against modernity.

Rydström appears eager to demonstrate, following other historians, that recognition of homosexuality (along with bestiality’s apparent obsolescence) is a litmus test for social modernity. Yet the legal sources he cites in support of this argument admit a great deal more complexity. During the period of his study, prosecutions for same- sex sexual expression (overwhelmingly male) increased exponentially in both urban and rural areas, in response to heightened awareness of homosexuality and concomitant changes in the law. Yet while the number of bestiality cases prosecuted in Sweden during this period (overwhelmingly in rural jurisdictions, as may be expected) did not increase, neither did it disappear or even substantially decrease. Bestiality apparently remained a widespread behavior as well as an important social and juridical concern in the Swedish countryside every year up to the repeal of the law against it in 1944. One might infer that it retained its social significance in rural areas even after the ban was lifted.

Though Sweden’s decriminalization of consensual same-sex sexual behavior between adults (also in 1944) came very early relative to many other European societies, Rydström notes that the abolition of the bestiality law came much later in Sweden than elsewhere, where such legislation was frequently struck from the books in the belief that the existence of the law had the effect of unintentionally promoting the practice. Sweden’s exceptionalism in this regard is exemplified by folk traditions such as sex-segregated labor practices on farms (the milking shed as an exclusively female domain, prohibited to male farmhands) which militated against bestiality. While the interests of jurists and reformers were clearly directed toward developments in the metropole, it should not be inferred that changes in urban sexual life and understandings of it prompted abrupt, fundamental change in the provinces. The “paradigm shift” which Rydström describes seems to have much more to do with intellectual and political developments, as well as urbanization and its attendant social mobility, than it does with one sexual practice superseding another.


Reviewed by William B. Turner, University of Wisconsin, J.D. candidate

In 156 pages, this slim volume purports to provide an overview of the “social construction of sexuality.” It contains three sections: “Theorizing Sex,” “The Sociology and Politics of Sexual Identity,” and “Social Conflict over Sexual Morality.” The first two sections each have three chapters; the third has four.

On the back cover, the series editor describes this series as consisting of “essays” that explain how major developments have “transformed their areas of specialty.” I find this a bit confusing, because such description suggests that this book is aimed at other academics. Its actual tone, however, is more that of a survey for undergraduates. Similarly, the attempt to achieve breathtaking scope – chapters on sexology and psychoanalysis, social constructionism, and the debates about sadomasochism and sex work, all in less than 200 pages – suggests more an overview aimed at beginners.

The result is a book that will probably not hold much interest for historians of sexuality and LGBT experience. Not that there’s anything wrong with the information it contains. Rather, it tends to fall into two categories: ‘oh, we already knew that,’ or ‘we’d need lots more detail for it to be terribly useful.’ I have to confess that part of my problem is that this book sounds very much like what I think of as standard sociology – and I have problems with standard sociology. I find the claims simplistic and overly broad, and the language clunky – lots of passive voice to disguise the over-generalizations. Thus, Seidman asks, “If establishing a heterosexual identity became an important way to project a normal, respectable gender identity, how is a heterosexual identity achieved in everyday life?” (49)

This is a potentially fascinating question, one that scholars from various disciplines have addressed. Part of the problem with Seidman’s approach, as with the language of “social construction” generally, is that it suggests a level of self-conscious deliberation in the process of “establishing a heterosexual identity” that simply is not there for most people. I find, say, Peter Boag’s historical account of this process in *Same-Sex Affairs*, or Judith Butler’s philosophical account in *Gender Trouble*, much more compelling. Discussing the theory of binary genders that Butler aimed at in her work, Seidman asks, “Is this idea true?” (36). I don’t know what it means to ask if the idea of binary genders is “true.” It certainly has its effects in the world. I don’t think Butler wrote to address its “truth” or “falsity.” Is it possible for us to substitute a different regime for the currently hegemonic concept of binary genders? I suppose so, but that doesn’t make the current regime less “true.”

Moreover, all this appears in a book that the series editor characterizes as demonstrating the centrality of “the cultural turn” for the transformation of sociology over the past generation (Back cover). It seems to me that the value of the cultural turn, or what historians might call the linguistic turn, is precisely that we ask how meanings function, rather than worrying about whether they are “true” or not.

