decisions and undermine the effectiveness and legitimacy of the military.321

This Note has argued that Justice Rehnquist's opinion did not represent the adoption of such an absolute deference standard, although it skirted the edges of such a standard. The most effective method for protecting against such judicial abdication of the necessity of reviewing constitutional claims by servicepeople is to continue to impose on the government the burden of articulating a substantial relationship between the challenged governmental action and the core military functions of the nation. Unless such a relationship is established, the challenged military action should face the same balancing against individual interests as would any other governmental action. As in modified rational basis analysis, the government must make a reasonable showing that a true military purpose, not mere prejudice, is motivating its actions.

321. The military is undercutting its own effectiveness by allowing prejudice to govern its decisionmaking in personnel matters rather than the skill and effectiveness of the individual being reviewed. See supra note 5.
Hate Crimes Against Lesbians and Gay Men

Issues for Research and Policy
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ABSTRACT: Antigay hate crimes (words or actions that are intended to harm or intimidate individuals because they are lesbian or gay) constitute a serious national problem. In recent surveys, as many as 92% of lesbians and gay men report that they have been the targets of antigay verbal abuse or threats, and as many as 24% report physical attacks because of their sexual orientation. Assaults may have increased in frequency during the last few years, with many incidents now including spoken references to the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome by the assailants. Trends cannot be assessed, however, because most antigay hate crimes are never reported and no comprehensive national surveys of antigay victimization have been conducted. Suggestions are offered for research and policy.

Hate crimes are words or actions intended to harm or intimidate an individual because of her or his membership in a minority group; they include violent assaults, murder, rape, and property crimes motivated by prejudice, as well as threats of violence or other acts of intimidation (Finn & McNeil, 1987). Hate crimes, which are also called bias crimes, are especially serious because they potentially victimize an entire class of people. Based on an individual's minority status, they assail the victim's identity and intimidate other group members.

Public awareness of hate crimes has increased recently. Numerous government-commissioned reports have documented the problem and offered policy recommendations (e.g., Attorney General's Commission, 1986; Finn & McNeil, 1987; Governor's Task Force, 1988). Legislation mandating the collection of bias-crime data has been enacted in several states, including Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut (Finn & McNeil, 1987). Legislation with a similar intent was passed by the U.S. House of Representatives in 1988 ("Congress Bill on Hate," 1988); it has been reintroduced in both houses of the 101st Congress (H.R. 1048; S. 419). Special units for investigating bias crimes have been established by the police departments of Boston, New York, Baltimore County (MD), Nassau County (NY), and San Francisco, and by the Komenal County (ID) Sheriff's Department (Finn & McNeil, 1987).

Lesbians and gay men are principal targets of hate crimes. In a report to the National Institute of Justice, for example, Finn and McNeil (1987) observed that "homosexuals are probably the most frequent victims" of hate violence (p. 2). A statewide survey of 2,823 junior and senior high school students in New York revealed greater hostility toward gay people than toward racial or ethnic minorities; students' responses often included threats of antigay violence (Governor's Task Force, 1988).

Antigay hate crimes have serious consequences. In addition to the physical and psychological harm they inflict on the victims, antigay assaults create a climate of fear in gay communities. Lesbians and gay men often feel forced to hide their sexual orientation in public (e.g., by not holding hands with a lover or not displaying a lover's picture at work). Fear of antigay harassment also functions to enforce rigid norms of gender-appropriate behavior. Gay people and heterosexuals alike may refrain from certain behaviors (e.g., men might not touch other men: women might not excel at tasks that require physical exertion) and avoid certain gestures or clothing styles because they fear being labeled as gay.

Antigay hate crimes are of concern to psychologists for a variety of reasons. First, they threaten the well-being of our colleagues, students, clients, research participants, friends, and family—including those who are heterosexual—because anyone might be perceived as gay by assailants. Second, antigay hate crimes violate the human rights and civil liberties of a historically stigmatized minority group; psychologists repeatedly have stated their commitment to removing this stigma (e.g., American Psychological Association [APA], 1975). Third, psychologists have special knowledge relevant to addressing the problem of antigay hate crimes. Psychological expertise on prejudice and aggression is relevant to understanding the motivations of assailants and developing prevention programs. Survivors of antigay attacks often experience psychological problems that require clinical intervention beyond that needed by other assault victims. Finally, hate crimes are of concern to psychologists because they attack basic values: Like cross burnings, lynchings, and decretations of synagogues, they effectively limit individual rights of expression, association, and privacy.

