

proval, or else conceal his identity behind an impermeable pseudonym.

The Ferment of Change. Change was not to come until the 1960s when demographic and social trends, catalyzed by the growth of the **Counterculture** and opposition to the Vietnam War, caused a loosening of traditional attitudes. The new educational theories seemed to bring life into the placid—sometimes almost comatose—purlieu of educational theory. Yet this shakeup was less novel than it was assumed, going back to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's eighteenth-century critique of authoritarianism in education. A number of the 1960s reformers were themselves gay. The most notable of these was Paul Goodman (1911–1972) who, largely self-educated, sought to bring an anarchist perspective to the theory of education.

In 1966 Stephen Donaldson founded the first gay student organization on the campus of Columbia University in New York City. Despite much opposition on the part of administrations, similar organizations sprang up in hundreds of North American college campuses. Shortly thereafter, but more cautiously, gay and lesbian teachers' associations, usually comprising those in the primary and secondary schools rather than college teachers, appeared in a number of localities.

In 1973 the Gay Academic Union (GAU) was formed in New York City to bring institutional change and foster the development of gay studies programs in academia. In keeping with the liberationist ideas of the time, GAU expected that many faculty members would "come out" by acknowledging their homosexuality, and that some of these would offer courses in gay and lesbian studies. Yet by the end of the eighties there were probably fewer than fifty openly gay and lesbian tenured professors in an American university system that boasted more than 2000 campuses. Moreover, these faculty members tend to be concentrated in schools of second rank rather than in the Ivy League and the great state universities. The caution of

many established teachers, combined with a covert "tracking system" that tended to shunt overtly gay faculty to the sidelines, served to reduce the number of "out" teachers. The situation with gay studies has been even more discouraging. No coordinated programs, such as those for women's studies and black studies, took root, and there was even a dearth of individual courses. Much research and teaching has had to be organized in parallel, private institutions, such as Los Angeles's ONE, Inc. Finally, in the 1980s the emergence of a more conservative social climate and the AIDS crisis have caused gay and lesbian students, especially in secondary schools, to assume a lower profile.

In short, the bottle is half empty, but it is also half full. It is unlikely that there will be a return to the atmosphere of clandestinity and open contempt with which gay members of the college community had to contend in the 1950s. Many university administrations acknowledge the need to support gay and lesbian student organizations, and few are willing to tolerate antigay violence on campus. Gay studies courses may be scarce, but special campus events in what is often termed "gay pride week" offer informative lectures. Although faculty still find little encouragement in their efforts to expand teaching and research in this realm, an increasing number of serious scholars are writing and publishing on homosexuality in their own disciplines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Wayne R. Dynes, *Homosexuality: A Research Guide*, New York: Garland, 1987; J. Lee Lehman, ed., *Gays on Campus*, Washington, DC: National Students Association, 1975; Henri-Irenée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, New York: New American Library, 1956.

Ward Houser

EDWARD II (1284–1327)

Plantagenet king of England. Born at Caernarvon, Edward was the first English Prince of Wales. Said by one four-

teenth-century chronicler to have "particularly delighted in the vice of sodomy," Edward's open homosexuality was a contributing factor in his overall lack of success as king.

Following in the footsteps of Edward I, the "Hammer of the Scots," was no easy task, and it was one for which Edward II seems to have been singularly unfitted. From his youth he showed himself to be rather irresponsible; he was an habitual and extravagant gambler, and on one occasion he precipitated his own exile from his father's court by recklessly breaking into a park belonging to the bishop of Chester.

In order to provide the prince with a role model of courteous martial behavior, Edward I introduced a young Gascon, Piers Gaveston, into his son's court in 1300. Ironically, Gaveston was to become Edward II's lover and a focal point of the baronial discontent that was to last throughout his reign, culminating in the king's deposition and murder in 1327.

In the spring of 1307 Edward I exiled Gaveston in an effort to restrain his son's behavior, but within a few months the aged monarch was dead, and Edward of Caernarvon had ascended to the throne. Gaveston was immediately recalled and elevated to the peerage as Earl of Cornwall. Soon thereafter he married the king's niece, Margaret de Clare, sister of the Earl of Gloucester. This sort of lavish display of patronage was ultimately to be the undoing of both Gaveston and Edward.

Dissatisfaction with the king's rule—and Gaveston's influence—surfaced as early as January 1308 in a statement of baronial grievances known as the Boulogne Agreement, drafted at the wedding of Edward II to Isabella of France, daughter of Philip IV ("the Fair"). But this warning went largely unheeded.

