

CLGBTH

COMMITTEE ON LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL & TRANSGENDER HISTORY

IN THIS ISSUE

1. **Chair's Column**
2. **Announcement of 2011 Prizes**
4. **Member Publications**
6. **Book Reviews**

Stuart E. Weisberg, *Barney Frank: The Story of America's Only Left-Handed, Gay Jewish Congressman*
Reviewed by John D'Emilio

Josh Sides, *Erotic City: Sexual Revolutions and the Making of Modern San Francisco*
Reviewed by Emily K. Hobson

Laura G. Gutiérrez, *Performing Mexicanidad: Vendidas y Cabareteras on the Transnational Stage*
Reviewed by Pamela Voekel

Charles Upchurch, *Before Wilde: Sex between Men in Britain's Age of Reform*
Reviewed by Nikolai Endres

Monica L. Miller, *Slaves to Fashion: Black Dandyism and the Styling of Black Diasporic Identity*
Reviewed by Kiana Green

David Valentine, *Imagining Transgender: An Ethnography of a Category*
Reviewed by C. Todd White

15. **Governing Board Candidate Statements**
17. **Governing Board Ballot**
19. **Call for Submissions, 2012 Prizes**

CLGBTH

Chair:

Ian Lekus, lekus@fas.harvard.edu

Book Review Editor:

Emily K. Hobson, hobson@usc.edu

Newsletter Editor:

Christina B. Hanhardt, hanhardt@umd.edu

CHAIR'S COLUMN SPRING 2011

The Committee on LGBT History kicked off an exciting and busy 2011 with a terrific series of events at the AHA annual meeting in Boston. Our program included nine panels and a packed reception co-sponsored with the Coordinating Committee of Women in History and the Peace History Society. On the Saturday evening of the conference, about fifteen of us trekked a few blocks over to meet with volunteers from The History Project, Boston's LGBTQ community history initiative, and to see their collections and discuss their public outreach work. At our business meeting, we discussed a broad range of issues, from creating and endowing a dissertation prize to increasing collaboration with public history projects such as OutHistory.org to strategizing our presence at the upcoming Berkshire Conference on the History of Women to be held this June at UMass Amherst. We heard from members of the AHA's LGBTQ Historians Task Force, especially about their forthcoming survey that will document the experiences of and the challenges facing LGBTQ people working in the historical profession. Additionally, after our energetic (but expensive!) 2010, we discussed various options to increase our revenue stream, and we approved raising our life membership rate to \$200 - a still quite modest amount as compared to equivalent rates from other historical societies.

One other issue discussed at the business meeting is how the Committee on LGBT History is facing a significant turnover in its leadership. First, Jen Manion and Ian Carter are finishing their terms on the Governing Board, and I am grateful to both for their work for the organization: Jen with book reviews, Ian with chairing the committee that conducted the strategic planning for our website overhaul. At the back of this newsletter, you will find the candidate statements and ballot (due June 30) for their successors. Next, Christina Hanhardt and Charles Upchurch are winding down their terms as, respectively, editor of the *Newsletter* and as Secretary, both of whom have done outstanding jobs in those positions. We are making progress identifying our next newsletter editor, but do we need someone to build on Chuck's work streamlining the

maintenance of our membership records. If this kind of detailed-oriented work is of interest to you, I encourage you to contact both Chuck (cupchurch@fsu.edu) and me (lekus@fas.harvard.edu) to discuss the position. Finally, my own term as Chair of the Committee on LGBT History concludes at the end of 2011, and we will soon begin to look for candidates to run for Chair in the fall. If you are interested in running for Chair, please let me know, and I will be happy to talk with you about what the position entails.

In other news, we recently awarded the 2011 John Boswell Prize for an outstanding book in LGBTQ history to Margot Canaday for *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, 2009). The prize committee (chaired by Ellen Herman and including Chris Waters and Stephanie Gilmore) also awarded the 2011 Joan Nestle Prize for an outstanding paper in LGBTQ history by an undergraduate student to Shelley Grosjean (University of Oregon) for her paper, "A 'Womyn's' Work is Never Done: The Gendered Division of Labor on Lesbian Separatist Lands in Southern Oregon." The committee also awarded an honorable mention to Bradley Milam (Yale University) for his work, "Gay West Virginia: Community Formation and the Forging of a Gay Appalachian Identity, 1963-1979." More information about these awards can be found inside this newsletter, and the Nestle-winning papers are now posted on our website. Likewise, this newsletter includes the calls for the 2012 Audre Lorde, Gregory Sprague, and Allen Bérubé Prizes, for best article, best graduate student article or dissertation chapter, and public history project, respectively.

I am also very pleased to announce that the Organization of American Historians is now introducing co-sponsorship of its panels by AHA affiliate societies, and we expect to have a couple of Committee on LGBT History panels approved for the 2012 annual meeting next April in Milwaukee. We are of course also looking ahead to the 2012 annual AHA meeting next January in Chicago, and while we will be finalizing those plans in the next few months, I want to alert you in advance to one unprecedented, exciting event. For the first time, the Committee on LGBT History will be co-sponsoring one of the featured public history tours at an AHA annual meeting. Specifically, we are delighted to co-sponsor a trip to the "Out in Chicago" exhibit at the Chicago History Museum, an exhibit that is being co-curated by University of Illinois, Chicago professor (and former Committee on LGBT History *Newsletter* editor) Jennifer Brier.

That's all for now; I wish all our members the best!

Ian Lekus

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS:

2012 AUDRE LORDE AND GREGORY SPRAGUE PRIZES

The Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History, an affiliate society of the American Historical Association, will award the Audre Lorde and Gregory Sprague Prizes in 2012:

The **Audre Lorde Prize** for an outstanding article on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, and/or queer history published in English.

The **Gregory Sprague Prize** for an outstanding paper or chapter on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, and/or queer history completed in English by a graduate student (the Sprague Prize is underwritten by the Gerber/Hart Library [Chicago]).

Papers and chapters written and articles published in 2010 or 2011 are eligible. Materials may be submitted by students, faculty, authors, readers, or publishers. Self-nominations are encouraged. Published articles by graduate students may be submitted for both the Lorde and Sprague Prizes. Please label whether the submission is for the Sprague Prize, the Lorde Prize, or both.

The 2012 Lorde/Sprague Prize Committee is chaired by Thomas A. Foster (DePaul University). Claire Potter (Wesleyan University) and Julio Capó, Jr. (Florida International University) comprise the remaining members of the committee.

Please send both one electronic copy *and* one print copy of your submission to:

Thomas A. Foster
Department of History, SAC 420
2320 North Kenmore Ave.
DePaul University
Chicago, IL 60614
tfoster4@depaul.edu

Mailed submissions must be postmarked by 31 December 2011; Electronic submissions must be sent by 11:59pm, Central U.S. Standard Time.

If you have questions about the prizes, please contact the Committee on LGBT History Chair, Ian Lekus, at lekus@fas.harvard.edu.

Call for submissions continued on page 19

COMMITTEE ON LGBT HISTORY 2011 PRIZE WINNERS

John Boswell Prize

Margot Canaday's *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton University Press) has been awarded the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History's 2011 John Boswell Prize. The John Boswell Prize is awarded for an outstanding book on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, and/or queer history published in English during the two previous years.

The 2011 Prize Committee was chaired by Ellen Herman and included Chris Waters and Stephanie Gilmore.

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

"Canaday's stunning analysis of the U.S. state during the twentieth century carves out a bold new place for sexuality at the center of political and legal history. Through a compelling series of case studies, *The Straight State* tells a story about the bureaucratic regulation of sexual and civic identities that are made problematic through their interaction with state actors and processes. Canaday's insights about how federal power made homosexuality increasingly visible over time are sure to inspire fresh directions in work not only in GLBT history, but on citizenship and state-formation in history and beyond. This is a truly original book. Margot Canaday is an assistant professor of history at Princeton University."

Joan Nestle Prize

Shelley Grosjean, "A 'Womyn's' Work is Never Done: The Gendered Division of Labor on Lesbian Separatist Lands in Southern Oregon" has been awarded the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History's 2011 Joan Nestle Undergraduate Prize. The Joan Nestle Undergraduate Prize is awarded for an outstanding paper on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, and/or queer history completed in English by an undergraduate student during the previous two years.