Because antigay hate crimes only recently have been recognized as a problem, social science knowledge about them is sketchy. Their prevalence remains largely undocumented, and their causes and aftermath have not been systematically studied. In this article, therefore, I use information from disparate sources to define the problem and identify issues for empirical research and public policy.
The Context of Antigay Hate Crimes

Victimization of gay people is not a new phenomenon in the United States. Men were executed for sodomy in the American colonies as early as 1624. Throughout the past three centuries, lesbian and gay Americans have been routinely subjected to many forms of institutional violence including felony imprisonment and fines, castration and castrationectomy, forced psychiatric treatment, dishonorable discharge from the military, and general social ostracism (Katz, 1976). Despite their achievement of greater visibility and acceptance in recent years, lesbians and gay men continue to be targets of widespread institutional prejudice. Although racial, ethnic, and religious minorities also suffer from such prejudice, gay people are unique in that overt discrimination and intolerance against them often are officially condoned by governmental, religious, and social institutions. Discrimination in housing and employment on the basis of sexual orientation remains legal in every state except Wisconsin. Lesbian and gay male couples generally are denied the community recognition, legal protection, and economic benefits accorded to married heterosexual partners. Indeed, sexual intimacy between same-sex partners remains illegal in one half of the states, and the constitutionality of such laws was upheld by the United States Supreme Court in 1986 (Bowers v. Hardwick).

Antigay hate crimes must be understood, in part, as a logical outgrowth of this pervasive norm of intolerance. This climate of condemnation fosters antigay hate crimes and keeps them invisible. It discourages individuals from disclosing their homosexual orientation and from reporting bias crimes motivated by antigay prejudice.

Scope of the Problem

Antigay bias crimes take many forms. In Bucks County, PA, for example, two men were convicted of first-degree murder of a gay man. The victim was found dead with multiple stab wounds and his throat slit; his car had been set on fire (Correll, 1988; National Gay and Lesbian Task Force [NGLTF], 1988). In Portland, ME, three women were assaulted after their assailant directed antilebian epithets at them; all three women required medical attention, and one of them suffered a fractured jaw, several broken teeth, and bruised ribs (NGLTF, 1987). In Boston, a gay man leaving a local bar was attacked by three assailants who raped him with bottles, lighted matches, and other implements while repeatedly stating that "this is what faggots deserve" (NGLTF, 1987). In Philadelphia, an 18-year-old lesbian required stitches on her head and face after being assaulted by her lover’s former boyfriend; the man had waited for her outside her lover’s home and had accused her of seducing "his girlfriend" (Aurrad, Addessa, & Bush, 1985). In Stockton, CA, a well-known gay minister was found dead in the trunk of his car; his skull was crushed, his throat was slashed, and there were multiple stab wounds in his chest (NGLTF, 1987). In Greensboro, NC, a cross was burned outside the home of a gay man who hosted a health group dealing with AIDS (NGLTF, 1988).

Although such victimization and harassment are facts of life for most gay people, the problem has received scant attention from social and behavioral scientists. Only a few published studies document the prevalence of antigay victimization. Bell and Weinberg (1978), for example, reported that 35% of the 684 men and 2% of the 293 women in their sample had been robbed or assaulted at least once in connection with their homosexuality. Jay and Young (1977) found that 27% of their 4,400 male respondents reported experiencing physical abuse at least once in connection with their homosexuality, whereas 77% had experienced verbal abuse. For their 1,000 lesbian respondents, the proportions were 14% and 71%, respectively. Of the 289 gay men and lesbians who responded to a questionnaire distributed by Minneapolis Gay Community Services in 1979, 72.3% reported that they had experienced verbal harassment because of their sexual orientation; 23.2% had suffered physical assault; and 5.9% (including 10 male respondents) had been raped in an antigay assault (Anderson, 1982).