In addition to the problems with conceptualization, this book contains one chapter that, in my opinion, vividly illustrates my suspicions about the entire approach. Why would one ever publish a 12-page book chapter (80-92) under the title “Comparative Perspectives on Gay and Lesbian Politics” with discussions of The Netherlands, Mexico, and Japan in it? With all due respect to Professor Seidman, I fundamentally don’t understand what he (and his co-author, apparently for this chapter alone, James Dean) thought he would accomplish.

You might consider this book if you’re teaching some sort of interdisciplinary survey, but otherwise, I fear it holds little of value for most CLGH members.


Reviewed by Howell Williams, Florida State University

Sociologist Arlene Stein’s *The Stranger Next Door* is a study of a rural Oregonian community called Timbertown (a pseudonym) and its mid-1990s battle over homosexuality. Stein’s analysis is not simply a case study for understanding sexual politics in small communities. She also highlights the importance of place, circumstance, and contradiction that make Timbertown’s story unique.

Stein, an intellectual, Jewish, lesbian mother, moved to Oregon in 1994 and pondered why the seemingly progressive state had almost passed Measure 9, a bill to deny civil rights protections to lesbians and gay men. While the measure was defeated in metropolitan areas, rural Oregonian communities endorsed it. But why, Stein asks, “did small-town folks find homosexuality, seemingly a non-issue, so confusing and troubling? And why bother organizing against lesbian/gay rights in towns where queer people were barely visible?” (2). Stein also explores how progressives in Timbertown “defend[ed] lesbian and gay rights in the absence of a visible, identifiable gay community” (2).

Stein’s explanations of anti-gay rights and pro-gay rights constituencies move beyond simplistic dichotomies.
Timbertown residents fiercely wrestled with the issue, not simply because the ideology clashes between conservatives and progressives, secularists and Christians, the working-class and elites, liberal and traditional Christians, Democrats and Republicans, longtime residents and newcomers, or insiders and outsiders, but because all these polarities combined and intertwined to create anxieties broader than the issue of sexuality. Stein argues that sexuality, however, became a symbol for manifold boundary anxieties.

She studied editorials and newspaper clippings and conducted dozens of interviews with Timbertown residents both for and against the ballot measure, not to mention many residents who were ambivalent. While readers are aware of Stein’s progressive politics, Stein suggests that for the most part her subjects were not. She does an, however, Stein complicates such assumptions.

The Oregon Citizens Alliance (OCA), largely composed of female conservative Christian activists, supported the antigay ballot measure. Stein describes how OCA activists like Sallie Humphries divided gays into “good gays,” those whose lives resembled heterosexuals, and “bad gays,” those whom she labeled activists and militants. The OCA’s message attracted many conservative Protestant ministers, but OCA also experienced the ambivalence of conservative and even fundamentalist pastors who resisted involving their congregations in politics or discussing what they felt to be the private matter of sexuality. Stein argues that those most involved in OCA organizing were not religious leaders in town, and in fact, the majority of Timbertown citizens who self-identified as conservative had murkier attitudes towards Measure 9.

What is interesting about Stein’s investigation is her emphasis on what might seem like contradictions to the reader; Stein, however, uses incongruity to demonstrate the fluidity and unpredictable nature of identities. Consider that it was not only Christian conservatives who were attracted to OCA’s message but also libertarians who had no faith in government. Stein describes Oregon as “contradictory mix of moralism and libertarianism” (67), and thus, not all people supporting the anti-gay ballot measure were homophobic. In fact, Stein “found that even many of those who thought of individual gay people as sympathetic and likable were often captivated by ‘special rights’ rhetoric, a fact that suggests that in Timbertown, as in the nation as a whole, public opinion about homosexuality is shifting, malleable” (125-126). People like Harry Boyle, a liberal, small business owner who married an Asian woman and practiced Buddhism, represented a large ambivalent majority who did not want “one group telling another how to live” (125).

Stein situates her analysis of the volatile community within a context of two decades of economic and cultural change. She explains that in the 1980s and early 1990s, rural Oregon attracted dozens of back-to-the-land movements that altered community structure. Subsequently, the timber industry, which sustained Timbertown’s economic base, suffered a downturn, thus interrupting community and family life. Finally, wealthy Californians came searching for cheap land bringing nostalgia for an imagined ideal of small-town life while wanting to maintain a big-city culture. For Stein, Timbertown lacked “a strong sense of itself” (65).

