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CHAIR’S COLUMN FALL 2011

As I sit down to write my final column as Chair of the Committee on LGBT History, I find myself wondering how three years have passed so quickly. To be sure, they have been exciting and eventful years, from navigating the boycott of the Manchester Grand Hyatt in San Diego to overhauling our website and online operations to awarding the Allan Bérubé Prize for the first time to three very energetic programs at the AHA. Once more, we have a terrific program on tap for this coming January’s AHA, including our first-ever official AHA tour, to the Chicago History Museum’s “Out in Chicago” exhibit, co-curated by Jill Austin and our own Jennifer Brier. We will also offer a dozen panels, co-sponsor a reception with the Coordinating Committee of Women in History, and continue our tradition of exploring and supporting local LGBTQ public history initiatives with a trip to the Leather Archives and Museum. Our full program is published inside and at our website, and I hope to see many of you in the Windy City.

In Chicago, we hope to learn about the preliminary findings of the survey currently being conducted by the AHA/Committee on LGBT History joint task force. That survey has been distributed through our email list and Facebook page, as well as by our friends at the Canadian Committee on the History of Sexuality and H-HISTSEX. One of the legacies of the San Diego AHA was increased recognition by the AHA leadership of the many challenges faced by LGBTQ historians working in the field, and this survey will provide the stories and data that will help the AHA develop best-practice guidelines aimed at resolving these challenges.

This coming spring, we will be awarding the Audre Lorde (best article in LGBTQ history), Gregory Sprague (best graduate student chapter/essay in LGBTQ history), and Allan Bérubé (accomplishment in LGBTQ public history) Prizes. Tom Foster is chairing the Lorde/Sprague prize committee,
with Claire Potter and Julio Capó, Jr. serving as fellow readers, while Kevin Murphy is chairing the Bérubé committee, assisted by Marcia Gallo, Lauren Jae Guterman, and Joey Plaster.

This is a time of dramatic transition for the Committee, far beyond the end of my own term as Chair. As this newsletter went to press, Don Romesburg and Jennifer Brier agreed to stand for election as Co-Chairs, and we will be conducting the Chair election online; please keep an eye on your email for their candidate statement and voting instructions. I am thrilled by their willingness to take the reins of the organization, and know we will be in terrific hands for the next three years. Tim Stewart-Winter and Whit Strub have kindly stepped forward to publish the newsletter for this academic year, with generous support from the History Department and the administration at Rutgers-Newark. Charles Upchurch is stepping down after more than four years as Secretary, in which he worked wonders to improve our maintenance of membership records and led several life-member fundraising campaigns, while Jim Rosenheim is also stepping down as Treasurer after almost six years of devoted service in that position. I am extremely grateful to both Jim and Chuck for their hard work and eternal patience. Finally, Brian Distelberg, the energetic manager of our re-designed website, has accepted a position at Harvard University Press, and is leaving us to focus on his new duties. We have four outstanding people filling their respective shoes: Wesley Chenault as Secretary, Phil Tiemeyer as Treasurer, and David Palmer and Jon Hoffman as Online Operations Managers. I also am happy to welcome Tim Stewart-Winter and Colin Johnson to our Governing Board.

Finally, I would simply like to say that it has been a terrific honor to serve as your Chair for the last three years, and I am grateful to all of you—especially all those of you who have served as officers, Board members, and in other volunteer capacities – for making my term as Chair so rewarding. I especially want to thank Karen Krauhl, Leisa Meyer, Marc Stein, and John D’Emilio for sharing their extraordinary knowledge and continued support of the Committee, and Christina Hanhardt and Emily Hobson for all their indefatigable work for the organization – all of whom deserve props for keeping me relatively sane over these three years. As I step away, I am especially excited about the tremendous energy I see coming to the fore among grad students and recent Ph.D.’s working in LGBTQ history, and I have the utmost confidence that the Committee’s most exciting days lie ahead of us. See you in Chicago!

Peace,
Ian Lekus

---

**AHA 2012 CLGBTH SESSIONS**

**THURSDAY, JANUARY 5**

2:30 PM-5:00 PM
**Tour 4: Chicago History Museum: Out in Chicago**
Parlor A (Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers)

Tour leader: Jennifer Brier, University of Illinois at Chicago

Join curators Jennifer Brier and Jill Austin (Chicago History Museum) for a behind the scenes tour of Out in Chicago, the Chicago History Museum’s 4,000 square-foot exhibition detailing Chicago’s century and a half long lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender history. Designed specifically for historians and scholars attending the Chicago conference, this curator-led tour will focus on how the exhibit team transformed decades of historical scholarship on same-sex desire and gender non-conformity into a complex and emotionally charged public history display that appeals to a wide range of visitors. Limit 20 people: $30 members, $35 nonmembers

3:00 PM-5:00 PM
**The Politics of Respectability Reconsidered: Using the Framework of Respectability to Examine Southern Lesbian History**

CLGBTH 1; Coordinating Council for Women in History 3
River North Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Benjamin E. Wise, University of Florida

Megan Shockley, Clemson University
*Respectability and Lesbian Motherhood: Sharon Bottoms and Linda Kaufman*

Janet L. Allured, McNeese State University
*Fashion and the Performance of Lesbian Feminist Identity*

La Shonda Mims, University of Georgia
*Activist or Apathetic? Lesbians and Bar Space in the Post-World War II South*
FRIDAY, JANUARY 6

9:30 AM-11:30 AM
Doing Queer History in the Twenty-First Century
AHA Session 49; CLGBTH 2
Erie Room (Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers)

Chair: Marcia M. Gallo, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Panel: Jennifer Brier, University of Illinois at Chicago; John A. D’Emilio, University of Illinois at Chicago; Marcia M. Gallo, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; E. Patrick Johnson, Northwestern University

12:45 PM-1:45 PM
CLGBTH Business Meeting
Illinois Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)
Presiding: Ian Lekus, Harvard University

2:30 PM-4:30 PM
The Queer Politics of Managing Youth and Sex in the 1920s United States
CLGBTH 3
Michigan State Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Amanda H. Littauer, Northern Illinois University

Don Romesburg, Sonoma State University
Wayward Sexualities, Delinquent Mentalities, and Early Twentieth-Century Youth Experts

7:00 PM-9:00 PM
Reception for the Coordinating Council for Women in History and the Committee on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History
Chicago Ballroom A (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7

9:00 AM-11:00 AM
Twentieth Century Queer and Artistic Bohemias
AHA Session 129; CLGBTH 4; Michigan Room A (Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers)

Chair: Daniel Hurewitz, Hunter College, City University of New York

Christopher Adam Mitchell, Rutgers University
Twilight of the Demimonde: Queer and Bohemian Radicalism and the “Liberation” of the Black Market Economy in Greenwich Village

Thomas W. Hafer, CUNY Graduate Center
Young and Evil Bohemia: Sex, Art, and Identity in the Queer Atlantic, 1930–39

H. Camilla Smith, University of Birmingham
Blue Travel at the Crossroads: Curt Moreck’s Guide to “Depraved” Berlin, 1931

Comment: The Audience

9:00 AM-11:00 AM
Building Community, Combating Phobia, Part 1: The Media’s Narratives on “Patient Zero” and Gay Sex during the AIDS Epidemic
CLGBTH 5; Michigan Room A (Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers)