Additional data on antigay hate crimes are contained in reports prepared by various lesbian and gay organizations. In 1984, for example, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force conducted a survey of 654 lesbians and 1,420 gay men (total N = 2,074) in eight U.S. cities (Berrill, 1986). Nearly all of the respondents had experienced some type of harassment, threat, or attack; more than one fifth of the men and nearly one tenth of the women had been physically assaulted because of their sexual orientation (see Table 1). In a recent survey of Philadelphia residents by the Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force (PLGT; Gross, Aurad, & Addessa, 1988), 46% of the male respondents (n = 291) and 20% of the female respondents (n = 146) reported that they had experienced criminal violence during the previous year because of their sexual orientation. Additionally, 75% of the male
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* The rape of men by other men is largely an invisible problem in contemporary American society, assumed by most people to occur only in prison populations. In reality, however, it is a serious problem and often is part of antigay violence. Contrary to popular stereotype, the perpetrators of male rape often identify themselves as heterosexual (Gold & Burgess, 1980). As with rape of women by men, male rape is a crime of violence more than a crime of sexuality (Anderson, 1982; Groth & Burgess, 1980; Kaufman et al., 1980).
Table 1
Combined Data for Antigay Violence (Survey Studies) in Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of incident</th>
<th>PLGTF* (1986–1987)</th>
<th>PLGTF* (Lifetime)</th>
<th>Yale*</th>
<th>Penn*</th>
<th>Rutgers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threats</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects thrown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chased or followed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spat upon</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit, kicked, or beaten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with a weapon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism or arson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault/harassment</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police victimization</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School victimization</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents not reported</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* PLGTF = Philadelphia Lesbian and Gay Task Force (Gross et al., 1988). The figures reported in column 1 are incidents for male and female Philadelphia residents that occurred in the year prior to the survey; figures in column 2 are lifetime totals. Total sample sizes for the PLGTF studies = 437, with 146 female respondents (33%) and 291 male respondents (67%).
* NGLTF = National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (Baird, 1986). N = 2,074, including 654 female respondents (32%) and 1,420 male respondents (68%).
* Yale = Yale Sexual Orientation Survey (Hersk, 1986a). N = 216, including 93 female respondents (43%) and 117 male respondents (54%). Gender was not specified by 6 respondents; percentages were reported only for gay or bisexual members of the sample (n = 166).
* Penn = Pennsylvania State University (D'Augelli, 1988). N = 132, including 42 female respondents (37%) and 83 male respondents (63%).
* Rutgers = Rutgers Sexual Orientation Survey (Cavin, 1987). N = 141, including 84 female respondents (60%) and 57 male respondents (40%).

respondents and 57% of the female respondents reported that they had been verbally harassed during that period. Seventy-three percent of the men and 42% of the women reported that they had experienced criminal violence at some point in their lives because of their sexual orientation; 92% of the men and 81% of the women reported receiving antigay verbal abuse at some time.

Data about antigay victimization are also contained in several as yet unpublished research reports by social and behavioral scientists. For example, David J. McKirnan (personal communication, August 18, 1988) reported that 84% of the 2,652 gay male subjects in his Social Indicators Study (e.g., McKirnan & Peterson, 1988) had experienced antigay verbal harassment at least once, and 42% more than once; for the 748 lesbian respondents, the figures were 71% and 35%, respectively. He also found that 44% of the gay men had been the target of physical assault or vandalism at least once, and 31% more than once; for lesbians, the figures were 22% and 13%, respectively. In a panel study of 624 gay men in New York City by John L. Martin and Laura Dean (e.g., Martin, 1987), 12.2% reported in 1987 that they had experienced some form of antigay violence during the previous year (L. Dean, personal communication, August 22, 1988). A substantial proportion of the 166 gay and bisexual students, faculty, and staff at Yale University who completed a survey conducted by the author (Herek, 1986a) had experienced some form of antigay victimization on campus (see Table 1). Similar patterns were observed at Pennsylvania State University (D’Augelli, 1988) and Rutgers University (Cavin, 1987).