Not all Timbertown citizens aligned with the liberal Community Action Network (CAN) were transplanted Californians or members of hippie communes. CAN, largely composed of white heterosexual women, also attracted liberal Presbyterians and moderate Catholics. Stein not only highlights the limits of OCA’s campaign, but also of CAN’s strategies. CAN determined that community education was the key to defeating the ballot measure, thus sponsoring an Anne Frank exhibit in order to focus the community’s attention on intolerance. Yet, CAN relegated its argument to “normalizing” homosexuals — claiming that “the boundaries separating the homo and hetero worlds were fixed, essential, and impermeable.” Stein highlights the limits of this essentialist argument most successfully through her interviews with parents of gay children who insist their gay and lesbian children “can’t help it” (149). Of course, fluid sexual boundaries were especially threatening to the OCA, but Stein critiques essentialist claims as not going far enough to challenge heteronormativity.

The community divided sharply over the issue, as each faction hurled slurs such as “Nazi” at their opponents, while townspeople even struggled to figure out who belonged to which camp. Timbertown residents began assuming heterosexual women were lesbians and then began boycotting stores they knew were owned by lesbian proprietors. Ironically, many lesbians in the town were neither open about their sexual orientation nor participated in CAN organizing. Once again, Stein does an excellent job at complicating reader assumptions by highlighting who is and is not participating in these debates (whether at the forefront or in the background) and why.

Overall, Stein provides readers interested in politics, sociology, queer history and religious studies an entertaining and informative read by gracefully weaving individual dramas with the collective history of Timbertown. Readers are left to ponder if similar contexts, which contributed to the tension and outcome over sexuality issues in Timbertown, could be recreated in small towns across America, towns that are rarely as homogeneous as presumed.
Reviewed by Emily Mieras, Stetson University

With *Intimate Friends: Women who Loved Women, 1778-1928*, Martha Vicinus makes an important contribution to the history of female relationships, sexuality, and same-sex love. Vicinus continues the work scholars—including herself—have done to recover the hidden stories of lesbian experience in an era before the definition of a lesbian identity itself. In a collective biography of educated, often socially prominent American and Western European women, Vicinus demonstrates that these women adapted their contemporary language of love, created rituals and social circles, and used artistic expression to mold their sexual identities. These women’s lives tested the era’s gender prescriptions not only in their disavowal of heterosexual conventions of love, but in their frank expression of sexuality and, in many cases, their decision to pursue lives independent of male support. Vicinus bookends her study with two important dates: 1778, the year the “Ladies of Llangollen,” Sarah Ponsonby and Eleanor Butler, set up housekeeping together in the Welsh countryside, and the 1928 publication of Radclyffe Hall’s influential novel about lesbian love, *The Well of Loneliness*. Over 150 years, as Western Europeans and Americans shifted from defining women who transgressed gender norms as “mannish” to adopting sexologists’ definitions of lesbianism, women negotiated the mores of their society in myriad ways.

Vicinus deploys an astonishing range of evidence showing how women who loved women created spaces for social support and alternative sexual expression. In the process, Vicinus provocatively suggests, many women found an independence born of these newfound homosocial environments (159). She successfully argues these intimate friends expressed “varieties of erotic love[,] ranging from the openly sexual, to the delicately sensual, to the disembodied ideal” (xx). Some women, like Ponsonby and Butler and the “female rake” Anne Lister, openly proclaimed their same-sex love; others expressed their feelings through metaphor or balanced intense emotional attachments to women with marriage. In addition to the Ladies of Llangollen, who overcame family objections and gained public support based on their presentation of a “model Romantic friendship” (6), Vicinus highlights, among others, American expatriates including sculptor Harriet Hosmer and actress Charlotte Cushman who established “an independent society of women” in mid-19th century Rome (31). She also examines the importance of scientists’ attitudes toward sexuality, devoting her last two chapters to such women as Natalie Clifford Barney, Renee Vivien, and Radclyffe Hall, who used social connections, the stage, and fiction to formulate a lesbian identity in the early 20th century, responding to and often opposing medical definitions of a deviant lesbian sexuality.