The 2011 Prize Committee was chaired by Ellen Herman and included Chris Waters and Stephanie Gilmore.

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

"Shelley Grosjean's well-written and persuasive exploration of lesbian lands in Oregon makes imaginative use of a wealth of wonderful sources: images as well as texts. She locates these utopian experiments in the contexts of 1970s lesbian feminism and back-to-the-land movements, moving easily between the experiential details of daily life and labor and the larger political, economic, and social forces that gave them meaning. Her paper illuminates not only the visions of community that motivated so many women; it helps to explain why their practical efforts to realize those visions met so many obstacles. Grosjean is an undergraduate at the University of Oregon."

The Prize Committee also awarded an Honorable Mention to Bradley Milam for his essay, "Gay West Virginia: Community Formation and the Forging of a Gay Appalachian Identity, 1963-1979," noting:

"Bradley Milam tells a moving and emotionally rich story about Appalachia, a part of the United States that has, to date, been almost invisible in GLBT history. Relying on oral histories, Milam's paper counters the urban bias of so many gay community studies. He suggests that the elements of gay life and consciousness in West Virginia emerged in a chronologically distinctive fashion that may be more typical of rural areas. Even more provocatively, he argues that many gays and lesbians in the state resolved their identities not by leaving home, but by doing exactly what they were raised to do: attend church, form families, and adhere to traditional American values. Milam is a 2010 graduate of Yale University."

For further information, contact Committee on LGBT History Chair Ian Lekus at lekus@fas.harvard.edu.

CLGBTH MEMBER PUBLICATIONS, 2010

Following are self-reported publications from 2010 by members of the CLGBTH in the broad field of LGBT history, including the history of gender and sexuality, LGBT studies, and queer theory.

Beachy, Robert. "The German Invention of Homosexuality." *Journal of Modern History* 82 (December 2010): 801-838.

Bérubé, Allan. *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War II*. 20th Anniversary Edition. With a New Foreword by John D'Emilio and Estelle Freedman. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Brown, Michael and Larry Knopp. "Between anatomo- and bio-politics: Geographies of sexual health in wartime Seattle." *Political Geography* 29 (2010): 392-403.

Brown, Michael and Claire Rasmussen. "Bestiality and the queering of the human animal." *Society and Space* 28 (2010): 158-177.

Capó, Jr., Julio. "Queering Mariel: Mediating Cold War Foreign Policy and U.S. Citizenship among Cuba's Homosexual Exile Community, 1978 - 94." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 29: 4 (Summer 2010): 78-106.

Charles, Douglas M. "From Subversion to Obscenity: The FBI's Investigations of the Early Homophile Movement, 1953-58." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19:2 (May 2010): 262-287.

Chenault, Wesley, Andy Ditzler and Joey Orr. "Discursive Memorials: Queer Histories in Atlanta's Public Spaces." *Southern Spaces*. February 26, 2010. <http://www.southernspaces.org/2010/discursive-memorials-queer-histories-atlantas-public-spaces>.

Chenier, Elise. "The Natural Order of Disorder: Paeophilia, Incest and the Normalising Family." In *Sex, Drugs and Rock & Roll: Psychological, Legal and Cultural Examination of Sex and Sexuality*, edited by Helen Gavin and Jacquelyn Bent. Oxford: Interdisciplinary Press, 2010: 48-57. Available as an ebook at <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/publishing/idpress/ebooks/sex-drugs-and-rock-roll/>

Chiang, Howard. "Epistemic Modernity and the Emergence of Homosexuality in China." *Gender & History* 22: 3 (2010): 629-657.

—. "Liberating Sex, Knowing Desire: Scientia Sexualis and Epistemic Turning Points in the History of Sexuality." *History of the Human Sciences* 23: 5 (2010): 42-69.

—. "Sexuality and Gender in Cold War America: Social Experiences, Cultural Authorities, and the Roots of Political Change." In *Cold War and McCarthy Era: People and Perspectives*, ed. Caroline S. Emmons. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2010: 111-128.

Davis, Rebecca. *More Perfect Unions: The American Search for Marital Bliss*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Distelberg, Brian J. "Mainstream Fiction, Gay Reviewers, and Gay Male Cultural Politics in the 1970s." *GLQ* 16:3 (2010): 389-427.

Eaklor, Vicki L. "Teaching LGBTQ History: Two Situations." *Controversy in the Classroom [Special Issue] Perspectives on History*: 48: 5 (May 2010): 31-32.

Evans, Jennifer V. "Decriminalization, Seduction, and 'Unnatural Desire' in the German Democratic Republic." *Feminist Studies* 36: 3 (October 2010): 553-77.

Freeman, Susan. "Building Lesbian Studies in the 1970s and 1980s." In *Breaking the Wave: Women, Their Organizations, and Feminism, 1945-1985*, ed. Kathleen Laughlin and Jacqueline Castledine. New York: Routledge, 2010: 229-45

Gossett, Charles. "The Impact of AIDS on the Botswana Public Service." *International Journal of Public Administration* 33: 5 (2010): 240-250.

Howard, John. "Beginnings with O." In *Stories of Oprah: The Oprahfication of American Culture*, edited by Trystan T. Cotten and Kimberly Springer. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2010: 3-17.

Johnson, David. "Physique Pioneers: The Politics of 1960s Gay Consumer Culture." *The Journal of Social History* 43 (2010): 867-892.

Koskovich, Gérard. "Une Amitié source d'inspiration." In *Jean Le Bitoux: passeur de mémoire (1948-2010)*, edited by Hussein Bourgi. Lyons, France: Mémoire Collective, 2010: 80-82.

—. "Des Dates clés de la vie de Magnus Hirschfeld." In *Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935), un pionnier du mouvement homosexuel confronté au nazisme*. Paris: Mémorial de la Déportation Homosexuelle, 2010: 4-5.

Meyerowitz, Joanne. "How Common Culture Shapes the Separate Lives': Sexuality, Race, and Mid-Twentieth-Century Social Constructionist Thought." *Journal of American History* 96:4 (March 2010): 1057-1084.

Murphy, Kevin P. "Gay Was Good: Progress, Homonor-mativity, and Oral History" In *Queer Twin Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010: 305-318.

Murphy, Kevin P. and Jennifer M. Spear, Eds. "Historicising Sexuality and Gender," a special issue of *Gender & History* 22:3 (Nov. 2010).

Reichard, David A. "We Can't Hide and They Are Wrong': The Society for Homosexual Freedom and the Struggle for Recognition at Sacramento State College, 1969-1971." *Law and History Review* 28: 3 (2010): 629-674.

Reis, Elizabeth and Suzanne J. Kessler. "Fetal Dex and Intersex: Why History Matters," *American Journal of Bioethics* 10:9 (September 2010): 58-59.

Reis, Elizabeth. "Is Intersex a Disorder or a Competitive Advantage." Women's Bioethics Project. March 2010. http://www.womensbioethics.org/index.php?p=Is_Intersex_a_Disorder_or_a_Competitive_Advantage&s=355

Roque Ramírez, Horacio N. "Gay Latino Histories/Dying to Be Remembered: AIDS Obituaries, Public Memory, and the Queer Latino Archive." In *Beyond el Barrio: Everyday Life in Latina/o America*, edited by Gina M. Pérez, Frank A. Guridy, and Adrian Burgos, Jr. New York: New York University Press, 2010: 103-128.

Roque Ramírez, Horacio N. Guest Editor. "Introduction: Homoerotic, Lesbian, and Gay Ethnic and Immigrant Histories." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 29: 4 (Summer 2010): 5-21.

Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. "Straight Girls Kissing." *Contexts* 9:3 (2010): 28-32.

Serlin, David. "Pissing Without Pity: Gender, Disability, and the Public Toilet." In Harvey Molotch and Laura Noren, eds., *Toilet: The Public Restroom and the Politics of Sharing*. New York: NYU Press: 167-185.

Stein, Marc. *Sexual Injustice: Supreme Court Decisions from Griswold to Roe*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

—. "All the Immigrants Are Straight, All the Homosexuals Are Citizens, But Some of Us Are Queer Aliens: Genealogies of Legal Strategy in *Boutilier v. INS*." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 29: 4 (Summer 2010): 45-77.

—. "Introduction to the Philadelphia LGBT History Project" and "LGBT Oral History Interviews." OutHistory.com,

http://www.outhistory.org/wiki/Philadelphia_LGBT_History_Project,_1945-1972. Jan. 2010.