Chair: Chet DeFonso, Northern Illinois University

Nicholas L. Syrett, University of Northern Colorado
Child Marriage and Contests over Non-Normative Sexuality in the 1920s

Allison Miller, Rutgers University
Therapeutic Discipline and Queer Youth in a School for Delinquent Girls, c. 1926

Comment: Amanda H. Littauer, Northern Illinois University
11:30 AM-1:30 PM
Building Communities, Combating Phobia, Part II: LGBT Identity, Medicine, and Health
CLGBTH 6
Michigan State Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Leisa D. Meyer, College of William and Mary

Judith A. Houck, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Treating Men at a Lesbian Clinic: Identity Politics, Feminist Organizing, and Health Care Provision, 1979 to the Present

Catherine Batza, University of Illinois at Chicago
“I Want You for a Free VD Test”: Making Sexual Health Part of Gay Identity in Chicago 1974–81

Tristan D. Cabello, Bowdoin College

John Goins, University of Houston
Politicking the Gay Cancer: Electoral Intransigence and the AIDS Response in Houston

Comment: Leisa D. Meyer, College of William and Mary

2:30 PM-4:30 PM
Race-ing the Sexual Revolution
CLGBTH 8
Michigan State Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Cathy Cohen, University of Chicago

Daniel W. Rivers, Emory University
Race, Class, Oral History, and the Liberation-Era Divide

Timothy Stewart-Winter, Rutgers University-Newark
Making the Second Gay Ghetto: The Whitening of Queer Chicago from Daley to Daley

Heather R. White, New College of Florida

Comment: Marc Stein, York University

2:30 PM-4:30 PM
Bodies of Evidence: Queer Oral History Methods
CLGBTH 7
Clark Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Marcia M. Gallo, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Daniel W. Rivers, Emory University
Race, Class, Oral History, and the Liberation-Era Divide

Horacio N. Roque Ramirez, University of California, Santa Barbara
Sharing Queer Authorities: Transgender Latina and Gay Latino Meanings

Nan Alamilla Boyd, San Francisco State University
Talking about Sex: Cheryl Gonzales and Rikki Streicher Tell Their Stories

Jason Ruiz, University of Notre Dame
Private Lives and Public History: Excavating the Sexual Past in Queer Oral History

Comment: Kevin P. Murphy, University of Minnesota

5:00 PM-7:00 PM
On These Shoulders We Stand
Sheraton Ballroom I (Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers)


7:00 PM-9:00 PM
Visit to the Leather Archives & Museum, 6418 N. Greenview Ave., Chicago
Please check back for updates as to where to meet to travel over to the LA&M in the Rogers Park neighborhood on the north side of Chicago. See http://www.leatherarchives.org for more information about the LA&M.
SUNDAY, JANUARY 8

8:30 AM-10:30 AM
Sexing Up the “Long” 1950s, Part 1: New Narratives in U.S. Gender and Sexuality Studies
AHA Session 229; Coordinating Council for Women in History 13; CLGBTH 9
Addison Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Vicki L. Eaklor, Alfred University

Julio Capó Jr., Yale University
“A Polluted Playground”: Gender, Sexuality, and the Consumption of Miami’s Vice Culture, 1948–60

Amanda H. Littauer, Northern Illinois University
“Sex Anarchy” and Female Sexual “Delinquency”: Young Women’s Sexual Nonconformity in the 1950s United States

Tim Retzloff, Yale University
Queer Cities and Suburban Sin Clubs: Sexual Anxieties in American Scandal and Men’s Pulp Magazines of the 1950s and 1960s

Stephanie Chalifoux, University of Alabama
“Highway Girls”: Sex Work Migration in the 1950s Rural South

Comment: David K. Johnson, University of South Florida

8:30 AM-10:30 AM
Ending Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell: Lessons Learned from Integrating Minorities and Women in the U.S. Military
CLGBTH 11; Coordinating Council for Women in History 14
Iowa Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Douglas Walter Bristol, Jr., University of Southern Mississippi

Douglas Walter Bristol, Jr., University of Southern Mississippi
Making Integration Work: The U.S. Military’s Race Relations Initiatives of the 1970s

David Hall, Servicemembers Legal Defense Network
Update on Ending the Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell Movement

Tanya L. Roth, Mary Institute and Saint Louis Country Day School
Elusive Integration: The Challenges of Integrating Women into the U.S. Military

Charissa J. Threat, Northeastern University
Does the Sex of the Practitioner Matter? Sex Discrimination, Nursing, and the Army Nurse Corps in the 1950s

Comment: The Audience

11:00 AM-1:00 PM
Sexing Up the “Long” 1950s, Part 2: Urban and Transnational Narratives in the Americas and Europe
AHA Session 256; CLGBTH 12; Conference on Latin American History 72
Addison Room (Chicago Marriott Downtown)

Chair: Anne Hardgrove, University of Texas at San Antonio

Nathan Andrew Wilson, York University
“The Gestapo Lives On”: West German and American Gay Activists and the Politics of Memory

Dasa Francikova, University of California, Santa Barbara
Going Global, Getting Personal: Transnational Lesbian Organizing and Relationships in the Long 1950s

Pablo E. Ben, San Diego State University
Family Life and the Formation of Modern Homosexual Identity in Argentina, Buenos Aires, 1930–60

Ryan M. Jones, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Homosexual Narratives in the Long 1950s: The Mexican Case

Comment: Tamara Chaplin, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
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Reviewed by Kwame Holmes (University of Virginia)

In *What Comes Naturally*, Peggy Pascoe continues recent trends in legal history that frame the law and the public stage of the courtroom as the primary site for the production, contestation, and management of race, gender, and sexual systems in the United States. As Pascoe points out in her introduction, scholars have previously located the first use of the word miscegenation during the Civil War, when Democrats across the country distributed political pamphlets warning that supporting Lincoln was tantamount to supporting interracial sex and marriage (I). *What Comes Naturally*, however, convincingly argues that miscegenation law, and subsequent court battles over the meaning and scope of the term, became the principal means of reinstituting a stable racial and gendered order after the end of slavery when “free” and “slave” no longer marked the boundary between “white” and “black” or citizen and non-citizen.

In examining the struggles to establish, enforce, and eventually overturn miscegenation law from the 1860s to the 1960s, Pascoe illuminates the centrality of marriage as a tool of state-based racial formation. In Pascoe’s words, “miscegenation law acted as a kind of legal factory for the defining, producing and reproducing of the racial categories of the state” (9). Though the book is national in scope, Pascoe builds her argument with close examinations of specific court battles and regional trends in sites where interracial unions threw white supremacy into greatest flux. These include the South after Reconstruction, the West during the closing of the western “frontier,” and the interwar and postwar South during the years when African American and white liberals began to gradually unravel the legal logic of white supremacy by filing challenges to miscegenation laws.