Is Antigay Victimization Increasing?

Observers recently have speculated that the prevalence of antigay hate crimes is increasing, possibly spurred by public reactions to the AIDS epidemic (Kim, 1988). The number of acts of antigay violence and victimization reported to the NGLTF Violence Project, for example, has risen steadily: from 2,042 in 1985 to 4,946 in 1986 (an increase of 142%) to 7,008 in 1987 (an increase of 42%; NGLTF, 1986, 1987, 1988). From 1985 to 1986, the New York City Gay and Lesbian Anti-Violence Project (AVP) recorded an 83% increase in its victim caseload (NGLTF, 1987); in 1987, the AVP served 14% more clients (NGLTF, 1988). The caseload of San Francisco’s Community United Against Violence (CUAV) increased by 50% from 1984 to 1985, by 14% in 1986, and by another 11% in 1987; CUAV reported also that the number of clients requiring medical attention rose by 23% from 1986 to 1987 (NGLTF, 1988).

These annual increases may simply reflect higher rates of reporting as organizations achieve greater visibility in local communities and as general awareness of the problem of antigay hate crimes increases. Survey data from gay samples, however, also support the hypothesis that victimization is increasing. Approximately twice as many respondents reported antigay criminal violence in the 1987 PLGTF survey than had reported it in a 1984 survey (Gross et al., 1988); the proportion of respondents who reported verbal harassment also increased substantially (up from 48% of males in 1984 to 75% in 1987, and from 39% of females in 1984 to 57% in 1987).
similar trend toward increased victimization is apparent in John Martin's panel study of gay men in New York City. In 1985, 8.8% of the men reported that they had experienced some form of antigay violence during the previous year; the proportion dropped slightly to 6.6% in 1986, but rose significantly in 1987 to 12.2% (L. Dean, personal communication, August 22, 1988). Martin's data are especially valuable in monitoring trends because they were obtained from a single sample in a longitudinal study.

Attempts to explain the possible increase in antigay victimization often cite public reactions to the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) epidemic, which, in the United States, initially struck gay and bisexual men (e.g., Kim, 1988). Reports to gay and lesbian organizations indicate that AIDS is often in the awareness of assailants. The perpetrators of antigay attacks made references to AIDS in 681 (14%) of the incidents reported to NGLTF in 1987; this includes 5% of the physical assaults. In the PLGTF study (Gross et al., 1988), 13% of the men and 1% of the women said that the violence or harassment they experienced was AIDS-related (e.g., being called a "plague-carrying faggot" during a violent assault). Approximately one fourth of the incidents reported to the New York City AVP organization included references to AIDS in 1986 (NGLTF, 1987).

Is the AIDS epidemic fueling the victimization of gay people? To the extent that lesbians and gay men have become more visible since the advent of AIDS, they may well be more vulnerable to attack. Attitude research suggests, however, that much of the variance in AIDS-related bigotry is explained by antigay attitudes, which presumably predate the epidemic (e.g., Herek, 1988; Lennon & McDevitt, 1987). Thus, AIDS may be less a cause of antigay sentiment than a focal event that crystallizes heterosexuals' preexisting hostility toward gay people. Other likely contributors to an increase in antigay attacks include the rise of antigay religious fundamentalism, antigay pronouncements from the Catholic Church, and antipathy toward gay people and civil rights issues by the Reagan administration.

Directions for Research

As researchers, clinicians, faculty members, and practitioners, psychologists have a unique role to play in preventing antigay hate crimes and reducing their negative consequences.

Sources of Data

Empirical inquiry into antigay hate crimes must overcome all of the methodological problems associated with other types of research on crime and victimization, as well as the problems created by the stigma attached to homosexuality in American society. Underreporting of victimization is especially serious because lesbians and gay men often do not trust local law enforcement personnel and fear additional harassment and retributions (e.g., job discrimination) if their sexual orientation becomes public. When antigay violence takes the form of sexual assault, the problem of underreporting may be especially serious, with male sexual assault victims even less likely to report than female victims (Kaufman, DiVasto, Jackson, Voorhees, & Christy, 1980). These problems necessitate a multimethod approach to data collection.