—. "Justice Kennedy and the Future of Same-Sex Marriage." UNC Press Blog, <http://uncpressblog.com/2010/11/08/justice-kennedy/>. 8 Nov. 2010.

—. "Gay Rights and the Supreme Court: The Early Years." UNC Press Blog, <http://uncpressblog.com/2010/10/04/gay-rights-and-the-supreme-court/>. 4 Oct. 2010.

—. "In My Wildest Dreams: The Marriage That Dare Not Speak Its Name. History News Network, <http://www.hnn.us/articles/121810.html>. 4 Jan. 2010.

Stewart-Winter, Timothy, and Simon Stern. "Picturing Same-Sex Marriage in the Antebellum United States: The Union of 'Two Most Excellent Men' in Longstreet's 'A Sage Conversation.'" *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 19:2 (May 2010): 197-222.

Twin Cities GLBT Oral History Project (Michael David Franklin, Larry Knopp, Kevin P. Murphy, Ryan Patrick Murphy, Jennifer L. Pierce, and Alex T. Urquhart, Eds.) *Queer Twin Cities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

Unger, Nancy. "The Role of Nature in Lesbian Alternative Environments in the United States: From Jook Joints to Sisterspace." In *Queer Ecologies: Sex, Nature, Biopolitics, and Desire*, edited by Catriona Mortimer-Sandilands and Bruce Erickson. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010: 173-198.

White, C. Todd. "The Right to Same-Sex Marriage Should Be Permitted in the United States and Protected by the Federal Government." In *Issues: Understanding Controversy and Society*, edited by Chuck Stewart. ABC-CLIO Social Sciences Database. Web, <http://issues.abc-clio.com>, July 2010.

—. "Marry, Mary! (Quite Contrary): Homosexual Marriage in *ONE Magazine*, 1953-1959." In *Queers in American Popular Culture*, edited by Jim Elledge. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010.

Young, Ian. "Mikhail Itkin: Tales of a Bishopric." Boston, *Gay & Lesbian Review Worldwide* 17: 6 (Nov. - Dec. 2010): 26.

—. "Reflections of a Catalyst: Running a Small Press in the Seventies." Ottawa, CNQ: *Canadian Notes & Queries* 80 (Summer-Fall, 2010): 45.

—. "Suggestive Reading: Don Garner's Dirty Laundry." Ottawa, Capitol Xtra! July 8, 2010.

BOOK REVIEWS

Stuart E. Weisberg, *Barney Frank: The Story of America's Only Left-Handed, Gay Jewish Congressman* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009).

Reviewed by John D'Emilio, University of Illinois, Chicago

Barney Frank deserves a better biography. The issue isn't that Stuart Weisberg has been a friend for decades and has written a book in the style of "Barney can do [almost] no wrong." Rather, it is a "one-damned thing after another" biography. The important and unimportant are indistinguishable. Weisberg makes little attempt to analyze or interpret, draws few conclusions of consequence, offers little sense of Frank's significance as a political figure, and doesn't provide much historical context.

Yet I read *Barney Frank* cover to cover because the subject interests me, now more than usually. The Obama campaign and presidency have drawn my attention to national politics in a way that has not been true for decades. Barney Frank is thoroughly of that world, even as his fate and career are entangled with a social movement. What can be learned by considering these worlds – electoral politics and social movements – side by side? What can Frank's life and career teach us?

Weisberg tells us that Frank grew up in the working-class world of Bayonne, New Jersey in the 1940s and 1950s. He came from a family of "passionate liberals" (34). Politics always interested him and election to Congress was his dream from early on. Harvard, where he was an undergraduate and graduate student, opened a path to this dream, and he made contacts there that served him well.

Frank's graduate years coincided with the campus upheavals associated with the movement against the Vietnam War. Harvard witnessed a rowdy confrontation between the radicals of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara. Frank was not one of the protesters; rather, he was McNamara's campus escort. According to Weisberg, he saw himself as "a natural antagonist" of the radicals of SDS (51). In a debate with New Left leader Tom Hayden, Frank declared: "You're such a grass root. I don't know whether I'm supposed to debate you or . . . water you" (59). To Frank, electoral campaigns, party politics, and the legislative process were the routes to achieving one's ideals.

He pursued those routes rigorously. Benefiting from the liberal turn in Massachusetts politics wrought by the movements of the 1960s, he worked first for Boston Mayor Kevin White and then for Michael Harrington, an antiwar member of Congress. In 1972, Frank ran for the state legislature from the Beacon Hill/Back Bay district, becoming the first Democrat elected from that area since the Great Depression. Frank has held office since then; in 1980, he resisted the Reagan landslide and was elected to Congress.

Throughout his career, Frank has aligned himself with the liberal wing of the Democratic Party. In the 1970s, the *Boston Globe* described him as "the leading liberal spokesman in the legislature" (136). He has consistently voted for measures that furthered racial justice and benefited the poor; made immigration reform a key part of his agenda; and worked to preserve Great Society programs. About free market capitalism he has said that it "will produce more inequality than is either socially healthy or economically necessary" (487).

Frank is about as outspoken as a politician gets, and his criticisms extend to leaders of both parties. Of welfare reform in 1996, he said Clinton had "traded the poor people for two more points in the polls" (422). He described Clinton's budget proposals as "cut[ting] Medicare so that you could have a capital gains tax cut" (422). In the Bush-Cheney years, Frank voted against the Patriot Act and against military action in Iraq. He has called Newt Gingrich "the meanest and most destructive political figure I have seen" (412).

At the same time – as Weisberg emphasizes – Frank expresses a pragmatism that sometimes annoys and baffles his allies. Frank takes pride in being a waste-cutting enemy of government inefficiency; he is known for calling out government bureaucrats in congressional hearings. He has broken ranks with his party and voted for Republican measures, mostly notably the Reagan administration's 1984 Equal Access Act. Intended to guarantee student religious groups access to school space and resources, it later provided legal protection to Gay/Straight Alliances.

From the start of his career, Frank knew he was gay. His sexuality moved from a secret he struggled with, to something he told a few friends and family members, to a matter of public record when he came out publicly in the *Boston Globe* in 1987. He was the first member of Congress to voluntarily identify himself as gay, but the story did not end there. Two years later, a major scandal erupted when it became known that Frank had bought the services of a male sex worker. Newspapers nationwide covered this story, and many media outlets as well as politicians called for his resignation. *Newsweek* put Frank on its

cover. Congressional debate dragged on for a year until Frank was reprimanded by the House. Frank's political career survived, however. He was reelected in 1990 by a huge majority. In 2007, after Democrats won the House, he became chairman of the Financial Services Committee, just in time for the largest financial crisis since the 1930s.

Weisberg covers all these episodes, the political and the personal, in great detail, and the book is a compendium of information about Frank's career and personal life. Through it all, two things particularly stood out to me, one about Frank's character, and the other about politics and movements.

About the man: Even when deeply in the closet, Frank openly addressed gay and lesbian issues, unlike many figures on the right who mask their sexual longings behind an outspoken homophobia. Frank supported gay rights during his 1972 campaign for state legislature and introduced a bill to prohibit discrimination based on sexual preference during his first month in office. Few elected officials of any political persuasion or sexual identity espoused such legislation in 1973. It took guts to do that.

About movements and politics: It seems clear to me that Frank is still in Congress because of the broader queer movement. Yes, he survived the scandal of 1989 in part because of his own integrity, responding to the charges and investigation in a forthright way. But it was the gains made by the LGBT movement in the preceding two decades that prevented Frank's colleagues from expelling him on the basis of sexuality. Without this movement, there would be no Congressman Frank today.

Yet Frank has been unabashedly critical, even dismissive, of the queer movement and its tactics. Here is Frank talking about the 1993 March on Washington, one of the largest demonstrations in United States history: "Everyone came to Washington and talked to each other, and said how wonderful we were, and nobody did any lobbying . . . Direct action, as a political tactic, is second choice. The first choice is to exercise political power . . . Direct action is what you do when you have no power" (401-402).

Statements like this drive me nuts. But in this last electoral season, I found myself wondering why the right, not the left, has proven so successful in entering the electoral fray and therefore exercising political power. Is there something that "movement people" can learn from the right? Is there something the queer movement, as well as other progressive social movements, need to absorb from what Barney Frank is saying? Though Weisberg doesn't raise (let alone answer) these questions, Frank's story provoked me to think about these concerns.