In chapter 4, “The Facts of Race in the Courtroom,” Pascoe powerfully makes the case for reading the late nineteenth century courtroom as a “factory” for American racial production. As she argues, “Miscegenation law made race classification seem to be imperative — that is, in order to determine who could and couldn’t marry, it was first necessary to identify every person’s race quickly and correctly” (111). Pascoe argues that from the end of slavery until the 1940s, American courtrooms played witness to shifting trends in racial pseudoscience as attorneys used expert testimony to identify what racial categories were and how jurors could distinguish one race from the other. Pascoe persuasively demonstrates that racial scientists were rarely able to produce a consistent theory of racial difference and that anxious policymakers were consistently vexed by their inability to ensure racial integrity in their jurisdictions. While laws against interracial marriage in Virginia remained ironclad throughout the twentieth century, Pascoe’s research reveals that the state faced enormous difficulties implementing the 1923 Virginia Racial Integrity Act. Enforcement of the bill proved difficult because the strict genealogical standards that determined racial status in Virginia could not be reconciled with the ubiquity of interracial sex — consenting and coerced — from the founding of the Virginia colony.

Pascoe takes careful pains to demonstrate that while separating whiteness from blackness drove the political and cultural imperatives of anti-miscegenation laws in the nineteenth century, African Americans were not their exclusive targets. She reveals that legacies of unions between white men and Indian, Mexican, and Asian women posed severe challenges to establishing “pure” white genealogies and, as a result, muddied the boundaries of racialized citizenship. Moreover, Pascoe is clear to demonstrate that the tenor of anti-miscegenation sentiment and the terms used to justify the criminalization of interracial unions were determined by participants’ gender and race. In chapter 2, she shows that unions between black men and white women were singled out as a form of illegal sexual activity on par with adultery, fornication, or sodomy. By contrast, while unions between white men and Asian women were illegal in western territories, newspaper coverage of these unions titillated readers with the sexual allure of Asian immigrant women.

One of Pascoe’s most provocative claims is that miscegenation law was one of the few areas in American life where the law explicitly blocked white men’s prerogatives regarding relations with women and racial minorities. While white men continued to engage in
interracial sex and a few were able to successfully marry non-white women, they found themselves increasingly barred from codifying those relationships as the nation gradually adopted “one-drop” racial taxonomies. In highlighting white lawmakers’ anxiety over policing the boundaries of marriage, Pascoe reveals that nearly every American understood marriage’s function as a vehicle for social mobility, in which those on the margins could move into the mainstream by binding themselves to white men and property. Prohibitions against white men in interracial unions show that maintaining exclusive white access to property was as important as preventing the racial degradation eugenicists posited would occur if white women bore children to non-white men.

As Pascoe’s narrative moves from the Progressive Era to the interwar and postwar decades, it shifts towards emphasizing the bureaucratization of miscegenation law and the efforts by liberal legalists to attack the logics that upheld miscegenation law as “natural.” While Pascoe brings deserved attention to pioneering legalists from the Catholic Interracial Council of Los Angeles (LACIC) and the NAACP’s Legal Defense Fund, chapters devoted to their efforts are less compelling than previous sections. Her treatment of legal challenges to miscegenation law evoke themes that will feel familiar to scholars proficient in civil rights legal history. For example, Pascoe describes the NAACP as conflicted, willing to attack miscegenation laws without endorsing interracial marriage. However, her characterization of the NAACP reads as similar to the extensive literature that has criticized the NAACP’s reluctance to confront white supremacy outside of the confines of Jim Crow legislation before World War II.

Pascoe’s concluding chapter, which explores the legacy of the Supreme Court’s invalidation of laws against interracial marriage in Loving v. Virginia (1967), finds the author on surer ground. I was particularly interested in Pascoe’s claim that broad acceptance of interracial marriage in the present moment works to frame minority opinions against interracial marriage as evidence of America’s racist “past.” In this way, Pascoe demonstrates that vocal, public support for interracial marriage has become a rhetorical tool to uphold the notion that the nation has become a “color-blind” utopia. Ironically, while miscegenation law was once used to maintain the fiction of biological racial difference — a fiction that upheld white supremacy — the nation’s shift to support of interracial marriages also works to uphold white supremacy, by arguing that “race” is irrelevant to political, economic and social structure in the United States.

Towards the end of her acknowledgements, Pascoe makes special mention of those colleagues, friends, and family, including her partner Linda Long and their children, who supported her as she finished this book during the final stages of a long battle with ovarian cancer. Well before the publication of What Comes Naturally, Pascoe had already left an enduring mark upon a wide range of disciplines, including nineteenth- and twentieth-century American history, legal history, women’s and gender studies, and the study of ethnicity, race, and racialization. In addition to continuing that trend, Pascoe’s final monograph also provides scholars with an invaluable resource. Her discovery of dozens of powerful stories of individual couples in a cornucopia of interracial unions will allow many other scholars to explore the broad cultural impact of interracial sex and marriage. Those who follow Pascoe’s work will undoubtedly return again and again to her extensive notes as starting points for their own projects. Their work will represent the greatest tribute to Pascoe’s enormous contributions to the humanities over the past thirty years.

Twin Cities GLBT Oral History Project, Queer Twin Cities (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010)

Reviewed by Lauren Jae Gutterman (New York University)

Queer Twin Cities provides an excellent study of GLBT history in Minnesota’s major cities and an inspiring model of queer public history. The book grew out of the Twin Cities Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Oral History Project (OHP), a collaboration between students, faculty, and community researchers at the University of Minnesota whose editorial board includes Michael David Franklin, Larry Knopp, Kevin P. Murphy, Ryan Patrick Murphy, Jennifer L. Pierce, Jason Ruiz, and Alex T. Urquhart. Comprised of eleven essays analyzing the past and present of queer life in Minneapolis and St. Paul, Queer Twin Cities also highlights the more than 100 oral histories the OHP collected, now housed in the Tretter Collection in GLBT Studies at Elmer L. Andersen Library.

The authors’ commitment to critically examining the practice of oral history is one of Queer Twin Cities’ greatest strengths. In “Queering Oral History,” Jason Ruiz reflects on the practical and theoretical challenges of naming the OHP. Labeling the project “GLBT” risked reifying the notion that a single GLBT community exists, as well as alienating those who do not identify with that term or its constitutive parts. “Queer” was preferable to many of the scholars and students involved, but did not appeal to the older Minnesotans the OHP wanted to target. While the OHP ultimately chose the label “GLBT;” Queer Twin Cities
acknowledges the many ways oral history narrators complicated strict sexual identity categories. Alongside Ruiz’s essay, Michael David Franklin’s “Calculating Risk” describes the difficulty the OHP faced in securing Institutional Review Board approval to conduct interviews with transsexual individuals. Franklin identifies an inherent conflict in attempting to conduct affirmative oral histories within a university system that has helped to frame transsexuality as a medical problem. Similar insights appear throughout the volume.

Jennifer Pierce’s introduction lays out the book’s key analytical goals. First, Queer Twin Cities draws attention to queer cultures and political organizing in Minneapolis and St. Paul, largely overlooked by historians of homosexuality to date. The authors join Anne Enke, John Howard, E. Patrick Johnson, Scott Herring, Karen Tongson and others in undermining the widespread assumption that GLBT communities and activism have only existed in the major cities of the East and West Coast. Second, the authors seek to challenge the popular understanding of GLBT history as moving from oppression to liberation and invisibility to visibility. They point out the sexual possibilities that existed in the Twin Cities long before Stonewall and critique the mainstream GLBT movement’s complicity in neoliberal economic and social policies.