Case studies available in popular literature (e.g., Bell, 1978; Correll, 1988; Freiberg, 1986) and scientific reports (e.g., Swigert, Farrell, & Yoels, 1976, p. 395) are rich sources for hypotheses about the causes, aftermaths, and perpetrators of hate crimes (see Miller & Humphreys, 1980). Once hypotheses are developed, they can be tested with at least three different types of data (see O'Brien, 1985, for a general discussion of each).

One source frequently used in research on criminal victimization is information collected by law enforcement agencies (e.g., Uniform Crime Reports). Unfortunately, these data are of limited use in research on antigay victimization because most criminal justice records currently do not include data on hate crimes. Some jurisdictions that monitor hate crimes do not include antigay attacks under this rubric (Finn & McNet, 1987). Even when relevant data are collected, local advocacy groups estimate that only a small proportion of antigay crimes are ever reported. Underreporting is a problem with all categories of crimes in the United States; National Crime Surveys indicate that only 60% of aggravated assaults with injury and 40% of simple assaults were reported in 1980 (O'Brien, 1985). For antigay hate crimes, the problem is even more serious: Perhaps as few as 10% are reported. In the 1987 PLGTF survey, for example, only about one fourth of the 133 Philadelphians who experienced antigay criminal violence (24% of the 110 men and 22% of the 23 women) reported all such incidents (Gross et al., 1988).

In a survey by Gay Community Services in Minneapolis, only 9.3% of the respondents who had been assaulted reported the incident to the police; an additional 5% reported it to another agency (Anderson, 1982). Of the 96 Yale respondents who had experienced harassment, only 10% reported the incident to the police or campus authorities (Herek, 1986a).

Before law enforcement agencies can gather adequate data on antigay victimization, they must obtain the trust and cooperation of local gay and lesbian communities, and they must establish uniform reporting procedures across jurisdictions. Neither condition exists today. Even if these criteria eventually are met, many antigay hate crimes will go unreported. Thus, researchers must use other sources to supplement law enforcement agency data.

Surveys of victim populations are a second common source of data for studies of criminal victimization. Information from known victims can be used to develop descriptions of perpetrators, the circumstances under which crimes occur, and the aftermath. The New York AVP and the San Francisco UCAV already gather information of this sort. Such data are limited in that they represent only the experiences of individuals who report their victimization. Unreported hate crimes can be studied through questions about victimization in surveys...
conducted with samples from lesbian and gay communities. This is the approach followed by NGLTF and PLGTF. The generalizability of these data is also limited, however, because probability samples are not employed (nor are they possible with an invisible population). To address this problem, questions about antigay victimization could be included in other surveys with national probability samples (e.g., National Crime Survey); underreporting would still be likely, however, because of many gay and bisexual respondents' fears about disclosing their sexual orientation, even in an anonymous survey.

A third data collection strategy is to survey perpetrator populations. Self-report studies of perpetrators can take two forms. One approach is to interview convicted or admitted perpetrators; the respondents, of course, are not necessarily representative of all antigay victimizers. Alternatively, groups of potential perpetrators (e.g., adolescent and young adult populations) can be surveyed about their past antigay behavior. Neither of these approaches has yet been used in published empirical research on antigay hate crimes, although some journalistic accounts follow this model (e.g., Weissman, 1978).

Areas for Empirical Inquiry and Intervention

Documentation and description. One of the first priorities for social science research on antigay bias crimes must be systematic documentation of the problem with data from more representative samples of gay women and men across the United States. Sampling people who are not well-integrated into the gay community will pose a particular challenge to researchers, but it is important because such individuals may be at greater risk for some types of criminal victimization than are openly gay people (e.g., Harry, 1982; Miller & Humphreys, 1980; for an autobiographical account, see Bauman, 1986). In addition, small-scale studies of student populations, employees, and similar groups can contribute to our general understanding of bias crimes and can be valuable tools for influencing local policy and increasing public awareness. Several researchers have conducted campus surveys, for example, and have submitted their results to university officials who were considering adoption of nondiscrimination policies (Cavin, 1987; D'Augelli, 1988; Herek, 1986a).