Josh Sides, *Erotic City: Sexual Revolutions and the Making of Modern San Francisco* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Reviewed by Emily K. Hobson, University of Southern California

In *Erotic City*, Josh Sides asks how sexual radicalism – and resistance to it – “made” San Francisco in the 20th century, especially from the 1960s forward. He argues that sexual revolutions were waged not only in bedrooms and media but also in urban space and municipal politics, as sex radicals won ever-wider geographies for erotic cultures, practices, and economies in San Francisco. Along the way, Sides tracks how the sexual revolution came to define San Francisco's image in the U.S. media and posits that local changes “prefigured” national shifts. Sides is a skilled storyteller, and *Erotic City* contributes to the expansion of urban history by treating sexuality as a force of urban change. Yet despite his stated goals, the book remains more an account of how sexuality changed in San Francisco than of how sexuality transformed the city. This is due in large part to Sides's troubled treatment of race and, relatedly, class. By persistently framing black, Latino, and working class claims to the city in opposition to those of sex radicals, Sides limits his ability to analyze sexual revolutions *within* communities of color and to explain sexuality's relationship to San Francisco's changing geography over time. At the book's outset, Sides “challenge[s] the notion that race was always the prime mover in postwar urban history by arguing that it was the shifting *culture* [including sexuality] of cities that more directly influenced their destiny” (10). As this suggests, he overlooks much scholarship that analyzes racial and sexual geographies as intersecting. This becomes especially evident in his treatment of LGBT communities and homophobic backlash: he links race and sexuality when addressing heterosexual prostitution, but places them in opposition when he considers same-sex and transgender lives.

In Chapter 1, Sides argues that though San Francisco earned a “wide-open” reputation in the late 19th century, between World War I and the late 1950s it was not significantly more permissive than other U.S. cities. Further, the containment of sexuality reinforced other inequalities. Sides describes the city's quarantine authority against prostitutes, enacted from 1944 to 1975, as “an effective tool for...racial order” and a means to control “socially undesirable women... under the guise of health enforcement” (27). These points are significant, but he does not pursue them consistently in chapters to come. Chapter 1 also covers restrictive birth control policy, early gay and lesbian claims to space, and a gradual broadening of “community standards” in erotic entertainment. Sides argues that changes in San Francisco kept pace with the nation's, while hinting that the growing homophile movement prefigured more significant changes around the corner.

Sides then turns to the “opening shot of the sexual revolution”: Carol Doda’s June 1964 topless performance in a North Beach bar. Doda was soon written into the landscape with a 40-foot sign; in the second half of the 1960s, erotic entertainments grew in number, geography, and permissive character. The Mitchell Brothers’ O’Farrell Theater allowed direct customer contact and, especially following their landmark film *Behind the Green Door* (1972), popularized pornography. At the same time, the predominately African American Fillmore neighborhood saw a steep rise in street prostitution. Sides credits this to deindustrialization, unemployment, and racially disproportionate policing, and cites youth activism against white johns who “‘can’t tell the difference between a black lady and a black prostitute’” (65). Yet he bypasses the opportunity to ask larger, analytic questions about the significance of prostitution to the Fillmore’s urban renewal, instead moving on to describe sex radicals’ contributions to the counterculture in Haight-Ashbury. Chapter 2 thus skips through a series of seemingly equivalent “sexual revolutions” whose differing relationships to the city’s geography remain unclear.

Chapter 3, “When the Streets Went Gay,” blends the rise of gay liberation with a neighborhood-by-neighborhood account of 1960s and 1970s gay and lesbian life. Sides narrates the Committee for Homosexual Freedom’s protests against anti-gay employment discrimination in spring 1969, usefully highlighting the centrality of the Financial District to both sexual cultures and gay liberationist claims. His overview of other neighborhoods is less original and at times reductive, covering transgender hustling and organizing in the Tenderloin; a shifting economy in the Polk; “Sex Without Politics” South of Market; Castro property values and Harvey Milk; and separatist lesbian feminism in the Mission District. The neighborhood approach obscures political, racial, and sexual diversity in each locale as well as the possibility of less visible gay sites. Sides treats San Francisco as a bounded space, ignoring transit in and out of the city, as well as the East Bay’s significance for lesbians and for community among LGBT people of color. He mentions gay racism only within a larger critique of “narcissistic” leather and S/M subcultures. Meanwhile, his treatment of lesbian feminism emphasizes separatist proscriptions in a way that casts heat rather than light.

Following a brief chapter on public sex in Golden Gate Park – which might have been better integrated into preceding chapters’ sections on the counterculture and gay life – Sides undertakes an important but flawed chapter on “Taking Back the Streets” in the 1970s and early 1980s. He presents a useful history of permissiveness under Mayors Joseph Alioto and George Moscone, including the 1975 defeat of the quarantine policy (spearheaded by the prostitutes’ rights group COYOTE). He relates Supervisor, later

Mayor, Diane Feinstein’s work to contain sex-related businesses in alliance with Women Against Violence in Pornography and Media (WAVPM). His discussion of Hollywood representations of San Francisco through “smut-busting vigilantes” – *Dirty Harry*, *Cruising*, and so on – opens a valuable angle onto national images of the city. This chapter falls dramatically short, however, in Sides’s discussion of anti-gay violence, which he describes as a Latino and black assault on white gay visibility. Generalizing from minimal sources while downplaying police abuse and the broader climate of the Bryant and Briggs era, Sides defines anti-gay assault as driven by anti-white resentment. This explanation obscures the presence of state violence, the experiences of gay and lesbian people of color, and the wide range of ways sexual and gender minorities experienced and thought about violence, policing, segregation, community space, and racial and sexual identities in this era. Groups such as the Gay Latino Alliance receive passing mention, yet Sides frames activism against gentrification as itself racist or even promoting anti-gay assault (161).

The final two chapters of *Erotic City* address the impact of HIV/AIDS in San Francisco and the closure of sexual radicals’ claims on public space amidst the skyrocketing property values of the 1990s and 2000s. Here Sides continues several of his previous themes. He seems convinced that bathhouse closures were necessary and does not engage (even by disagreement) Gayle Rubin’s argument that these closures provided cover for corporate redevelopment in South of Market. In discussing black AIDS activism, he rehearses tropes of black male homophobia without mentioning or discursively analyzing the “down-low.” He rightly argues that “Where new sites of public sexuality were being created, they were being created by lesbians” (206), but his description of these sites recapitulates his narrow assessment of earlier lesbian feminism.

At the outset of *Erotic City*, Sides observes that sexual expression expanded at the same time that information and finance economies transformed the city. He uses this point to frame the sexual “counterrevolution” as driven by “provincial” and “ethnic” concerns, and economic mobility, commercial development, and gentrification as necessary vehicles for sexual expression. Yet, in his final chapter, Sides acknowledges that skyrocketing housing costs in the 1990s diminished space for public sexuality and “bohemianism.” He offers no explanation for such contradictions, and all too frequently, substitutes polarizations between sexuality and race for a broader analysis of how sexuality relates to political economy writ large. *Erotic City* is filled with important stories and so will be a useful research reference for histories of sexual expression, the counterculture, gay liberation, and San Francisco politics. But its flaws dull rather than sharpen the analytical tools of scholarship on sexuality.

Laura G. Gutiérrez, *Performing Mexicanidad: Vendidas y Cabareteras on the Transnational Stage* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2010).

Reviewed by Pamela Voekel, University of Georgia

Historians have much to learn from Laura G. Gutiérrez's command of the historical archives of "*lo mexicano*," the shared symbols and cultural productions that have forged a sense of "us" for Chicanos and Mexicans over the course of the twentieth century. But it is her vast knowledge of how Greater Mexico's melodramatic cinema, *ranchera* music, and iconography — especially the Virgin of Guadalupe — have conspired to naturalize heterosexuality and patriarchy at the core of national belonging that lofts the book into the category of a *tour de force*. At the heart Gutiérrez's book lie her interpretations of a wildly talented group of cabaret, video, and other visual artists. Gutiérrez argues that these artists' delirious romps through "*lo mexicano*" are not about vying for national belonging so much as forging a transnational community intent on shifting notions of evil away from sexual transgressions and towards the structural sin that is neoliberalism. Along the way, she has a great deal to offer our understanding of globalization and avant-garde art, and demonstrates the centrality of the history of sexuality to the study of nationalism, transnational communities, and neoliberalism.