Ryan Murphy and Alex Urquhart’s “Sexuality in the Headlines” is the book’s most sweeping essay. It traces discourses around sexuality in Minnesota newspapers from the late nineteenth to the early twenty-first century and provides a historical framework for the other essays. Murphy and Urquhart suggest that, in some ways, the Twin Cities held greater opportunities for same-sex sexual relationships before gay liberation. From the 1880s to 1920s, an overriding concern with stemming heterosexual vice gave immigrant men space to explore homoerotic, and sometimes explicitly homosexual, relationships. Even in the post-World War II era, young gay men and lesbians growing up in the Twin Cities’ suburbs found ways to engage in homosexual relationships despite pressures to conform sexually. Yet by the late 1970s Twin City queers were facing a new level of homophobic violence, which police and politicians pointedly ignored. After 1980, gay and lesbian activists and politicians achieved new political power, but fought primarily to extend civil rights to middle-class, domesticated gay and lesbian couples, leaving queers of color, sex workers, HIV-positive individuals, and low-income families vulnerable to stigmatization and abuse.

The next three essays in the volume focus on people whose identities defy easy classification and whose activism addresses multiple forms of oppression. “The Myth of the Great White North,” a roundtable discussion among queer of color activists, attests to the Twin Cities’ significant history of queer of color organizing. The participants explore both the frustrations and benefits that come with inhabiting multiple, intersecting identities and with the relatively small number of queers of color in Minneapolis/St. Paul. Marc Soderstrom’s “A Single Queer Voice with Polyphonic Overtones,” examines the personal history of bisexual activist, Renaissance Festival performer, feminist, and “farm kid” Elise Matthesen. Soderstrom argues that Matthesen — who participates in many overlapping communities without privileging any one, and remains critical of them all — demonstrates how queer activists can resist impulses to normalization. In “Two-Spirits Organizing,” Megan MacDonald charts how Two-Spirit groups have been bridging indigenous and queer activism since the late 1980s.

Next, Amy Tyson’s “Skirting Boundaries” and Pamela Butler’s “Sex and the Cities” investigate critical episodes within queer U.S. history from the Twin Cities’ vantage point. Tyson proves that queer bars and their patrons in the postwar Twin Cities experienced less police harassment than those in other, larger cities. She suggests that city government officials and police officers, concerned with protecting the Twin Cities’ morally upright reputation, preferred to turn a blind eye to gay bars rather than draw attention to them. Only when bars became unavoidably queer by featuring female impersonators did police step up their efforts. Butler, in turn, reveals how race and urban spatial politics shaped anti-porn feminism in Minneapolis, the first U.S. city to pass an anti-pornography civil rights ordinance. She argues that the spaces and cultures that produced anti-porn feminism were based on a notion of middle-class respectability that was “both sexually restrictive and racially exclusive” (205). She points out that while anti-porn feminists were not entirely anti-sex, they favored a privatized model of gay and lesbian sexuality that failed to contest economic and racial inequality.

Ryan Murphy’s “The Gay Land Rush” and Alex Urquhart and Susan Craddock’s “Private Cures for a Public Epidemic” examine how larger political shifts are shaping GLBT life in the Twin Cities today. Murphy shows how the real estate industry has sought to attract gay and lesbian gentrifiers in an attempt to revive the local economy without addressing the underlying causes of poverty and crime: ongoing racial discrimination, disappearing jobs, and the destruction of the welfare system. He argues that the mainstream GLBT movement abets this process by framing the GLBT community as a niche consumer market. Urquhart and Craddock elucidate similar neoliberal forces behind the funding shortage for Minnesota’s AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP). They point out that Target has turned the annual Twin Cities’ AIDS Walk into a branding event, presenting the corporation as a leader in the battle against HIV/AIDS, even as Target benefits from corporate tax breaks that deprive ADAP of money. Urquhart and Craddock also
show that though University of Minnesota scientists have helped to create a new, effective anti-retroviral medication, by licensing the drug with one pharmaceutical company exclusively, the University has been complicit in inflating the cost of HIV treatment.

The concluding essay, Kevin Murphy’s “Gay Was Good,” reflects on the OHP’s attempt to undermine the triumphant narrative of GLBT history. While the book’s creators felt pressure to provide an uplifting story that would appeal to the public, many of the oral history narrators refused to provide this, reflecting fondly on the pre-Stonewall era while expressing disappointment with contemporary GLBT politics and concern about the dangers that come with increased gay visibility. Murphy urges historians to pay attention to such “expressions of ambivalence and loss” while acknowledging that narratives of disappointment, like those of hope, are shaped by contemporary circumstances (314).

Though Queer Twin Cities’ major arguments are not new, the detail the book provides about Minneapolis and St. Paul complicates and enriches the field of GLBT U.S. history. Intended for a broad audience, the book succeeds in making insights from queer theory and GLBT history accessible and its essays would work well in undergraduate courses. Queer Twin Cities is necessary reading for scholars studying the Midwest or planning to conduct oral histories. On nearly every page, the unique voices of GLBT and queer Minnesotans stand out, a testament to the formidable archive the OHP has created and analyzed in this valuable book.


Reviewed by William Pencack (The Pennsylvania State University)

Demonstrating their masculinity has always been important for men in the United States. From the filibusters who went off to conquer Latin American nations in the 1840s and the followers of the strenuous life championed by Theodore Roosevelt to the present enthusiasm for football, professional wrestling, and NASCAR racing, American men have engaged in behavior that may seem irrational from any viewpoint except their own. As Thomas Foster’s collection *New Men: Manliness in Early America* helps to show, these dimensions of American masculinity hold their origins in colonial societies vastly different from those in Europe. In many places men far outnumbered women and were not subject to the usual restraints of traditional society; in nearly all of them, white men had to come to terms with Black and Native American men who threatened both the colonies’ existence and whose (frequently unclothed) bodies challenged their notions of what it meant to be a man.

Fittingly, a ferocious image of pirate Bartholomew the Portuguese stares at us from the cover of Foster’s collection, which includes twelve first-rate essays on manliness in early America. The essays, written by both younger and more established scholars, are fairly short, extremely readable, and without exception fascinating. The book is reasonably priced and deserves wide use in undergraduate courses on sexuality and early American history. Foster should be familiar to the readers of this newsletter as the premier historian of sexual relations in early America, both from his book *Sex and the Eighteenth-Century Man: Massachusetts and the History of Sexuality in America* (Beacon Press, 2006), and the essay collection, *Long Before Stonewall: Histories of Same-Sex Sexuality in Early America* (New York University Press, 2007). Though there is not a hint of same-sex activity in his latest effort, *New Men* offers many insights for scholarship on sexuality and gender more broadly.

The collection begins with Jamestown, where John McCurdy blames much of the colony’s hard times on three contrasting views of masculinity. The feudal view, manifested by George Percy, saw aristocrats as the primary possessors of masculinity and held that aristocrats could do as they chose at others’ expense. John Smith’s achievement-oriented concept of masculinity applied to those who contributed to the colony regardless of class. Meanwhile, Thomas Dale defined masculinity through stringent discipline, based on the changing nature of English and European armies as well-trained lower-class state supported infantry replaced upper-class cavalry supported by the nobility. McCurdy has added yet another, and an important, reason for Jamestown’s early failure: different versions of masculinity offered different models for how to rule the colony and ensure its survival. Ironically, none of these competing models won out: tobacco and men who proved their worth by making it profitable did.