Descriptions of the perpetrators of antigay hate crimes and the situations in which they occur are also needed. Data currently available suggest that the bulk of reported attacks are perpetrated by male assailants, usu- generally juveniles or young adults in groups, who are not known by the victim (NGLTF, 1987). For example, more than one half of the 213 incidents reported in 1986 to San Francisco's CUAV involved two or more assailants (112, or 53%); at least 94% were perpetrated by male assailants (the sex of assailant was not reported in another 3%); and at least 42% of the attackers were under 21 years of age (the assailant's age was unknown in another 8% of attacks). This tentative profile of attackers should not lead researchers to ignore other manifestations of antigay hate crimes, including victimization at the hands of hate groups, family members, and law enforcement officials.

Organized hate groups (e.g., the Ku Klux Klan) regularly target gay people in their rhetoric. A Georgia extremist group called the Crusade Against Corrupton, for example, published a pamphlet titled "Praise God for AIDS," which included such statements as "AIDS is a racial disease of Jews and negroes that also exterminates sodomites," and urged that "those high risk AIDS groups must be SEGREGATED far away from us White people so as to protect innocent White people from AIDS" (in NGLTF, 1987). Similarly, a recent issue of the Thunderbolt, published by the National States Rights Party, carried the front-page headline, "Bisexuals Infect White Women with AIDS" (Fields, 1988), and reported that "most bisexuals are Negroes who often seek affairs with White females" (p. 1). Such rhetoric reveals clear linkages between antigay prejudice and bigotry directed at other minority groups in American society. Janet Caldwell (1988) of the Center for Democratic Renewal in Atlanta reported that gay people are now included with Jews and Blacks as favorite targets for hate groups.

Families constitute another setting in which antigay hate violence and harassment often occur, instigated by siblings, parents, a spouse, children, or others. In the Philadelphia PLGTF study (Gross et al., 1988), for example, 19% of the male respondents and 25% of the female respondents reported that they had experienced some sort of victimization from a family member. According to Barbara Fox (1983), Executive Director of New York's Institute for the Protection of Lesbian and Gay Youth, the problem most frequently observed with gay adolescents is rejection by the family, which often includes violence. Family violence frequently forces lesbian and gay youth onto the streets where they are subject to further victimization. Antigay victimization in families is probably even less visible than are other forms of antigay hate crimes because crimes that occur in a family or home setting are generally less likely to be reported (O'Brien, 1985).

Yet another important category of perpetrators includes law enforcement personnel. Nearly 10% of the incidents reported to CUAV in 1986, for example, involved verbal or physical harassment by police. In the PLGTF study of Philadelphia residents, 26% of the male respondents and 15% of the female respondents reported that they had experienced antigay harassment or violence from the police at least once (Gross et al., 1988).

Causes and antecedents. Research on the immediate causes of antigay hate crimes (e.g., motivations of perpetrators, situational influences) will be useful in developing preventive strategies. Such research also will contribute to psychological knowledge of aggression and prejudice. Although different factors are likely to be involved with different types of perpetrators and situations, some preliminary hypotheses can be drawn from the scientific literature on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men (see Herek, 1984, 1986a, 1987, 1988). For example, an

---

2 This fits a pattern observed for most assaults (O'Brien, 1985).

3 Data from CUAV were obtained from CUAV Quarterly Reports, provided by Diana Christensen.
tigay assaults by groups of young male assailants may be explained in part as attempts to obtain acceptance from peers and solidify group membership (Weissman, 1978) while simultaneously externalizing intrapsychic conflicts concerning gender and sexuality. Many male members of this age group who manifest delinquent activities also strongly reject culturally defined feminine characteristics and embrace what they perceive to be masculine characteristics (Horwitz & White, 1987). Attacks against gay people may provide a means for such male youths to affirm their masculinity by attacking someone who symbolizes (consciously or not) an unacceptable aspect of their own personalities (e.g., homoerotic attractions or a perception that they are not sufficiently masculine). The intense rage often associated with antigay assaults lends credence to this hypothesis. A gay person may also serve as a symbol of the out-group; by attacking her or him, members can demonstrate their loyalty and increase group solidarity. Whether or not this hypothesis is supported by subsequent empirical research, it can guide the framing of research questions; additional hypotheses will be needed to explain hate crimes perpetrated by hate groups, family members, and police officers.