Although *rancheras* and the melodramatic films of Mexico's Golden Age cinema have trained several generations in the gender and sexual affect of "real" *mexicanidad*, Gutiérrez notes that the Virgin of Guadalupe "is the stick by which Mexicanness is measured" and "the principle imperative in the archives of heterosexual national culture" (32). Protector of the downtrodden and leader of the independence struggle, Revolutionary-era peasants, and the Chicano movement, the demure Virgin of the official Catholic Church nonetheless offers only marriage and motherhood or virginity as acceptable paths for women. High reverence is the only approved relationship to have to Our Lady. No wonder, then, that "sexualizing the Virgen de Guadalupe is the same as de-Mexicanizing the artist" (35). In Chicana visual artist Alma López's 1999 digitally manipulated picture "Our Lady," performance artist Raquel Salinas stares boldly at the camera, a sure-footed Guadalupe sporting a 1930s-style two-piece swimsuit of pastel-colored roses. The iconic angel supporting her, naked above the waist, exudes female masculinity to those in the know. In 2001, the local Catholic Church demanded that a Santa Fe museum remove the image, declaring this avocation of Mary to be — you guessed it! — a whore rather than a virgin, and inciting thousands to hold prayer vigils. At a press conference on the artwork, men chanted "burn her, burn them" as the curator and the artist ran for a get-away car. Bomb threats, mass-media attacks, and

sermonizing from the pulpit followed. Gutiérrez as interpreter proves as sure-footed and steely-eyed as Salinas herself, in part because of the deep contextualization that characterizes the entire book.

This same chapter details recent efforts by both Mexican Church dignitaries and a transnational calling card company to patent Guadalupe. It further examines the brouhaha surrounding the Mexico City exhibition of Rolando de la Rosa's 1987 collage of a Guadalupe bearing Marilyn Monroe's face and cleavage. The right-wing press howled that the artist must be Guatemalan; no real Mexican would sexualize the Virgin. Gutiérrez uses de la Rosa, López, and other artists to expose how national belonging is inscribed in bodies and sexualities, casting queers outside the pale of *mexicanidad*, *chicanismo*, and *americanidad*. At the same time, she observes how artists craft alternatives to exclusionary nationalism: López's Our Lady, Gutiérrez proclaims, is a "Queer Mother for the Transnation" (53).

This Lady is also *avant-garde*. Gutiérrez's analysis of Bay Area performance artist Nao Bustamante and Mexico City videographer and performance flaneur Ximena Cuevas leave no doubt that the avant-garde must be expanded beyond its classic white bad-boy genealogy to include the long history of Chicana and Mexicana art interventions. "The cultural logic of late capitalism," its ability to assimilate oppositional art by commodifying it, did not in fact signal a death knell to all avant-garde art (140). Gutiérrez seems unassailable here: who could profit from Bustamante's and Cuevas's subtle deployment of the capitalist mass media against itself? In 1992, Bustamante infiltrated the Joan Rivers show as a "sexual freak," a seemingly eager object of the normalizing discourses generated by talk show hosts and invited "authorities." In her video of this experience, *Rosa Does Joan*, she turns the tables, suggesting, as Gutiérrez informs us, that sexual freakery resides more in the lurid interest of the hostess, the audience, and the psychiatric expert. In the video's last scene, a distinguished psychologist declares Bustamante to be "the real thing" — at which point she removes her wig and costume! This art is genuinely subversive, Gutiérrez explains, not because it transgresses cultural lines but because it offers sustained resistance behind or even within them.

In a similar vein, in 2001 videographer Ximena Cuevas lured the scandal-mongering branch of the Mexican mass media into an inescapable discursive pit. The most public coming out in Mexican history included a fake girlfriend flown in for the occasion and Cuevas's kitschy, saccharine ("high-cursi") rhetoric about their "love at first sight" and "her better half" (158). On a television talk show where she was the designated "lesbian freak," Cuevas stayed mum about herself, inviting the audience to ponder their own lives instead.

When McDonald's contracted national icon Pedro Fernández to star in a commercial and hired Cuevas to film it, she caught on video the sexy star spitting out his burger. By disseminating the footage, Cuevas dislodged "transnational capital from national identity" in one fell swoop.

Gutiérrez clearly revels in analyzing this high-octane art but offers a cautionary tale to blithe celebrations of globalization. Artistic production does not flow freely through transnational circuits; the relative accessibility of the video camera cannot erase power differentials with global media conglomerates. Cuevas's McDonald's video turned into "road kill" at the crossroads of mass media and avant-garde art when McDonald's threatened a lawsuit, and López's Virgin of Guadalupe found herself homeless after violence in Santa Fe and multiple galleries' self-imposed censorship.

Though Gutiérrez's subjects form part of an avant-garde, they avoid individual and nihilistic thrashing about in favor of community creation. Gutiérrez locates them as part of a "queer world-making project" firmly embedded in a critique of neoliberal ethics. Jesusa Rodríguez, one of Mexico's best-known performance artists, ran the famous theater El Hábito for years with songwriter Liliana Felipe, her romantic and business partner. Their work *Victims of the Neoliberal Sin*, created in collaboration with renowned cultural critic Carlos Monsiváis, plays with the gender regime of the classic film *Nosotros los Pobres* to focus attention on the economic sins of neoliberalism rather than the timeworn sexual sins against Mexican nationalism. Likewise, Rodríguez's *El Maíz* explores an archive of *mexicanidad* right up there in importance with the Virgin of Guadalupe (namely, corn). The artist offers a particularly strong critique of genetically modified corn, drawing on Thoreau to argue that eating (non-GMO) Mexican corn is an act of civil disobedience and self-defense against neoliberalism's free trade regime.

Gutiérrez's graceful style includes clear summaries of the literary and cultural theorists whose ideas she embraces or critiques – a contribution I suspect many historians will find useful, as I did. This is a rich interdisciplinary work. It is also a swashbuckling account of the work of multiple artists. The frenetic performance artist Astrid Hadad's campy renditions of *ranchera* classics could easily fill an entire book rather than the one-chapter treatment they receive here. Such offbeat artists have found their rightful chronicler in Gutiérrez. Lest you doubt, read the book's striking opening salvo, where she establishes her narrative authority in a vignette about her experience as Hadad's informal translator. *Performing Mexicanidad* would greatly enhance modern Mexican or United States history courses as well as Chicano/a and Women's studies classes at all levels. For graduate classes, it would work especially well alongside Mar-

got Canada's *The Straight State* and Licia Fiol-Matta's *Queer Mother for the Nation* as a demonstration of the often-overlooked origins of straight nationalism and the import of cultural belonging for those without official national citizenship.

Charles Upchurch, *Before Wilde: Sex between Men in Britain's Age of Reform* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

Reviewed by Nikolai Endres, Western Kentucky University

Incredibly, this is the first historical study of same-sex activity in Britain in the first half of the nineteenth century. *Before Wilde* thus bridges a gap between Louis Crompton's pioneering *Byron and Greek Love* (1985) and the countless books on middle to late Victorian sexuality. Charles Upchurch has mined a large trove of hitherto neglected public reports ranging from newspaper articles to courtroom accounts. He calls into question the assumption that homosexuality became increasingly unspeakable starting in the late Georgian period – only to erupt in the sensational trials of the 1880s and 1890s. He also complicates our picture of the homosexual: "There was no single, unified understanding of sex between men in the early to mid-nineteenth century, and analyzing the differences across class divisions is the first goal of this book" (2). Further, Upchurch relates changes in the perception and regulation of same-sex activity to broader historical shifts, particularly the threat of revolution and the pitfalls of industrialization. (There is some confusion about dates, though: Upchurch variously claims to cover the period from 1810-1870 and 1820-1870.)