Anne Marie Plane shows a completely different masculinity at work in New England by examining the dreams of upper-class patriarchs. They feared disorder both in their society and themselves, and confided to their diaries worrisome dreams that revealed these trends. By contrast, they regarded the Native Americans’ flaunting of extravagant dreams to demonstrate shamanic power as proof positive of their diabolic inspiration.

Combined with upper-class privilege and the desire to defeat enemies, gun possession has been central to expressions of masculinity since early colonial times. Three essays in the collection relate colonial violence to masculinity. Two focus on the contrast between British and Native American views of what it meant to be a man. Tyler Boulware demonstrates that many European Britons regarded the Americans as effete and incompetent warriors compared to the Native Americans; Native Americans shared this perception when...
the whites launched invasions of their territory that merely destroyed villages and failed to confront warriors. Complementing this analysis, Susan Abram’s fascinating essay sets Cherokee warfare in its elaborate spiritual context by analyzing male initiation, pre- and post-war ceremonies, and practices of honoring animals, chanting war songs, and torturing captives.

Carolyn Eastman brings us back to the pirates, whose exploits were exaggerated in internationally best-selling narratives. They won backhanded admiration for their courage and defiance of a class-based society under which many landsmen also chafed. She demonstrates attitudes toward pirates’ masculinity and sexuality through splendid illustrations, including the one on the book’s cover and others that can be found on a linked website.

Trevor Burnard and Natalie Zacek present complementary views of white men in the British West Indies. Burnard attributes their lascivious lifestyle to a short life span, absolute authority over slaves, and great wealth. But he finds that white men were forced to respect Black masculinity by allowing Black men to have informal wives and families. Zacek, in turn, questions the idea that most men in the West Indies lived like frat boys on spring break. She notes that while diarists tended to present negative examples both for their readers’ edification and titillation, careful reading of their texts shows admirable characters as well. Kathleen Brown's article, on the other hand, stresses that Black men had only their bodies to demonstrate their masculinity, and did so by stoically or defiantly bearing pain and punishment. She also notes the attraction of European men to Black male physiques accompanied by efforts to deny their humanity. That whites defined Blacks as lazy, thieving, and sexually overactive is an obvious projection onto the “other” of their own behavior. These attitudes, of course, have persisted throughout American history with tragic results.

Nothing could be further from the West Indies than the standard of masculinity in colonial Philadelphia, where a weak government in an economically flourishing community gave the most status to men who built community institutions. Benjamin Franklin was only one of many who used the voluntary association — from fire societies to the Library Company, from fishing clubs to ethnic charitable associations — to demonstrate the locally agreed upon standard that a good man demonstrated virtue. This meant civic consciousness, not necessarily sexual abstinence. Jessica Choppin Runey, whose excellent, comprehensive dissertation on the associations of pre-revolutionary Philadelphia is the basis for this article, also notes that women were entirely excluded from such associations. It would be fascinating to take her story into the early republic when, for instance, 52 of the 395 subscribers to the Philadelphia Dispensary to provide free health care for the poor (founded in 1786) were women who could vote by proxy at meetings.

Masculinity was an important factor mobilizing men during the American Revolution. Benjamin Irvin takes the figure of the henpecked husband, presented by at least two loyalist satirists as the typical revolutionary, and presents it in the context of two opponents challenging each others’ masculinity in print. John Adams, collection editor Thomas Foster tells us, chose the self-restrained Hercules who chose virtue over passion as his own model (the young lawyer did not marry until he was twenty-nine largely out of devotion to his career). Adams even suggested Hercules be represented on the new republic’s seal. Other paragons of civic virtue from Greek and Roman antiquity fortified the Revolution’s leaders. Janet Lindman reminds us, however, that their followers were largely not readers of the classics but Christians, many of them evangelical. She calls attention to the numerous published sermons of revolutionary chaplains who urged men, with reasonable success, to fight a virtuous war that would synthesize a fighting spirit with the manly restraint that prevented war from degenerating into barbarism.

Introductory comments by editor Foster and Mary Beth Norton and a concluding note by Toby Ditz suggest generalizations that emerge from reading the essays collectively. Ditz is especially astute in noting that two kinds of frontiers — both military and gendered encounters with “others” such as blacks and Native Americans — shaped the way early (white) American men came to think of themselves. She also adds that more attention is needed to how women helped shape masculinity. New Men thus points towards important areas for new scholarship. Most significantly, thanks to Foster and his collaborators the history of American masculinity now begins with the history of America itself.

Noreen Giffney and Michael O’Rourke, eds., The Ashgate Research Companion to Queer Theory (Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2009)

Reviewed by Julian Carter (California College of the Arts)

Ashgate describes its Research Companion volumes as “designed to offer scholars and graduate students a comprehensive and authoritative state-of-the-art review of current research in a particular area.” Such a volume could be a godsend to the many historians of LGBTQ subjects who feel out of the queer-theoretical loop; it might shed some light on the tensions between queer theory and queer history, or clarify what history has to offer theory and vice versa. This is not that book. Though the Companion is a brilliantly edited, excitingly diverse collection, its significant
strengths are not likely to make it worth $165 to many historians.

This is a pity because thematic anthologies are rarely of such quality, and there is much to learn from paying attention to this Research Companion’s structure as well as to its contents. The volume contains 29 essays, all commissioned for this volume, and each supplemented with five suggested “further readings” as well as a complete bibliography. Contributors are careful to report and evaluate the positions and major players in current debates within subfields ranging from the sociology of sports to medieval English literature. While this topical breadth is intellectually exciting, it also risks incoherence — a risk the editors successfully contain by grouping essays into four heading areas (Identity, Discourse, Normativity, and Relationality, which reflect queer theory’s core areas of engagement from the early 1990s to the mid-oughts). Essays within each area not only share basic investments but also speak to one another’s approaches — sometimes in concert, sometimes in conflict — in a way that captures much of the dynamism of queer theoretical conversation.

The picture of the field that emerges from this volume is remarkably, excitingly diverse along several axes. Most LGBTQ studies and theory continues to grapple with the over-representation of white gay men; not this book, which is far more successful than most at uncoupling “queer” from any given axis of identity. At the same time, the editors have made an obvious effort to include work intended to provoke further exploration of the more marginalized identity-categories. Thus the book’s opening section, “Identities,” features contributions addressing theoretical tools for engaging queer heterosexuality, intersex, bisexuality, lesbians, FTM masculinities, and cyborgs and other non-human queers. Other essays outline conceptual tools and questions important for tackling issues of migration, dis/ability, racialization, and violence. There’s more to be done along these lines, but this topical range is perhaps the volume’s most significant contribution. It is all the more laudable in that very few of the essays seem to have been included because they fill a niche rather than for their intellectual value. Still, to my mind the best essays go far beyond the volume’s review function to offer strikingly original interpretations of discourse and events. Two of these in particular are outstandingly well-conceived, well-executed approaches to crucial issues in interdisciplinary queer studies. Meredith Raimondo, “Generic Definitions: Taxonomies of Identity in AIDS Discourse” (147-166) and Myra J. Hird, “Biologically Queer” (347-362) are utterly brilliant and will certainly provoke important discussions in many advanced undergraduate and graduate classrooms.

