

anarchist who has never believed in anarchism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Henry de Montherlant and Roger Peyrefitte, *Correspondence*, Paris: Robert Laffont, 1983; Pierre Sipriot, *Montherlant sans masque*, I: *L'Enfant prodigue, 1895-1932*, Paris: Robert Laffont, 1982.

Wayne R. Dynes

MOTION PICTURES

See Film.

MOVEMENT, HOMOSEXUAL

Modern life has seen many movements for social change, including those intended to secure the rights of disenfranchised groups. The *homosexual movement* is a general designation for organized political striving to end the legal and social intolerance of homosexuality in countries where it had been stigmatized as both a vice and a crime, and where the revelation of an individual's homosexuality almost inevitably led to social ostracism and economic ruin. Only at the end of the nineteenth century did such organized movement endeavors become possible in continental Europe, in no small measure because of the impact of scientific thinking on the political discourse of that epoch. Characteristic of such movements is their capacity to give the homosexual individual not just a sexual but a political identity—as a member of a **minority** with a grievance against the larger society. These movements varied in the size of their membership and the scope of their activity, as well as in the specific goals which they pursued and the arguments by which they sought to persuade the decision-making elites and the general public of the justice of their cause.

Origins. The **Enlightenment** of the eighteenth century, which took up arms against every form of arbitrary oppression, may be regarded as the spiritual parent of all later homosexual liberation movements. Yet such leading Enlighten-

ment thinkers as **Voltaire** and **Diderot** had ambivalent attitudes toward sexual non-conformity. While opposing barbaric oppression, they clung to the notion that the church remained the arbiter of "morality," which in practice meant sexual morality, and that same-sex relations, being "unnatural," were destined to disappear in a truly enlightened polity. During the French Revolution two pamphlets appeared, *Les enfans de Sodome* and *Les petits bougres au manège*, purporting to give information on adherents to a proto-liberation movement for homosexuals, but this anticipation remains shadowy.

A lonely precursor was **Heinrich Hoessli** (1784-1864), a Swiss milliner from the canton of Glarus, who in 1836-38 published in two volumes *Eros: Die Männerliebe der Griechen: ihre Beziehungen zur Geschichte, Erziehung, Literatur und Gesetzgebung aller Zeiten* (*Eros: The Male Love of the Greeks: Its Relationship to the History, Education, Literature and Legislation of All Ages*). Amateur that he was, Hoessli collected the literary and other materials—mainly from ancient **Greece** and medieval **Islam**—that illustrated male homosexuality. His writings, issued in very small editions, had no immediate effect on public opinion or the law.

Second in the prehistory of the movement, the German jurist and polymath **Karl Heinrich Ulrichs** (1825-1895) began in January 1864 to publish a series of pamphlets under the title *Forschungen zur mann männlichen Liebe*. The first of these was entitled *Vindex*, a name meant to vindicate the homosexual in the eyes of public opinion. The second had the name *Inclusa*, taken from Ulrichs' formula *anima muliebris corpore virili inclusa*, "a female soul trapped in a male body." The pamphlets rambled over the entire field of ancient and modern history and sociology, with comments on contemporary scandals. Although he even conceived the idea of an organization that would fight for the human rights of **Urnings**, as he called them,

Ulrichs' efforts to ameliorate the legal plight of the homosexual in **Germany** failed, since the North German Confederation and then the German Empire adopted the Prussian law penalizing "unnatural lewdness" between males. He ended his days in poverty and exile, befriended by an Italian nobleman who wrote a short tribute to him after his death.

Emergence. Two years after Ulrichs' death, the world's first homosexual organization came into being: the Wissenschaftlich-humanitäre Komitee (**Scientific-Humanitarian Committee**), founded in Berlin on May 14, 1897 under the leadership of Magnus **Hirschfeld** (1868–1935), a physician who became the world's leading, if controversial, authority on homosexuality in the years that followed. The Committee's first action was to draft a petition to the legislative bodies of the German Empire calling for the repeal of **Paragraph 175** of the Penal Code of the Reich. For this petition the Committee solicited the signatures of prominent figures in all walks of German life, and ultimately it obtained some 6,000 names, an impressive cross-section of the intellectual elite of the Second Reich and the Weimar Republic. It also began to publish the world's first homosexual periodical, the *Jahrbuch für sexuelle Zwischenstufen* (Yearbook for Sexual Intergrades), whose title embraced not only homosexuality but also transvestism, pseudohermaphroditism, and other departures from the norm of masculinity or femininity.