Indeed, upon his return to England from his marriage in France, Edward his reported to have ignored the other magnates and run to Gaveston, hugging

him repeatedly while smothering him with kisses. A similar, and even more public, scene was played by the two at the banquet following the coronation of Edward and Isabella. Gaveston, resplendent in royal purple trimmed with pearls—looking like the god Mars according to one contemporary—was the center of attention. Indeed, the fact that Edward spent more time on the favorite's couch than on that of the queen was taken as an insult not only to the English nobility, but to the French royal house, represented at the banquet by the queen's uncles Charles d'Orléans and Louis d'Evreux and her brother, the future Charles IV.

The ultimate result of the banquet was Gaveston's second exile in as many years and Edward's assent to the appointment of a body of reformers, the Lords Ordainers. Gaveston spent the year between June 1308 and June 1309 as king's lieutenant in Ireland, and Edward spent the year working to restore his favorite. He achieved this, perhaps at the expense of more urgent concerns such as Robert the Bruce's rising power in Scotland, but learned little in the process.

Within months baronial discontent had resurfaced yet again, perhaps hastened by Gaveston's scurrilous nicknames for his fellow earls. A third exile for Gaveston ensued, followed by another swift but ill-conceived return. This time the favorite was hunted down and executed by the barons. A particularly vivid image of Edward's attachment to his favorite is presented by the ruby found on Gaveston's person when he was taken by the barons; "la Cérise" was valued at the phenomenal sum of one thousand pounds in 1312!

Edward's relations with the barons did not improve after Gaveston's death, but the king was not linked with another individual favorite until the emergence of Hugh le Despenser the younger in around 1320. There is less evidence of a sexual relationship between them, yet one has generally been presumed. If we are to be-

lieve the chronicler Jean Froissart, following her successful coup in 1326, Isabella ordered that Despenser's genitals be cut off and burned before his eyes prior to his hanging.

As for Edward himself, the red-hot poker which is said to have ended his life has virtually become a symbol of his unfortunate reign. However, regardless of the exact nature of his death, it is incorrect, as has sometimes been suggested, to claim that Edward was deposed and murdered *because* of his homosexuality. His sexual behavior was used as a means of justification for events after his death, as part of what can only be called a propaganda campaign on behalf of Isabella and her paramour Roger Mortimer. Nevertheless, Edward II's example was subsequently held up as a pointed warning to later kings—homosexual and/or ineffective—and their favorites, not only in England, but in France as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Natalie Fryde, *The Tyranny and Fall of Edward II, 1321–26*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979; J. S. Hamilton, *Piers Gaveston, Earl of Cornwall, 1307–1312*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1988; Hilda Johnstone, *Edward of Carnarvon, 1284–1307*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1946.

J. S. Hamilton

EFFEMINACY

Effeminacy is any of various forms of feminine or female-like behavior in a man. It tends to be disliked if not condemned in virtually every society—though, like other anxiety-arousing behavior, it can be the focus of wit and humor. In a few tribal societies where it is associated with shamanism it has been respected or feared.

By a kind of "opposites attract" reasoning, the effeminate man is generally assumed to want male partners in sex, and thus to be homosexual—a double error since effeminate men are sometimes notably heterosexual while, as the Kinsey re-

search found, most homosexuality is not marked by effeminacy; in fact, a very considerable amount of same-sex behavior "is found among ranchmen, cattlemen, prospectors, lumbermen, . . . groups that are virile, physically active." (Kinsey et al., p. 457).

Similar and worse confusions have arisen in various descriptions of what effeminate behavior actually is. The psychoanalysts, noting certain exaggerations in effeminacy, have interpreted its gestures as take-offs or as caricatures of women or of femininity (Bieber). Less abusive interpretations have simply noted the similarities between effeminacy and femininity, usually concluding that female-like mannerisms in a man must originate from "identity" problems, such as a profound uncertainty about his maleness, or an overt identification with women, or with his "overclose" mother. The appeal of such insufficiency theories is remarkable. They are in line with popular notions of a homosexual's "impairment" and "inadequacy" but fly in the face of important contradictions—not only from Kinsey but from a few perceptive clinicians: almost forty years ago Karen Machover demonstrated that, far from being "sexually confused," effeminate males frequently have a sharper-than-average awareness of male/female differences, even when they identify more with women than with men.

But if effeminacy is not impaired maleness, if it does not spell male insufficiency, and is not necessarily homosexual, if it is not a fixation on one's mother, nor a caricature of women, then what *is* it and where *does* it come from? Exactly where it comes from is too hard a question. (Like trying to say precisely why one person is more aggressive, or fussy, or good-natured than another, the answer is invariably multifaceted—too scattered among a maze of social, genetic and physiologic biases to permit confident answers.) But accurate and useful descriptions can be given.