So the Companion is very well-designed and well-crafted. Nonetheless it has several significant weaknesses. First, the volume is already out of date. If the publications cited are any indication, the volume was completed in 2007 at latest; most essays cite nothing more recent than 2005. This matters because queer theory has been gathering renewed force in the past five years, in large part due to a surge of brilliant work on affect, embodiment, and temporality. These subjects are not represented, which means that the volume does not actually provide a snapshot of the current state of the field. Another problem is that the editors’ evident commitment to breadth does not adequately undermine the troublingly narrow, and increasingly prominent, formation in which “queer theory” is rooted in literary methods developed in and reflecting the concerns of the global North. In the editor’s introduction, Giffney notes that queer theory is produced in “locations as diverse as Ireland, Poland, the Netherlands, Germany, Russia, Africa, New Zealand and India” (3), but in fact the essays are almost entirely authored by scholars from the Anglophone remnants of the British Empire; contributors to this volume are predominantly from the United Kingdom (13) and the United States (10), with four from Canada, two from Australia, and one from South Africa (schooled in England and working in France). Their disciplinary range is greater but still skewed. Ten contributors were trained or are teaching in English literature departments, while another six are in sociology. The remainder includes three film scholars and two psychologists, and one contribution each from people working in geography, law, performance studies, American studies, and archeology. History, anthropology, theology and the arts are not included at all.

These omissions raise serious questions about how the field of “queer theory” is defined and, of particular interest to readers of the newsletter, how historical scholarship and queer theory speak to one another today. While interdisciplinary queer studies once featured powerful historical analyses of social constructionism, the contingency of identity categories, and sexuality’s relationship to gender and race, historical investigation itself is rarely perceived as “theoretical” enough to be intellectually provocative beyond its content. It is often assumed to be little more than a collection of “community stories,” rather than an investigation into the imbrications of sexuality with other social structures or an investigation into precisely what might constitute “queer history.” The Companion therefore leaves me wondering why the work historians do is now seen as fundamentally different from theory. In the end the volume’s strongest contribution to LGBTQ history may be the provocation it offers for historical research: through what cultural processes, events, and texts did LGBTQ history become marginal to queer theorizing?

Reviewed by Julio Capó, Jr. (Yale University)

Carlos Ulises Decena’s first book, *Tacit Subjects*, is a most welcome addition to the nascent field of queer Latina/o studies. Like Marysól Asencio, Lionel Cantú, Ramón Gutiérrez, Susana Peña, José Quiroga, and Horacio Roque Ramírez, Decena explores how sexuality intersects with converging class, racial, and ethnic realities. Decena interviewed twenty-five queer Dominican immigrant men living in New York City, weaving their experiences into a remarkably compact analysis that challenges preconceived notions of ethnic and (homo)sexual identities. Decena argues that migration has brought his subjects into “an increasingly transnational Dominican society” where they “continu[e] to juggle their proximity with fellow compatriots in the city with the advantages and challenges of pursuing a life as men who love and have sex with men” (2). Decena envisions his subjects as part of a community whose same-sex encounters may go beyond carnal desires and sexual appetites, as to not preclude the possibility of romantic or platonic relations. Save one, all of Decena’s interviewees self-identify as gay or bisexual men. His analysis of their lives encourages the reader to consider the queer dimensions that can easily be overlooked in the *barrios* of Santo Domingo and the *bodegas* of Washington Heights. As Decena suggests, these queer spaces are anything but invisible and are a vital part of how these men fashion their own ethnic, class, racial, gender, and sexual identities.

Decena’s first chapter encourages a new understanding of queer identity politics. He argues that queer of color identities are too often oversimplified and dismissed as part of a “closeted” culture, wherein queer Latinos maintain a public identity that appears — on the surface — to reject the identity often embraced by “gay” men in the United States. He complicates this phenomenon by observing how these queer men are instead “tacit subjects” whose sexual identities are already understood or assumed within particular social circles. He attributes the “tacit” nature of their sexual identities, in part, to the power dynamics inherent in their transnational experiences. Decena uncovers how particular circumstances churn the wheels of knowledge production that may reveal or conceal the immigrants’ sexual identities. For example, in chapter two, Decena elaborates on these circumstances by dissecting how race and class structure the men’s health (i.e., HIV/AIDS), economic independence, and immigration status (i.e., documented vs. undocumented). In chapter three, Decena explores how the United States’ long history of empire in the Dominican Republic informs queer men’s “self-making.” He investigates how their sense of *dominicanidad*, or Dominican identity, changes over time as a result of migration and settlement. Further, Decena deconstructs how some of his interviewees interpret “racism” as part of a larger matrix in which they experienced “homophobia” and how they employ classist preconceptions to detach themselves from particular stigmas often linked to Dominican immigrants.

The subsequent chapters introduce the reader to prominent characters in the U.S. and the Dominican immigrant queer imagination, including the archetypes and gendered categories that have historically framed queerness throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. In chapter four, Decena tackles the body politics of his subjects. He reinterprets many of the notions defining the “masculine” attributes of “top” Latino men, commonly personified as *el tíguere*, *machito*, or *bugarrón*, as well as the traditional feminized embodiment of *la loca* or *mujercita*. He challenges simple binaries between masculine and feminine expression by exploring underlying class and racial tensions. In chapter five, he builds on these points by demonstrating how his subjects often employ “code swishing” as a means of maintaining a distinct queer identity within circles where non-normative gender behavior is more accepted. In other settings this “code swishing,” a clever play on the linguistic flexibility known as “code switching,” allows men to limit their queer visibility to obtain greater upward social mobility.

Decena’s final section ties his previous discussions together. He explores how notions of modernity and *dominicanidad* remain central to the power dynamics he argues have repositioned the gendered constructions of the Dominican *loca* or *tíguere*. He investigates the “democratic” nature — or lack thereof — of these immigrants’ sexual patterns. He demonstrates how migration serves as a liberating means for “top” men to explore their “bottom” impulses, and vice versa. In chapter seven, Decena further reimagines power hierarchies by exploring how queer immigrant men who return home engage with the island’s sex tourism. Building on research into Caribbean sex tourism by scholars such as Mark Padilla, Decena provides a refreshing vantage point detached from the traditional narrative that depicts queer white men as colonial “exploiters.” He places the commodification of the Dominican *tíguere* in a global and capitalist context and, in so doing, assigns greater agency to queer Dominican returnees as both producers and consumers of “exotic” carnal desire. This encourages a more elastic definition of queer identity politics, as the immigrants challenge the “rigidity” American “gay” life affords them by performing new roles upon their return to the island.

*Tacit Subjects* makes an original, interdisciplinary contribution, bringing together literary, socio-historical, philosophical, and cultural methodologies and theoretical
approaches; Decena should be applauded. I am particularly grateful that he includes the original Spanish texts alongside their English translations. Spanish readers can identify syntax and terminology that might otherwise get lost in translation. Despite the book’s strong analysis, however, there are also missed opportunities. Although Decena refers to the “bisexuality” of some of his subjects, it does not appear as a formal or distinct category in this text. That is, there is limited discussion on how this identity may or may not have altered a man’s experience on the island or in New York. Similarly, his limited discussion of butch lesbians as a threat to the queer male immigrants’ sense of masculinity seems underdeveloped (64). These characters appear as ghosts in the text that leave the reader questioning how gender dissent informs sexual diversity. By contrast, he offers an insightful analysis of an MTF transsexual whose Dominican father grew more comfortable with her early-age gender difference, suggesting that the father interpreted her transition as a sort of panacea for what would have otherwise been categorized as male homosexuality. The book also makes only passing references to regime changes and general socio-political shifts on the island. For example, the reader is introduced to the Guerrero family in chapter two and learns that the mother raised her children in a Catholic household, despite the father being a “communist” (44). These socio-political details are crucial to understanding not just the subject’s gendered upbringing, but also the motivations behind his migration and settlement. More background on resistance movements and the distinct policies of such figures as Rafael Trujillo or Joaquín Balaguer would have situated Decena’s often-floating subjects more clearly into time and place. While this information may have strengthened the analysis, its omission does not detract from the book’s many accomplishments.