The Committee professed the view—which did not go unchallenged even within homosexual circles—that homosexuals belonged to a "third sex" which represented an innate "intermediate stage" between male and female. All traits of mind and body it assigned to the masculine or the feminine, while insisting that there was a continuum between the two in every human being. It also issued pamphlets and brochures for the lay public, trying to break down the layers of prejudice and ignorance that had encrusted the

subject over the centuries. Gathering some 1500 members from all parts of Germany, the Committee never became a mass or "activist" organization; unlike some later groups, it never even sought this status.

Outside Germany the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee only gradually attracted imitators, as in countries that had adopted the **Code Napoleon** where no criminal statute remained in need of repeal. In the **Netherlands** a branch was founded in 1911 in the wake of the passage of a law which ominously raised the age of consent from 14 to 21—discriminating against homosexual acts for the first time in the twentieth century. This Dutch branch had been preceded by the participation of several writers—Arnold **Aletrino**, L. S. A. M. von **Römer**, Jongherr Jacob van Schorer—in the international aspect of the German movement. Aletrino had courageously spoken in defense of homosexuals at the Congress of Criminal Anthropology in Amsterdam in 1901 and been roundly abused by the other delegates. Another offshoot of the Committee was founded in Vienna in 1906 to seek reform of the Austrian law of 1852 which penalized both male and female homosexual expression.

By the second decade of the twentieth century the various organizations or groups of friends such as those around John Addington **Symonds**, Edward **Carpenter**, and Havelock **Ellis** that were concerned with changing the law and public opinion in regard to the legitimacy and morality of sexual behavior began to coalesce into a larger "sexual reform movement." All rejected the traditional ascetic morality of the Christian Church and its more modern variants to a greater or lesser degree, though some affected a neutral pose on this issue. The birth control movement was joined by the eugenics movement and by an organization that sought to abate the stigma attaching to unwed motherhood—the *Deutsche Bund für Mutterschutz* (German League for the Protection of Motherhood). Also, voices were raised against the laws prohibiting

voluntary abortion as a method of birth control and the religiously based laws which made divorce difficult—if not impossible, as was the case in most of Catholic Europe. Despite entrenched opposition, the women's suffrage organizations were becoming ever more influential in countries such as Germany and Great Britain.

Throughout the industrial world, the old order in the realm of sexuality—a kind of Old Regime of social control—was under attack on many fronts. By and large, the protagonists of these various reform movements saw one another as natural allies and clerical and traditionalist parties in the national legislatures as natural enemies. So the homosexual movement was part of a much larger wave of social agitation against nineteenth century sexual morality. This positive development was paradoxical in that its roots lie in part in the "social purity" campaigns of the late Victorian era. In their conviction that social hygiene required repressive as well as fostering aspects, the social purity advocates were hardly unambiguous supporters of sexual freedom. Social purity sought reform in the context of normative management and social engineering, not liberation. But in the actual situation, which was one of revolt against the corseted restraints of High Victorianism, reformers of various stripes were swept along in a wave of libertarian or quasi-libertarian openness. Yet the contradictions exposed in this era were to reemerge in the 1970s in the feminist campaigns against pornography and child abuse.

The 1920s. World War I brought the efforts of the sexual reform movement to a temporary halt, but then ushered in the far more radical rejection of Victorian norms of sexuality of the 1920s. The preoccupation of the police with espionage, sabotage, and other crimes directly affecting the war effort, the mood that youth had "so little time" to enjoy the pleasures of life when death was always imminent, the breakdown of authority in the wave of revolution that swept Central and Eastern

Europe in 1917–18—all created a new setting for efforts at homosexual emancipation.