Upchurch begins with how homosexual behaviour was understood. "Families and Sex between Men" chronicles the reaction(s) family members had to the revelation of same-sex activity by loved ones. Upchurch breaks new ground by focusing on families rather than molly houses and other high-profile venues for same-sex intimacy. He finds little acceptance or indifference toward homosexual activity, but also warns against taking the vitriolic ostracism expressed at trials as typical of family responses. After appropriate disciplinary action, the accused family member was often reintegrated. Upchurch works through some fascinating examples: a prodigal son in cahoots with a "wicked" older gentleman, a wealthy master who seduced his servant, a stranger/traveller assaulting his host's teenage sons, a husband accused of sex with his stepson. Two findings stand out. First, it was overwhelmingly female family members (wives, mothers, or sisters) who effected a reconciliation, even while female spectators were usually barred from the courtroom and female witnesses discredited. Second, even

a well-publicized court case might not ruin a man for life if the accused did not repeat the alleged act. As expected, the main difference was class.

Chapter 2, "Class, Masculinity, and Spaces," attempts to answer how men who engaged in same-sex activity understood their behavior. Again, class, age, and geographic space mattered, with upper-class and working-class men both justifying same-sex activity, albeit for different reasons: the former described it as shared among peers, the latter as done for monetary gain. Meanwhile, middle-class notions of character and respectability rendered same-sex behavior problematic. Upchurch carefully differentiates between sex acts (active vs. passive), the desire for sex (attraction or arousal), same-sex desire (what we would term a gay identity), and location (the Mediterranean, homosocial sites such as elite public schools, or the city of London). He also lists the texts that individuals read, notably from ancient Greece and Rome, and documents that sex between men occurred all over London rather than in the usual locales of urinals, parks, or molly houses.

The next part turns to the institutional forces and drastic changes that came to determine the discourse of homosexuality. Chapter 3, "Law and Reform in the 1820s," surveys the (new) laws against "infamous crime," which had the purpose of maintaining economic and social stability rather than upholding morality. The death penalty for sodomy, which dated back to Elizabethan times, was abolished, but the new law required only proof of penetration for conviction rather than the additional emission of semen previously mandated. Further, this law sweepingly punished "attempts at, solicitation of, persuasion to, and even promises of sodomy" (92). Upchurch focuses on a curious extortion law that severely penalized false accusations of attempting an "infamous crime." Working-class men were the usual targets of sexual attempts and accused their social superiors with increased frequency. Accusation became a powerful weapon in class warfare and, even if frivolous, could gravely impugn the defendant's reputation. As a result, the penalty for bringing a fraudulent case was considerably harsher than the penalty for unnatural assault itself.

Chapter 4, "Public Men: The Metropolitan Police," finds that public policing of urinals, parks, and other cruising sites, especially in the West End, began as early as the 1820s. After the Metropolitan Police was established in 1829, arrests, uniformed police presence, and self-policing all increased. However, since the standard police officer was from the lower classes and hence lacking in proof of character (as defined by middle-class ideology), upper-class men were antagonistic toward police testimony and often held the upper hand. A young officer, alone on the streets at night and wearing a striking uniform, ironically made a tempting tar-

get for sexual solicitation. Finally, a ubiquitous police presence raised public awareness of being observed and thus necessitated more thorough self-fashioning among men in pursuit of sex.

Chapter 5, "Unnatural-Assault Reporting in the London Press," scrutinizes different publications that reported major and minor homosexual scandals between 1820 and 1870: the *Weekly Dispatch* (a working-class paper), *Times* (middle-class), and *Morning Post* (upper-class). Perhaps surprisingly, Upchurch observes little distinction in tone between the papers, but does find that the *number* of cases differed dramatically (this point is aided by helpful tables of statistics). The liberal daily press – in accordance with tenets of the democratic dissemination of information and civic responsibility, reason, and morality – devoted the most space to same-sex activity. This shows that most middle-class men in London must have been aware of the presence of same-sex activity and could not coyly claim ignorance. Sex between men simply did not shut up during that time.

In the final section of the book, Upchurch looks for patterns in the changes he has described. Same-sex activity faced heightened scrutiny and fewer, but more consistently enforced, penalties. (He contrasts this against the previous era's more selective but spectacular persecutions, such as the pillory or public hangings.) A spike in newspaper accounts resulted; however, sex between working-class men was rarely reported, and the highest number of arrests occurred in the wealthier West End. Furthermore, "Contrary to what might be expected, it was not the male cross-dresser, the debauched aristocrat, or the man already repeatedly engaging in sexual acts with other men who was the primary target of the new systems of regulation" (16). It was the respectable middle class man's sexuality that aroused the most anxiety.

As a result, Upchurch asks how a "respectable" man could reconcile same-sex desire with the middle-class concept of character that rendered homosexuality despicable. He shows that the revolutionary sexology on the European continent, notably Richard von Krafft-Ebing's ground-breaking *Psychopathia Sexualis*, was equally as rooted in class structures as in everyday London society. For example, the true symptoms of disease were absence of self-control and hence lack of masculine respectability: "medical theories involving identity and sex between men became as much about preserving older notions of identity based on character as they were about creating new identities based on sexuality" (188). A real turning point occurred with the publication of Havelock Ellis and John Addington Symonds' *Sexual Inversion* (1897), which challenged the cultural construction of middle-class respectability and stressed the congenital nature of most homosexuals.

Before Wilde is a valuable contribution to sexuality studies. Not all findings are original, and the book's argument that "shifts in the conceptualization of the self and in perceptions of experience can be understood only in the context of the culture within which they are generated" (17) is hardly news these days. However, the book is particularly successful in complementing the vast scholarship available from the second half of the nineteenth century, and decisively counters the assumption that same-sex desire was publicly unacknowledged before Wilde. The sheer archival work in the volume and Upchurch's impressive command of a proliferating bibliography in the field do him great credit. Nineteenth-century (homo)sexuality has now been covered from beginning to end.

Monica L. Miller, *Slaves to Fashion: Black Dandyism and the Styling of Black Diasporic Identity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2009).

Reviewed by Kiana Green, University of Southern California

"I ask you to note how, within the black repertoire, *style* — which mainstream cultural critics often believe to be the mere husk, the wrapping, the sugar coating on the pill — has become *itself* the subject of what is going on... think of how these cultures have used the body — as if it was, and often it was, the only cultural capital we had. We have worked on ourselves as the canvasses of representation." — Stuart Hall, "What Is This 'Black' in Black Popular Culture?" (1992)

Monica Miller ends her introduction and opens her final chapter with this quotation, which succinctly illuminates her aim in this book: to examine the significance of fashion and style in the creation of Black, especially Black male, subjectivity. She asks how and why Black people have used style and dress to define their identity, and traces moments when Black folks literally and symbolically style themselves from "slaves to selves" (1).

Miller focuses on two historical moments in which the Black dandy figure becomes prevalent in American culture. The first is during Reconstruction, when Black Americans refashioned themselves by rejecting images of "dandified 'luxury' slavery" (1). Miller argues that the Black dandy is a post-Emancipation figure who challenged popular blackface portrayals by bringing together European dandy stylization and what Miller deems a type of African adornment. She also finds that the Black dandy used style to signify class, even when the man performing dandyism lacked actual wealth or social standing. In this way, Black dandyism provided a critique of the social hierarchies ordering late 19th century U.S. society.

Miller identifies a second moment for the Black dandy in the early 20th century, particularly the Harlem Renaissance. Here, Black dandyism became less about differentiating the free from enslaved self and more about proclaiming and signifying modernity and urban progress through the Black body. Miller calls this fashioning "a kind of visible sign of the modern black imaginary, a kind of 'Freedom Dream'" (221). Miller focuses on Harlem, the site of the New Negro, as fostering a Black dandy who was just as queer as he is Black. She then identifies connections between the Harlem Renaissance and the late 1980s through early 1990s, closely reading Isaac Julien's film *Looking For Langston* as well as the self-portraiture of artists Iké Udé, Lyle Ashton-Harris, and Yinka Shonibare, MBE. Analyzing how these artists revived the dandy figure, Miller cites Frantz Fanon's claim in *Black Skin, White Masks* "that as a racialized subject struggling for actual and psychic freedom he 'wears his blackness like a costume'" (24). Julien and the other artists used a "post-black" aesthetic not only to craft a queer Black dandy, but to challenge the color line by interpreting Blackness through dress and style rather than inborn nature. Thus, Miller argues that New Negro artists of the Harlem Renaissance and Black artists of the 1990s took part in a shared challenge to any essentialist notions of Blackness.