Ultimately, Tacit Subjects offers more than just a rich analysis. It is also a pleasure to read. The book is an autoethnography enhanced by Decena’s own experiences and expertise. It is clear that his connection to the queer Dominican community — including his past work in Latino AIDS-prevention research and activism — provided his subjects the trust and comfort to divulge sensitive material. Decena’s prose, insight, and commentary are entertaining and personable. He makes charming use of language (e.g., the difficulty Spanish speakers encounter in pronouncing “leave” versus “live” and its subtle connection to the queer transnational experience) and is unabashedly frank (e.g., noting his friend’s suggestion that he hire a bugarrón to “work his ass”). In his epilogue, Decena suggests a post-colonial reformulation of Dominican (homo)sexuality by describing a T-shirt aimed at a gay, Anglo tourist market that reads “buggaron,” a misspelling of the mythical Latino lover. The misspelling, he suggests, is indicative of a completed cycle “that returns the word to travel and to U.S. empire” (239). Like Decena, I too would want to purchase this novelty item. Where I would wear it remains uncertain, but I am sure that like the imagined archetype it represents, the T-shirt would not remain in the closet. As Decena argues, queer Dominican immigrant identities are neither covert, static, nor one-dimensional and cannot be subsumed within a homogenous queer community.


Reviewed by Kevin White (Portsmouth University, UK)

Sheila Rowbotham’s Edward Carpenter: A Life of Liberty and Love is a tour de force by Britain’s pioneer women’s historian; the book is designed to reclaim Carpenter in the heart of the history of the British Labour Party and the gay community. In this book, Rowbotham expands on the themes of her 1976 book Socialism and the New Life, co-authored with Jeffrey Weeks, in which she portrayed Carpenter as a prototype hippy or beatnik living out his socialist ideals in a country commune with his working-class boyfriend. “Consumed” by the links between the personal and the political aspects of Carpenter’s life, Rowbotham recaptures him in full complexity and presents a mature and refreshed reflection, not only on Carpenter, but also on the development of the British Left and its links to sexual dissidence.

Carpenter was born in Brighton (now Europe’s gay capital) in 1844, the scion of a family enriched by the Indian Empire. He was thus independently wealthy all his life. While at university, he seems to have indulged a love of ancient Greek culture and first consummated his passion for young men; he also read Walt Whitman’s poetry. Eventually, in 1882, Carpenter wrote to Whitman in New Jersey and, by all accounts, probably slept with him there. In Love’s Coming of Age (1896), Carpenter wrote of a “Spiritual Democracy” that would see the growth of socialism in England through the comradeship of a “Theban” band of brothers. Love and the attainment of socialism would grow in tandem. There was nothing particularly original in these ideas; Carpenter borrowed from Whitman as he borrowed from William Morris’s ideals of Socialist community.

Except that Carpenter practised what he preached. In 1887, he took up with arguably the love of his life, George Hukin, who in some ways is the hero of this book. Hukin and Carpenter were friends until Hukin passed away, at 57, in 1916. He was a skilled craftsman, a man of deep integrity who worked solidly and pragmatically to improve the lot of the working man, and “the lynchpin of the Sheffield Socialist Society because of his organisational skills and steadiness of judgement” (106). When he enthusiastically took up with
Carpenter, he was already a widower. After two years in a fully consummated and mutually meaningful sexual relationship with Carpenter, he suddenly announced he was getting married again. This news devastated Carpenter, although the two men continued to sleep together sporadically for years to come. Rowbotham insists that their relationship preceded any categorization, and that “no theory” could explain its complexity. Yet it fits into our understanding of nineteenth century same-sex relationships. Hukin simply saw his sexual friendship with Carpenter as a natural extension of his masculinity; Carpenter, as was common among Victorian elites, saw the working class male as embodying a primitive sexuality.

By the mid 1890s, the politically and socially idealistic world of the 1880s had given way to the trials and imprisonment of Oscar Wilde, which did so much in England to bring on the twentieth century gay/straight dichotomy. Men who slept with other men were dubbed “Oscarwilde.” By this time, Carpenter had met a man who was prepared to dedicate his life to him: a slightly wilder, more earthy, but less politically-engaged version of Hukin, George Merrill, with whom he had a 35 year relationship, albeit an open one on both sides. As the twentieth century moved on, Carpenter became a renowned international figure through his publications, such as Civilisation: Its Cause and Cures (1889), and other syntheses of contemporary European thought made possible by his fluency in German, Italian, and French. People, both famous and ordinary, came from around the world to visit Carpenter and Merrill in their rural community at Millthorpe in Yorkshire. Young men visited “the English Walt Whitman” to sleep with him. Through Carpenter’s life, Rowbotham brilliantly and wittily illuminates the sexual meanings of the day. Her best anecdote concerns one of the visits of Chester Alan Arthur III, the grandson of the 1880s United States President. Arthur later published a vivid description of sex with the eighty-year old Carpenter, which Rowbotham cites. This suggests a line of connection from Walt Whitman who slept with Carpenter who slept with Arthur who slept with Neal Cassidy, the model for Dean Moriarty in On the Road.

Carpenter’s fame within the Labour movement was such that when he turned eighty (1924), the first Labour government sent him an album signed by all the members of the Cabinet. His death in 1929 was similarly an occasion for significant commemoration. Yet until the onset of gay liberation and Rowbotham’s work in the 1970s, Carpenter was all but forgotten. In a final chapter, Rowbotham tries to prove Carpenter’s influence over a whole range of movements, from vegetarianism to environmentalism. While Rowbotham has produced a great book, I remain unconvinced that Carpenter himself is a truly great figure. The mud that George Orwell threw at Carpenter in his brilliant dissection of class prejudice and the North/South divide on the English Left, The Road to Wigan Pier, (1937) has stuck. With Carpenter in mind, Orwell spoke scathingly of every “fruit-juice drinker, nudist, sandal-wearing sex-maniac, Quaker, ‘Nature Cure’ quack, pacifist and feminist” as being attracted to Labour. Elsewhere, he referenced “the sort of eunuch type with a vegetarian smell, who go about spreading sweetness and light — readers of Edward Carpenter or some other pious sodomite” (442). Rightfully, if distastefully, he saw Carpenter’s type of socialism — utopian and rooted in cultural politics — as irrelevant in the impending world crisis and a distraction from the deeper goals of the Labour movement. The historian A.J.P. Taylor also famously denounced Carpenter as a “crank.” The mid twentieth century British Left chose to bury its gay legacy, as the Labour Party dismissed cultural and feminist politics in the brave new world of the welfare state.