Germany, now the Weimar Republic, remained the center of the movement, which barely existed in most other countries, even where a semi-clandestine subculture flourished, as it had in London, Paris, and the major Italian cities since the late Middle Ages. The Deutsche Freundschaftsverband [German Friendship Association] was founded in 1920 as an expression of the displeasure felt by many homosexuals at the academic and political orientation of the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee and the narrow elitism of the Community of the Exceptional. The Association was more oriented toward the needs of the average homosexual; it opened an activities center in Berlin, held weekly meetings, sponsored dances, and published a weekly entitled *Die Freundschaft* [Friendship]. Some 42 delegates from chapters throughout Germany attended the second annual conference of the Association. A period of rivalry with the Committee ensued that lasted until 1923 when the Association renounced its involvement in the struggle for legal reform and changed its name to the *Liga für Menschenrechte* (League for Human Rights), while *Die Freundschaft* changed from a weekly to a monthly and took on a more literary and cultural focus. A third journal *Uranos* also competed with Adolf Brand's *Der Eigene* in the artistic sphere. The *Jahrbuch* itself was forced to discontinue publication after the inflationary spiral of 1923 had destroyed its resources. Its 23 volumes remain the classic repository of information on all aspects of homosexuality from the first quarter of the twentieth century.

Most of the organizations and periodicals that flourished in the 1920s had a more social than political purpose, though Hirschfeld and the Committee continued their struggle against the "paragraph." In 1922 Gustav Radbruch, the Social Democratic Minister of Justice, drafted a far more progressive criminal

code, but it never came before the Reichstag. The indifference of conservative jurists to legal reform led to the formation in 1925 of the Kartell für Reform des Sexualstrafrechts [Coalition for Reform of the Law on Sexual Offenses], which under the direction of the lawyer and litterateur Kurt Hiller (1885–1972) set about drafting a comprehensive alternative. Only one of the seven member-organizations of the Coalition, whose own draft was published as a compact volume of legal texts and commentaries in 1927, was a homosexual group (the Committee).

The country that had the most sweeping revolution of all was Russia, where the codes of the fallen autocracy were abolished in one stroke, and when the Soviet regime drafted its penal code in 1922, homosexual offenses were not included. Only crimes involving force or the corruption of minors were punishable, and the definition of minor was a sliding one, to be determined by physical examination of the subject, not by chronological age. The actual degree of freedom that homosexuals enjoyed during what later came to be seen as the "golden age" of the Soviet regime remains moot. No publications on homosexuality for the general reader are known from this decade, and no organization comparable to the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee or the League for Human Rights was formed. A group of medical experts did seek to enlighten the masses on sexual matters in general, and a rather tolerant attitude of the regime toward heterosexual promiscuity, divorce, birth control, and abortion facilitated some public discussion of homosexuality. But no direct benefits for homosexuals ensued, and a number of individuals suffered repression or persecution.

The English-speaking world lagged sadly behind Europe, as the traditional "Anglo-Saxon attitudes" toward sexuality changed but slightly in spite of protests after the condemnation of Oscar Wilde. At the end of the 1920s Bertrand Russell wrote that it would be virtually

impossible to discuss the findings of modern psychologists on sexuality in print because of the English laws on "criminal obscenity," which the courts had defined as the power to corrupt any individual "into whose hands the publication might fall." A British Society for the Study of Sex Psychology had been established in 1914, but its real interest focused in the subcommittee on sexual inversion which was surreptitiously a "committee of the whole." Between 1915 and 1933 the Society published 17 pamphlets, one of them a translation of a German tract issued by the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee.

In the United States, Henry Gerber, who had served in the American Army of Occupation in the Rhineland, attempted to transplant the ideas and organizational forms of the German movement. In December 1924 the (Chicago) Society for Human Rights received a charter from the state of Illinois; it was officially dedicated to "promote and protect" the interests of those who, because of "mental and physical abnormalities" were hindered in the "pursuit of happiness." It lasted only long enough to publish a few issues of the newspaper *Friendship and Freedom*, modeled on the German periodical *Freundschaft und Freiheit*. One member of the ill-fated group was a bisexual whose wife complained to a social worker, with the result that all four members of the group were arrested without a warrant. Gerber lost all his savings and had only the bitter memory that no one came to the aid of the organization.