Particularly compelling is Vicinus’ attention to language as a tool for self-fashioning. She demonstrates her subjects’ agency in manipulating public and private discourse about love to define themselves and shape how outsiders would view their intimate relationships. To do so, she lets women speak through their own texts—whether sculpture, performance, fiction, letters, or memoir. She shows how the “intimate friends” appropriated the romantic language and social structures of their times. Some women referred to each other as husbands or wives, daughters or mothers, a tactic Vicinus sees as a creative adaptation of familiar images.

The players in this study repudiated traditional gender roles, whether by finding public success in artistic fields, by being outspoken in an age that praised female demureness, by cultivating sexual intrigue, or by living homosocially within societies organized around heterosexual marriage. Various factors enabled or discouraged women from succeeding in their intimate friendships. Class privilege worked in their favor, offering social networks, financial support, and occasional immunity from public opinion. On the other hand, unmarried women had more freedom to pursue such relationships. The famous 1864 Codrington divorce trial in Britain, Vicinus shows, exemplified the silencing of discussion about same-sex love—the unstated but central topic in the trial— in the interests of respectability (79).

Vicinus’ work nicely highlights scholarly conundrums for understanding expressions of sexual identity. Throughout much of the period she studies, women who were “intimate friends” lived in societies that used the concept of “gender inversion” to understand normative male and female behavior. Signs of “gender inversion” (dressing, walking, or talking in a “mannish” way, for example) were the “most common identifying mark of women who loved women” (82). Women themselves offered various responses to this dominant view. Some, like Eliza Lynn Linton, wished to be men themselves. Vicinus explains this impulse as a response both to Linton’s positive view of male traits and to her own feeling of abnormality. Of course, even an approach like Linton’s was constructed by her era’s definitions of gender. “Mannishness,” itself a socially constructed category, became a measure for some women to assess their own identity and behavior. Some, like Anne Lister, intentionally “inverted,” claiming a male identity through masculine self-presentation rather than reacting to an identity conferred by others.

Vicinus interprets these “intimate friends” relationships along a sexual continuum. She shies away from...
adopting easy definitions of what these women were to each other. Vicinus moves beyond issues that have concerned historians of sexuality including Lillian Faderman, Carol Smith-Rosenberg, and Leila Rupp—such as determining when to use the term “lesbian,” and whether or not sexual acts took place. Vicinus asserts that “all categories and definitions must remain provisional,” and her book nicely shows the slippery nature of sexual categorizations. Writer Vernon Lee, for example, loved women but elevated same-sex love as a form of moral purity, ultimately using her writing itself to express her physical desire (170). Natalie Barney took advantage of the permissive climate in late-19th century Paris to forge an influential social circle centered on theatrical performance and sexual expression that endured into the mid-20th century.

Vicinus departs from scholars including Faderman, Rupp, and Smith-Rosenberg, who have concluded that sexual activity was not necessarily central in defining same-sex love. Her close reading of fiction, memoirs, and letters strongly suggests that the writers’ expressions of love and closeness were more than metaphorical. Moreover, her interpretation of public responses to some same-sex couples suggests that sexual activity stood at the center of public outrage or curiosity. Vicinus concludes, “It would be foolish and arrogant to assume that none of these women knew their own bodies well enough to practice sexual relations to orgasm with another woman” (230).

Clearly, this book has many strengths, but it also raises some additional questions. Vicinus’ sources, as she acknowledges, are mostly the educated elite. It is tantalizing to wonder what experiences of same-sex love might have been like for women of fewer advantages. Vicinus often blurs geographical and cultural boundaries, overlooking the significance of regional or national norms in determining sexual expression. In the final chapters, she smoothly weaves together the early history of sexology with women’s changing expressions of desire, but at other points, a fuller discussion of broader societal attitudes about female sexuality would have been helpful. These issues, however, only point to the depth and richness of the topic. *Intimate Friends* is a complex and nuanced text that highlights the agency of late-18th to early-20th century women in choosing and shaping their own identities as lovers of women.


Reviewed by William A. Peniston, Ph.D., Manager of the Library and Archives, The Newark Museum.