Miller pursues the meaning and presence of the Black dandy via moments and traces; this is in no way a linear history. By analyzing literary and visual culture, she traces a series of recurring, transatlantic moves in which Black male subjects can be said to be working and reworking "the dandy's signature method: a pointed redeployment of clothing, gesture, and wit" (5). Miller's project is a deeply interdisciplinary one, engaging with the fields of performance studies, Black queer studies, and African American studies, and drawing heavily on E. Patrick Johnson's definition of performance and performativity. I find her most poignant intervention, however, in the field of history and particularly histories of fashion. Though the European dandy has been the subject of many studies, the Black dandy has scarcely been written about and never in such depth as in Miller's book.

Miller's book is engaging and accessible for a wide range of audiences including undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty. Though she focuses her work on the history of Black male dandies, Miller opens up the possibility of further work on the subject of Black female dandies as well. I wonder how her arguments might shift or be extended when female-bodied, masculine-of-center queer women and transgender men embody the Black dandy. She acknowledges from the start that her study is not a traditional history, but the years she skips over, the 1940s to 1990s, are a long stretch of time, as well as important years in the ongoing construction of Black mas-

culinity. I cannot help but wonder how the Superfly, Black Panther, and pimp figures, to cite just a few examples, might be situated in relation to the dandy. At a more general level, I would ask Miller for more analysis of what forces produced the transition from the dandy as a response to enslavement to the dandy as queer expression of “post-black” androgyny.

Those caveats aside, Miller’s text is an excellent example of rigorous interdisciplinary scholarship. She is able to create a picture of the past that is not closed and finite, but rather opens up room and space for other scholars to extend and add to her impressive elucidation of the Black dandy. This is a must read for anyone interested in the histories of Black performance or in the relationships between queer studies and African American studies.

David Valentine, *Imagining Transgender: An Ethnography of a Category* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007).

Reviewed by C. Todd White, Hobart and William Smith Colleges

David Valentine’s award-winning book, *Imagining Transgender*, has already secured the standing of a classic work of ethnography. While it quickly garnered the attention of anthropologists, historians of gender and sexuality will also benefit from Valentine’s insights and nuanced attention to the emergence and development of the identity labels “transgender,” “transsexual,” and “gay.”

Beginning in 1997, Valentine conducted ethnographic research on how “race, class, and other social differences” intersected with the emergent category of transgender in the streets, bars, and LGBT institutions of New York City. His introduction defines his study’s three primary and overlapping themes. First, he demonstrates an incongruence between the way the term “transgender” operates within institutionalized contexts and the way it is actually utilized and experienced by his informants. Second, he offers an ethnographic and historical exploration of contemporary conceptions of “sexuality” and “gender” in the United States, especially compared to how they are defined in activism and social theory. The third theme, elaborated in the final three of the book’s six chapters, explores intersections between activism, identity politics, and social theory writ large. Here, Valentine posits that social scientists are themselves implicit in defining, producing, and reifying the very categories that they seek to analyze.

Imagining Transgender is divided into three sections. The first, reflecting the book’s title, presents the theo-

retical, historical, and other backgrounds that Valentine maneuvers as he examines this imagined community. The second section, “Making Community, Conceiving Identity,” explores the origins of the transgender label and documents the social and ideational conception of that term as contrasted with gay, lesbian, homosexual, and transexual. The final section, “Emerging Fields,” considers the intersections between transgender studies, transgender activism, and anthropology.

The first chapter does an admirable job of presenting a cogent history, though the reader understands that this is but one of the possible ways to contextualize transgender and that a thickly described emic perspective as elucidated through participant observation is pending. Valentine could delve deeper into the antagonism many of the pioneering homophiles had toward gender transgressors, effeminate males in particular, though he does adequately summarize this concern in his conclusion. I find his reference to pre-Stonewall homosexual activists as “accommodationists” interesting and wish he would have elaborated on this label with the same deliberation he provides others. I wonder how more gender-normative gay activists would reflect on his use of this term.

The book really comes to life in the second chapter. Seeking to explore the boundaries of the transgender imaginary rather than elucidate a core, Valentine presents three different drag occasions: a weekly competition at the Clubhouse in Hell’s Kitchen with predominantly black and Latino gay-identified clientele; the annual Debutante Ball of Crossdressers International, comprised of white men who do not typically identify as gay; and The Night of a Thousand Gowns ball hosted by the Imperial Court of New York City. In the first venue, Valentine appears in his role as a safer-sex outreach counsel for the Gender Identity Project (GIP) of New York. He learns that the conception of transgender utilized by GIP is at odds with bar-goers’ self-identification. Ironically, he finds little evidence of a “transgendered” community at this predominately gay drag celebration. Likewise, at the Debutante Ball cross-dressed participants refer to each other as “cross dressers or transvestites, sometimes as ‘trannies,’ but rarely as ‘transgender’” (88). Similarly, the middle-class whites at the Imperial Court gala identify as “gay” while separating their performance from any implications about core identity or sexuality (93).

Valentine next revisits the institutional perspective on the “transgendered community” and reflects on his position as safer-sex outreach coordinator for the Gender Identity Project. He recognizes that the notion of a transgender community is assumed a priori by the GIP, making it an evoked rather than an organic social entity. In short, the category is being imposed upon those it claims to represent. Those who are most ac-

tive in the GIP have a different opinion of and relationship to the category “transgender” than those who did not avail themselves of the organization’s services. The remainder of the book ponders why this is so. Valentine concludes that for activists, there are undeniable advantages to the concept “transgender” – it sets boundaries by which people can be delineated, targeted, and motivated. The complication, of course, is that these borders exist in several domains simultaneously: between masculine and feminine, male and female, individual and agency, nature and nurture, ethnographer and activist, theory and practice. Valentine uses the image of him riding his bicycle, with its two wheels spinning, between his field sites as a compelling metaphor for the dialogical relationship between all these contrasting factors.

The final section of the text connects the question of “imagining transgender” to larger gay and lesbian organizations. Valentine shows that while the emergent category of transgender as a new social movement is still irresolute, inclusion of this minority “stabilizes the vulnerable margins of ‘gay’ and ‘lesbian’” (177). Valentine explores these dynamics within the Lesbian and Gay Community Center of New York, which administered the GIP program and officially added “Bisexual and Transgender” to its name in 2002. Valentine also discusses the relationship between GenderPAC and the Human Rights Campaign and the 1977 resolution that included transexual women within the National Organization for Women. Valentine’s historical overview of the debates in these and other organizations makes this book of particular interest to LGBT history scholars and activists alike.

Imagining Transgender exemplifies the power of bearing witness as a participant observer well attenuated to linguistic and historical insights and perspectives. As the book’s subtitle proclaims, this work proves that ethnography can indeed be applied to a category – an emergent and imagined community – as well as to any other socio-cultural domain. It will provide an excellent text for graduate students and advanced undergraduates in the fields of LGBT history and anthropology as well as urban and gender studies. The book was justly awarded the 2007 Ruth Benedict Book Award by the Association for Queer Anthropology (formerly the Society of Lesbian and Gay Anthropologists). I have no doubt that members of the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender History will likewise find this book a pleasure to read and to revisit.

GOVERNING BOARD NOMINATIONS FOR 2011-2014 TERM

Timothy Stewart-Winter

As a scholar of the modern United States, I specialize in the study of urban political culture, social movements, and the intertwined histories of sexuality, race, and citizenship. I am an assistant professor of history at Rutgers University, Newark, where I teach courses in the Ph.D. program in American Studies, and am an affiliated faculty member in the Women's and Gender Studies Program. Previously, I earned my B.A. from Swarthmore College and Ph.D. from the University of Chicago; served as a visiting lecturer in LGBT Studies at Yale University; and received the James C. Hormel Fellowship in Lesbian and Gay Studies at the University of Chicago.

I'm currently engaged in revising the manuscript for my first book, which looks at sexuality, race, and politics in Chicago from the 1950s to the 1990s, situating the rise of modern gay politics in the context of contentious racial politics, neoliberalism, and gentrification. Far from the nation's coastal gay cultural meccas, in a city increasingly defined by racial conflict, gay politics embodied some of the contradictions of America's minority rights revolution. While the actions of the federal government legitimized the minority rights revolution in the mid-1960s, big-city government expanded the scope of that revolution in the subsequent three decades. At the same time, the city's increasingly visible North Side gay enclaves cemented a linkage between gayness and whiteness in a segregated metropolitan landscape.