In France *Inversions* published a few issues in 1925 but was halted by a prosecution inspired by Catholic members of the National Assembly. The prosecution appealed to anti-German sentiments (the movement drew its inspiration "from across the Rhine") quite as much as to the traditional intolerance promoted by the church; the defendants lost. Still, in the absence of any penal law comparable to Paragraph 175, French homosexuals had little reason to organize. The frightful loss

of life in the trenches during World War I coupled with the declining French birth rate even led in 1920 to anti-birth control legislation.

On the international front, a World League for Sexual Reform on a Scientific Basis was founded in Berlin in 1921 at the recently created *Institut für Sexualwissenschaft* (Institute for Sexual Science) headed by Magnus Hirschfeld. The founders included world leaders in law, sex education, contraception, endocrinology, eugenics, and sexual research in general. At its peak, the League united groups with a total membership of 130,000, and had members in countries from the Soviet Union to Australia. All were devoted to the task of replacing the ascetic morality of the church with a new standard of rights and obligations shaped by the findings of biology and medicine as well as by a modern conception of society's interests and of the individual's claim to happiness. Further congresses of the League were convened in Copenhagen (1928), London (1929), and Vienna (1930). The London conference, attended by many prominent figures in British intellectual and public life, may have had the greatest influence. In the following year, 1930, the Lambeth Conference of the Church of England approved the use of birth control by married couples. Breaching the long tradition of intolerance on this subject, Anglicans began to abandon the old ascetic norms of morality, thereby opening the way to ultimate acceptance of sexual pleasure as legitimate in its own right.

Setbacks. The 1930s—the Depression era—saw the sexual reform movement, as a whole, retreat. While it fostered radical movements throughout the world, the economic crisis made sexual problems seem secondary if not irrelevant. Worst of all, the rise of National Socialism and its seizure of power spelled the end of the homosexual movement in Germany. As early as 1929 Nazi harassment had forced Hirschfeld to leave the country. In 1933 the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee

had to dissolve, and on May 6 the Institute for Sexual Science was invaded by Nazis who seized the library and files and burned them publicly four days later. Many of the homosexual and lesbian cafés and bars in Berlin were closed; all publishing activity of the organizations ceased for twelve years of National Socialist rule. The World League for Sexual Reform lasted until 1935, when the death of Magnus Hirschfeld in Nice led to its collapse, because the leadership was split over the issue of whether to remain a centrist movement or to form an open alliance with the Communist Party—which, as it happened, would have been a dead end.

The Soviet Union amended its penal codes to make homosexual acts between males—though not females—criminal. The “Law of March 7, 1934” patently alluded to the day of National Socialist assumption of power in Germany the previous year. Repudiating most of the other reforms of the 1920s, the Stalin regime prohibited abortion, suppressed the sale of birth control devices, and returned to a puritanical “petty bourgeois” code of sexual morality. Communist parties under Soviet domination lost all interest in sexual reform and became—and mostly remain—foes of homosexual emancipation.

Towards the Present. In Switzerland, just as the movement in Germany was coming to an end, a new homosexual organization began. In 1933 a monthly journal called *Schweizerisches Freundschaftsblatt* (Swiss Friendship Bulletin) came under the editorship of Karl Meier (“Ralf”), a former contributor to *Der Eigene* and *Die Freundschaft*, publishing articles, short stories and photographs of interest to the general gay reader. Subsequently the name was changed to *Der Kreis/Le Cercle*, and French (1943) and English (1952) sections were added, so that the publication took on an international character. The headquarters of the publication in Zurich became a social center for the subscribers; foreigners were admitted upon presenta-

tion of a passport. From their observation post in neutral Switzerland the contributors recorded the death of the older movement as the Nazis occupied one European country after another, but after the war they watched the rebirth of the movement, in due course, with an ideological and social base in the Anglo-American world.