The field of gay and lesbian history has grown substantially in the past few decades. Most of the work has focused narrowly on specific time periods, locations, individuals, or themes. However, Nicholas C. Edsall thinks that it is now time to set these very important studies into a broader historical context, and that is what he has done in *Toward Stonewall: Homosexuality and Society in the Modern Western World*.

Edsall begins his narrative in the late 17th century in the urban centers of northwestern Europe. There men began to use the public areas of Paris, London, and Amsterdam (as well as other cities) to make contacts with other men for brief casual affairs or longer more intimate relationships. In the process, they developed recognizable signals, both verbal and gestural, that constituted the origins of subcultures. Such subcultures soon attracted the attention of authorities in the early 18th century, who tried to suppress them in different ways according to local conditions. In Paris, the police department aimed at social control through surveillance and harassment. In London, private religious societies dedicated to the “reformation of manners” initiated private lawsuits against individuals. In the Netherlands, the state brutally cracked down on the subcultures in violent and shocking ways. At the same time, legal scholars (and other thinkers) were beginning to question the rationality of what lay behind these “patterns of repression.” Nevertheless, by the early 19th century, the pietist movement in Germany and the evangelical movement in Britain had succeeded in silencing the issue of same-sex sexuality and making the subcultures invisible through a process of social ostracism.

The result of this repression was not that the subcultures disappeared but that they began to develop a self-consciousness that found its expression in the poetry of Walt Whitman, in the writings of Karl Ulrichs, Magnus Hirschfeld, Adolph Brand, and Benedict Friendlander, and in the essays of John Addington Symonds and Edward Carpenter. The trials of Oscar Wilde interrupted the work of these “pioneers” and gave impetus to the medical construction of homosexuality as “degeneracy” or “atavism.” In addition, society at large remained religiously and politically conservative in its attitude. Nevertheless, in the early 20th century, “the cult of youth” contained a contradiction between its imperial nationalism and its homoerotic under-
tones. André Gide and E. M. Forster managed to bridge the gap between the pre- and post-war generations.

From the 1920s to the 1960s, the subcultures moved gradually from consciousness to activism. Despite the violence of the fascists and the communists, despite the stigmatization of the Freudians (although not of Freud himself), and despite the “reaction” of the McCarthyites, gay men and lesbians experienced several “false starts and new beginnings.” Eventually they succeeded in getting the law against homosexual acts in private (at least after the age of 21) repealed in Britain in 1967 and in acquiring a new unapologetic visibility after the Stonewall Riots in New York City in 1969. Edsall reminds us in the 21st century that “all gay men and lesbians, whether they know it or not, and by and large they do not, stand on the shoulders of Urnings” (333). And beyond them are the anonymous men and women who solicited one another on the city streets of Paris, London, and Amsterdam in the late 17th and early 18th centuries.

Thus, Edsall has written a remarkable book that provides a very valuable introduction of the history of homosexuality in the modern world. He highlights some very important changes and he does so by interweaving seamlessly diverse stories into a comprehensive narrative. He points out, for example, that the Dutch in the 18th century implemented the most repressive measures towards the subcultures, and yet by the 20th century, their Cultural and Recreational Center (COC) was one of the most active homophile organizations in Europe. In his chapter on the Enlightenment, he discusses Jeremy Bentham’s first essay on pederasty in the context of legal reform, but in his chapter on Europe in the Napoleonic era, he notes how Bentham change his tactics in his second essay to confront a much more conservative social and cultural world.

Edsall discusses lesbianism throughout his book but usually only incidentally. He waits until well in his third part before he addresses the issue head on. His chapter is very good, connecting “the making of a lesbian subculture” to the rise of feminism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Later on, he includes an overview of the Daughters of Bilitis in his chapters on the homophile movements of the 1950s and 1960s. He discusses sympathetically but critically the changes that it underwent, along with other male homosexual organizations in the United States and Europe, as they moved from cautiousness to militancy.

As an introductory text, Edsall should have done more to lead the readers to the secondary literature upon which he based his book. In his “Notes,” he includes very brief paragraphs to all of his chapters, which should have been developed into more expansive bibliographic essays. He should have also used traditional endnotes to document his sources; instead, he only used brief citations to the quotations that he includes. Despite this very minor criticism, his book is a very good survey of the subject and it should be very informative to undergraduates, graduate students, and general readers.
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