I have a longstanding interest in institutionalizing LGBT studies in the academy, and in queer and social justice activism. I wrote a proposal that led to a gender-neutral on-campus housing option at Swarthmore College, one of the country's first such programs, and contributed to a proposal to add gender identity to the University of Chicago's nondiscrimination policies. I've served on task forces on LGBT student services at Chicago and Rutgers. Along with my colleague Whitney Strub, I teach the core introductory course for the new undergraduate minor in LGBT Studies at Rutgers-Newark.

Throughout my academic career, I've maintained a strong interest in public history. I've served as a volunteer event photographer for Gerber/Hart Library and Archives. I've also organized public programs at Gerber/Hart, including a panel of LGBT community leaders on the 20th anniversary of Chicago's Human Rights Ordinance; a panel of former members of Harold Washington's mayoral administration who worked on LGBT issues; and a symposium on the 25th anniversary of John D'Emilio's book *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*. I've published in the *Journal of the History of Sexuality* and *Gender & History*, as well as the *Windy City Times* and *Gay & Lesbian Review*. In a 2008 op-ed in the *Los Angeles Times*, I analyzed the shifting racial politics of same-sex marriage, including the cultivation of African American ministers by the campaign for California's Proposition 8.

I'm interested in serving on the board of CLGBTH because I'd like to give back to an organization and community of scholars that's helped me find my way as a scholar of the queer past. I'm particularly interested in identifying ways the Committee can help graduate students and those on the job market, and in the organization's online presence.

GOVERNING BOARD NOMINATIONS FOR 2011-2014 TERM

Colin R. Johnson

I am Assistant Professor of Gender Studies at Indiana University Bloomington where I also hold appointments in the Department of History and the Programs in American Studies and Human Biology. At Indiana University I teach courses on U.S. LGBTQ history, the history of sexuality in the United States generally, queer theory, feminist theory, and the cultural geography and gender and sexuality. For more than a decade now my research has focused on the history of same-sex sexual behavior and gender non-conformity in the non-metropolitan United States during the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries and I am currently completing my first book on that topic. My recent publications include essays about the Los Angeles GLF's 1970 plan to seize control of Alpine County, California, the history of drag performance in the Civilian Conservation Corps, the history of same-sex sexual behavior among early twentieth century migrant agricultural workers and casual laborers in the United States and, perhaps unsurprisingly, a few pieces about *Brokeback Mountain*.

Throughout my career I have worked exceedingly hard to create opportunities for graduate students doing work on LGBTQ history. For example, while I was a graduate student at the University of Michigan I co-founded that institution's Lesbian-Gay-Queer Research Initiative, an initiative which is still going strong ten years later. More recently, at Indiana University, my colleague Mary L. Gray and I co-organized a major symposium on rural queer studies. I am especially proud of this event because we were able to raise enough money to invite not only established scholars working in this emerging area of sub-specialization, but more than a dozen advanced graduate students as well. And of course as someone who teaches in one of the few Ph.D.-granting departments of Gender Studies in the United States I also have the enormous privilege of teaching and mentoring an entirely new generation of historically-minded interdisciplinary scholars of gender and sexuality every single day.

If elected, there are several things that I would like accomplish as a member of the CLGBTH's governing board. The most pressing may be facilitating a discussion about how to make the case for LGBTQ history's continued importance during hard times. Like many of you, I continue to believe that colleges and universities have an obligation to offer formal instruction in LGBTQ history for the simple reason that doing so is the right thing to do in a world where fear and ignorance continue to result in significant suffering among minoritized peoples of every sort. At the same time, I have also become increasingly convinced that there is another reason for colleges and universities to continue and even increase support for research and teaching about the history of gender, sexuality, race, and class—namely that it is precisely these subjects that many undergraduates feel they should be studying as part of their post-secondary education. At Indiana University, the courses I teach on LGBTQ history always fill to capacity; indeed, they usually have substantial waitlists even as other courses in more traditional areas struggle to meet enrollment minima. While I would obviously like to think that this has something to do with my reputation for being an engaging teacher, I am fully aware that it probably has more to do with the fact that many of today's undergraduates actually see LGBTQ history as immediately relevant to their lives—because they identify as LGBTQ themselves, or because they have friends and family who do, or simply because they recognize that sexuality has functioned as an important ideological and political battleground for as long as they can remember. No longer a marginal area of historical study, undergraduate courses on LGBTQ history quite often function these days as the very context in which students who might otherwise never have considered choosing a major in the humanities begin to develop a serious interest in doing so. As academic professionals I think we must do a much better job of drawing attention to this trend, and of documenting the intellectual, institutional, and economic value of the contributions we make to colleges and universities—not only because it's demonstrably true that we do make significant contributions, sometimes disproportionate ones, but also because that is likely the only way that new jobs are going to be created for younger scholars under circumstances where courses on LGBTQ history might easily be written off as curricular “luxuries” that cash-strapped universities can no longer afford.

BALLOT

CLGBTH Governing Board Elections – Spring 2011

Please return completed ballot by June 30, 2011 to:

Ian Lekus
Committee on Degrees in History and Literature
Barker Center
12 Quincy St.
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
lekus@fas.harvard.edu

Governing Board Elections:

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

Select TWO candidates for three-year terms (June 30, 2011 – June 29, 2014)

_____ **Timothy Stewart-Winter**

_____ **Colin R. Johnson**

cut here

2012 ALLAN BÉRUBÉ PRIZE

The Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History, an affiliate society of the American Historical Association, has established **the Allan Bérubé Prize** to recognize outstanding work in public or community-based lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or queer history. While books or essays written for a broad audience are eligible for consideration, we are looking in particular to recognize other types of historical work, including — but not limited to:

websites, blogs, podcasts, and other online media documentary, film and video, archival and oral history projects, museum and other curated public exhibitions and installations, walking tours, radio programming, organizational/program development efforts whose primary audiences are not academic specialists.

Scholarly publications that politically intervene in the relationship between academic and public/community-based history may also be considered. While academically affiliated scholars may apply based on public or community-oriented projects, individuals with a history of independent or community-based work will be given priority and are especially encouraged to apply.

The **2012 Bérubé Prize**, which is underwritten by the GLBT Historical Society (San Francisco), will recognize excellence in work completed in the previous two calendar years (2010 and 2011). Projects by individuals, groups, community organizations, or other organizations may be nominated. Individuals or organizational entities responsible for the project should nominate themselves.

Nominations and supporting materials should specifically address three criteria:

- (1) the creativity and/or originality of the approach;
- (2) the quality of historical research and interpretation resulting from the use of material culture, oral history, or any other type of historical evidence; and,
- (3) the social, cultural, civic, and/or intellectual impact of the project.

Procedures and Submission Requirements

1. Nominations should be submitted in the form of a project abstract (not to exceed 250 words) and a written narrative (not to exceed 1,500 words). The narrative should clearly address the three criteria, and identify the project's intended audiences.

2. Nominations for projects such as DVDs, videos, CDs, etc. should include copies of the production, submitted with the written narrative and other materials.

Other types of nominated projects should include documentation appropriate to the form of historical work involved, e.g., exhibition guides/catalogs, walking tour maps, and photographs of installations. For online projects, the submitted materials should clearly identify the URLs for committee members to read/listen to the historical materials.

3. Nominations should include pertinent supporting documents, such as a copy of the nominee's resume or curriculum vitae if available. If the nominee is an organization or institution, information on its governance, mission, and size should also be provided. Formal reviews from newspapers, magazines, professional journals, or other evidence of public feedback is encouraged but not required.

4. A total of four copies of all submission materials are required. Send one set of application materials to each of the four following Prize Committee members:

Kevin P. Murphy (Prize Committee Chair)
University of Minnesota
Department of History
1047 Heller Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Marcia Gallo
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Department of History
4505 S Maryland Pkwy
Box 455020
Las Vegas NV 89154-5020

Lauren Jae Gutterman
Center for Lesbian and Gay Studies
The Graduate Center, CUNY
365 Fifth Avenue rm. 7115
New York, NY 10016

Joey Plaster
GLBT Historical Society
657 Mission St. No. 300
San Francisco, CA 94105

Submissions must be postmarked by 31 December 2011.

If you have questions about the prize, please contact the Prize Committee Chair, Kevin P. Murphy, at kpmurphy@umn.edu.

CLGBTH

c/o Christina B. Hanhardt
Department of American Studies
1102 Holzapfel Hall
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742