Community organizing and prevention. Research also is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of different programs for preventing antigay bias crimes or mitigating their effects. For example, researchers should assess the effectiveness of local antidiscrimination efforts in organizing street patrols in predominantly gay neighborhoods and in monitoring court appearances when antigay bias crimes are prosecuted (see Bohn, 1984). The effectiveness of educational programs aimed at students, families, social service providers, and criminal justice personnel should be assessed. Social science theory and data might be employed to design more effective educational programs (see Herek, 1984, 1986c).

Problems faced by survivors. Psychologists' skills are needed to develop and evaluate strategies for providing the variety of psychological and social services needed by people who experience antigay victimization. Along with the problems faced by other crime victims (e.g., Niederbach, 1987), lesbian and gay survivors often are blamed by others for their assault and accused of inviting or deserving the attack. In addition, if their sexual orientation becomes public knowledge as a result of an attack, they subsequently may experience heightened discrimination in employment, housing, or services. As Bohn (1984) noted, the experience of antigay victimization and its aftermath can significantly lower self-esteem and evoke strong feelings of guilt, shame, or depression in the lesbian or gay survivor (see also Anderson, 1982). Suicidal ideation may result (Miller & Humphreys, 1980). The survivor may experience high levels of internalized homo-

---

For example, Miller and Humphreys (1980) commented on the “growsers, often vicious nature” of the antigay murders that they studied.

"Seldom is a homosexual victim simply shot," they noted. "He is more apt to be stabbed a dozen or more times, mutilated, and strangled" (p. 179).
Criminal Justice Personnel

Sensitivity to the needs of survivors of antigay hate crimes is necessary at all levels of the criminal justice system, including police personnel, district attorneys, and judges. In-service and academy and professional training programs should be instituted to sensitize personnel to the needs of lesbians and gay men, including discussion of why antigay bias crimes are serious, how to identify and report them, and how to work with the victims of such crimes.

Law enforcement personnel will be better sensitized to the needs of gay crime victims if they have opportunities for positive interactions with openly gay colleagues, which will be facilitated by recruiting openly lesbian and gay individuals at all levels of the criminal justice system. Furthermore, police and district attorneys should engage in extensive outreach to the lesbian and gay communities and, when possible, should appoint formal liaisons. Such liaisons might help to develop collaborative programs between police and community groups for directly reducing violence, for example, through monitoring neighborhoods.

Community Education

Finally, programs are necessary for reducing the bigotry that underlies antigay hate crimes. Federal, state, and local funds should be available for developing and implementing programs designed to reduce prejudice against all minority groups, including lesbians and gay men.

Because school-age youth are overrepresented among the perpetrators of antigay bias crimes, interventions in public and private schools are especially important. Elementary and secondary schools should inaugurate programs to foster tolerance and an appreciation of diversity. Teachers and staff should receive explicit training in sensitivity to lesbian and gay issues to prepare them to foster tolerance and reduce conflicts in their students; such training should be reflected in licensing and professional degree requirements. Schools also should enact clearly stated antidiscrimination policies.

College and university officials should speak out strongly against antigay victimization. They should train staff (including security personnel) to recognize antigay bias and to act against it. Any instances of antigay harassment or victimization should be penalized, and this response should be publicized throughout the campus community. Colleges also should include sexual orientation in their antidiscrimination policies and should actively seek openly gay or lesbian faculty, staff, and students. Although more data are needed to understand the full extent of the problem, the existence of antigay hate crimes is indisputable. Opposition to these crimes is not controversial: A democracy as diverse and pluralistic as the United States cannot tolerate intimidation of any citizens because of their minority group status. Nor can a profession pledged to "respect the dignity and worth of the individual and strive for the preservation and protection of fundamental human rights" stand by while victimization occurs (APA, 1981, p. 633). Through our research, teaching, advocacy, and practice, psychologists can confront the menace of hate crimes and the bigotry that feeds them.
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