The movement revived only slowly after the liberation of Europe from Nazi rule. The first country to have a postwar movement was the Netherlands, where the "Amsterdam Shakespeare Club" held its first meetings on December 8-9, 1946. This group and its journal *Levensrecht* (Right to Life) formed the nucleus of the Cultuur- en Ontspanningscentrum [Culture and Recreation Center] with the publication *Vriendschap* (Friendship), both of which began early in 1949. Despite the Catholic Center Party's efforts at repression in the Parliament, the organization grew in size from 1000 members in 1949 to 3000 in 1960. In preference to the term "homosexual," the Dutch group preferred the coinages *homofiel*, "homophile," and *homofilie*, "homophilia," which gained a certain currency in other languages and served to designate the first phase of the movement in the United States.

For a time the Netherlands became the refuge of the reviving homosexual movement. Supported by such world-renowned figures as Alfred C. Kinsey, whose pathbreaking studies (1948-53) had begun to reorient public opinion, the International Committee for Sexual Equality (ICSE) held its first conference in Amsterdam in 1951 and for a number of years issued an *ICSE-Newsletter*. In France André Baudry founded the monthly *Arcadie* in 1953 as a forum for the discussion of homosexual issues; like *Der Kreis*, it had a membership of Arcadiens who gathered at intervals for political and social purposes. Although France and Switzerland had no laws against homosexuality between consenting adults, the pressure of public opinion and the refusal of the establishment

media to open its channels to the homosexual cause left the leaders and supporters of these publications with a painful sense of their outsider status.

The Early American Movement.

The United States had no tradition of homosexual movement activity, though many Americans had lived in Central Europe and Hitler's persecution brought exile and émigré homosexuals to such centers of the American gay underworld as New York and Los Angeles. "Vice squads" of the metropolitan police forces regularly entrapped homosexual men, raided bars, and generally intimidated public manifestations of same-sex proclivities. As early as 1948 in Southern California "Bachelors for Wallace" had appeared as a cover for the gathering of homosexuals, but Wisconsin Senator Joseph McCarthy's campaign against "sex perverts in government" put the gay community on the defensive: its response was the founding of the **Mat-tachine Society** in Los Angeles by Henry (Harry) Hay in December 1950. With leadership modeled on the organizational forms and practices of the American Communist Party and of freemasonry, it designed a five-tiered structure that would preserve the anonymity of members while allowing the highest tier to control the entire group. The founders conceived homosexuals in a separatist manner as a minority deprived of identity and rights, and needing a new consciousness of its history and place in society. Initial successes of the group led to growth in Southern California and spread to the **San Francisco Bay Area**, with chapters elsewhere in the country (these became independent in 1961). **Mat-tachine** also had a nationally circulated monthly, *ONE*, which for the first time provided American homosexuals with a forum for discussion of their problems and aspirations. In the course of time *ONE* emerged as a separate organization, while the original group's San Francisco branch issued *Mattachine Review*.

The anti-Communist campaigns

of the cold war could not leave the Mattachine Society untouched, and in 1953 an open struggle developed between the founders and a new set of leaders who challenged their "separatist" ideology, instead stressing the normality of homosexuals as differing from other Americans only in sexual identity. With this assimilationist program went a rejection of activism, so that the group could only by proxy appeal for toleration and understanding—through psychiatrists, jurists, sociologists, and the like who would come forward as seemingly disinterested authorities.

In San Francisco in 1955 Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon founded the lesbian counterpart to Mattachine, the Daughters of Bilitis. Its monthly publication, the *Ladder*, provided an English-language forum for homosexual women analogous to the *Mattachine Review* and *ONE*. The three organizations worked together in the face of the indifference and hostility of the Eisenhower years, in which "deviation" and nonconformity were relentlessly decried.

Law Reform. In 1953 a series of sensational trials in England brought the subject of homosexuality to the attention of Parliament. Urged by the Church of England and a number of prominent intellectuals, the Conservative government appointed a Committee on Homosexual Offenses and Prostitution headed by John Wolfenden. After hearing the testimony of witnesses from the British establishment, the Committee voted 12-1 in favor of repeal of the existing laws punishing male homosexual acts between consenting adults in private. Its Report, published in September 1957, proved a major landmark in the evolution of public opinion in the English-speaking world. It held that sexual acts belonged to the realm of private life which was not the law's business, rejecting the theological arguments that these were "crimes against nature," "contrary to the will of God," and the like, just as it dismissed the notion of homosexuality as a disease, finding it—to the

chagrin of the psychiatric establishment—compatible with full mental and physical health.