Today, Carpenter lacks both relevance on the Left and popular significance as a gay forerunner. His world was one that the medical model and then later gay liberation would sweep away. His is now the “love that dare not speak its name,” that between a young man and an older man, and the wealthy man who loved younger proletarians. Imagine a seventy-five year old man holding court in the countryside while a string of young men queue up to be fellated by him. I suspect that in Britain, anyway, gay members of the police force might be the first to arrest him as being politically unsound. Although Carpenter discreetly supported Oscar Wilde during his trials, they had little in common. The butch Carpenter would not have related to Wilde’s urban campery and flamboyance that marked the future. Rightly, Rowbotham never once describes Carpenter as “gay.” All the same, as a road not taken, the story of the life of Edward Carpenter, so compellingly told here, deserves a wider audience if only as the identification of that very English type: the loveable eccentric. Carpenter as a butch Quentin Crisp, anyone?

Susan K. Freeman, Sex Goes to School: Girls and Sex Education before the 1960s (Urbana and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008)

Reviewed by Allison Miller (Rutgers University, New Brunswick)

In Sex Goes to School: Girls and Sex Education before the 1960s, Susan K. Freeman challenges expectations that the late 1940s and 1950s were a time of conservative attitudes toward sex education in the United States and argues that a spirit of openness and even democracy pervaded sex education curricula in the early postwar era. With rich descriptions of course materials and a persuasive analysis of
the interaction between experts, teachers, parents, and students, the book is useful for those who seek to understand the workings of gender and sexuality in postwar education and youth culture. While lessons varied, it was junior high and high school students’ own queries about their pubescent bodies, dating, and marriage that animated classrooms. Some curricula bore the influence of scientific and medical experts, yet question-and-answer sessions proved vital to sex education pedagogy, and the anonymous question box became a staple of sex education classes across the country. Although teachers and course materials almost always discouraged topics such as birth control and homosexuality, students’ own concerns drove many programs. Freeman argues that sex education in the postwar era was not solely a matter of moralistic, top-down instruction; rather, it engaged preadolescents and teenagers with topics that concerned them.

Admirably comprehensive in national scope, Sex Goes to School focuses on the creation and classroom dynamics of three influential programs in Oregon; Toms River, New Jersey; and San Diego, California. These three programs served as models for the rest of the country and differed slightly in their approaches. In Oregon, a sometimes-messy collaboration among educators, philanthropists, and scientists produced the film Human Growth, viewed by two million schoolchildren between 1948 and 1962 (51). Human Growth took an “objective,” straightforward approach to human anatomy and physical and emotional changes of puberty. It also depicted a classroom of students asking questions, modeling to viewers how discussions could be conducted: frankly, without giggling or profanity. The Toms River curriculum included a high school elective, “Family Relationships.” In this popular class, young women and men talked about pressing issues of adolescence while sitting on homey sofas instead of at formally arranged desks; the comfortable, open environment helped them discuss what might be embarrassing subjects. San Diego’s program began in the late 1930s and reached students as early as the sixth grade, providing information about the pubescent body as well as information on social “adjustment.”

Despite the variety of these approaches, Freeman writes, sex education between about 1945 and 1960 marked a break from earlier philosophies of how to teach young people about their bodies (already well documented in scholarship by Jeffrey Moran and Janice Irvine). Prewar curricula sprang to a great extent from fears of venereal disease spreading among young people; educators had to warn students away from sex without giving any hints about how coitus was performed. Freeman notes that these fears lingered into the postwar era, as midcentury educators worried that sex education would amount to sex instruction. Yet new materials concentrated less on the supposed evils of masturbation or lustful desires. Human Growth, for instance, sent the message that the human body was nothing to be ashamed of by providing information about external and internal anatomy, but the film left it to students to figure out the mechanics of copulation (92).

Yet the needs of young people and the nation were different after the war, which especially affected lessons designed for older students. Most strikingly, masturbation was no longer “self-abuse.” It was not ideal, of course — it could tragically disrupt or even substitute for sex within marriage — but curricula acknowledged that it was something many people did (80-81). Moreover, as young people married at significantly younger ages, information about family life seemed urgently necessary for juniors and seniors as preparation for marital “adjustment” (120). These new approaches, which many young people enthusiastically embraced, resulted from psychologists’ growing influence in designing courses (29-30). Indeed, one of the signal contributions of Sex Goes to School is in fleshing out these experts’ new role. On the whole, psychologists were more concerned that young people develop healthy attitudes toward heterosexuality and less focused on warning of the dangers of sexual indulgence (145). But psychologists’ input also stressed nonsexual aspects of adolescence and young adulthood, such as being comfortable in the company of the opposite sex and expressing oneself within normative gender roles. This emphasis entailed conformity not just to behavioral standards but also to postwar iterations of mental health.

In addition to analyzing the intentions of those who designed midcentury sex education curricula, Sex Goes to School also attempts to do something other studies of sex education have generally been unable to contribute, namely, provide more information about students themselves. Freeman examines student questions, polls, and one student’s workbook completed for the Toms River course. Several student letters to educators (especially Toms River’s charismatic Elizabeth Force) confirm the utility of the lessons. But this information is not as well developed as it might be, which detracts somewhat from Freeman’s argument that sex education in the 1950s was democratic. Indeed, despite the sincerity of those who designed and taught these programs, it is easy to imagine the coercion inherent in classroom dynamics. Freeman pointedly examines the none-too-subtle construction of normative gender, class, and race ideals in course materials, but cannot demonstrate the effects these messages had on students in coed class discussions. It seems likely that students shut out of popularity regimes — those who did not date or could never be prom king or queen — would feel vulnerable in classroom discussions, as would young lesbians, gay men, or other sexual minorities. “Family Relations” was a one-
semester elective, and students who felt isolated to begin with might have avoided it; then again, some who felt abnormal and wanted to know what to do about it might have enrolled.

The other curious drawback to Sex Goes to School is that it promises to be a history of girls but only partly follows through. Freeman’s discussion of menstrual “hygiene” is vivid, and hints at (though does not analyze) the power wielded by women, who often taught sex education courses even if they were not always instrumental in designing curricula. On the other hand, the book establishes that coeducation was vitally important, the better to prepare young people for marriage. All-girl classrooms were established mostly for in-depth lessons about menstruation or for the younger students in San Diego (85).

Yet Sex Goes to School does take the reader as far into the classroom as the evidence permits while simultaneously identifying trends pervasive across the United States. Freeman points out that sex education met with widespread community approval after the war because vocal reactive forces had not yet coalesced. While she resists analyzing the 1945-1960 period as a golden age, she acknowledges the irony that anti-sex, abstinence-only education is of quite recent vintage. Though her discussions of course materials and their implementation may be a bit stronger than her evidence of students’ views, Sex Goes to School is a valuable resource for scholars of youth, education, and sexuality in the postwar United States. Additionally, though its discussions of LGBT adolescents are only glancing, cultural and social historians might build on its insights to consider how young people felt the impact of the closet in spaces that were designed to be safe.
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Donations and dues support Committee on LGBT History activities at the AHA annual meeting and other conferences, our prizes, our newsletter, and our other projects. Mail membership forms, dues, and donations to:

Wesley J. Chenault, Ph.D., C.A.
Head, Special Collections and Archives
James Branch Cabell Library
Virginia Commonwealth University Libraries
901 Park Avenue
P. O. Box 842033
Richmond, VA 23284-2033
CALLS 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, 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 Thomas A. Foster at tfoster4@depaul.edu.

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, Calif.), 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