In a country where the whole subject had been taboo since time immemorial, and where German homophile literature had remained largely unknown, the public discussion of the Wolfenden Report put the issue on the agenda and set the precedent, though ten years were to pass before a Labour government enacted the recommendations. The Homosexual Law Reform Society (later known as the Albany Trust) was founded to press for repeal of the criminal laws; it issued brochures and a magazine, the first specialized periodical in Great Britain.

The United States followed in 1961 with the American Bar Association's drafting of a model penal code that omitted homosexual offenses from the roster of punishable acts. Illinois, in 1961, became the first state to enact this recommendation. Furthermore, professors of criminal law at the major schools began to teach the coming generation of lawyers that "victimless crimes" had no place on the statute books because they violated the freedom and privacy of the individual, and in time half of the states of the Union struck the archaic laws from the books either by legislative act or by an appellate court decision holding them unconstitutional.

Warren Johansson

America in the 1960s. The period from 1961 to 1969 saw the evolution of the American homophile movement from a defensive, self-doubting handful of small, struggling groups in California and the Boston-Washington corridor to an assertive, self-confident, nationally organized (if ideologically divided) collection of some three score organizations with substantial allies and a string of major gains for which it could take credit.

A characteristic figure in the ideological change was Franklin E. Kameny, a Harvard-trained astronomer, who became president of the Mattachine Society of

Washington after unsuccessfully fighting his dismissal from a government job. Where the previous leaders of the movement emphasized "helping the individual homosexual adjust to society," Kameny and such associates as Barbara Gittings, Randy Wicker, and Dick Leitsch urged a program of militant action designed to transform society on behalf of a homosexual community which was perfectly capable of speaking for itself. Not the psychiatrists, not the theologians, not the heterosexual "authorities," but homosexuals themselves were the experts on homosexuality, they insisted. Progress would come not by accommodation to the powers-that-be but by publicly applied pressure, legal action, demonstrations, and aggressive publicity.

Operating from his base in Washington, Kameny targeted the federal government's discriminatory practices in employment, military service, security clearances (a key to employment in large sectors of private industry), and other areas. Finding that government officials were relying on the doctrines current in psychoanalytic and other psychiatric circles to the effect that homosexuality was a debilitating mental illness, Kameny launched a systematic and rigorously formulated attack on the medical model in July 1964. While this effort would make considerable progress during the 1960s, gaining support from a National Institutes of Mental Health task force under Dr. Evelyn Hooker (1969), it was not to reach its triumphant conclusion until a 1973 vote by the American Psychiatric Association. More importantly, the campaign transformed the self-image of the American homosexual from one which internalized many of the most negative characteristics attributed to homosexuals by homophobic "authorities" to one which embraced his slogan "Gay is good."

Other activists, such as Laud Humphrey and Arthur Warner, preferred to work more quietly, though their efforts too reflected the new mood of urgency.

The National Committee for Sexual Civil Liberties, headed by Warner, orchestrated a subtle and resourceful campaign of sodomy decriminalization, which proceeded methodically on a state-by-state basis through the 1960s and 1970s.

Throughout the decade, mass media coverage of homosexuality snowballed, starting with Randy Wicker's publicity barrage of 1962 in New York and extending through articles on homosexual lifestyles in national magazines, until the once-forbidden topic had become a common subject for television and newspapers. In the process, previously isolated homosexuals became aware of the gay subculture and the homophile movement in large numbers and the ground was laid for substantial shifts in public, as well as professional, opinion on issues of concern to the movement. Notable also was the favorable publicity and financial support extended to the hard-pressed movement from the *Playboy* empire.

The movement's involvement with the social life of homosexuals was another major development of the sixties, originating in San Francisco. First came the organizing of gay bars there in the Tavern Guild (1962), then the founding of the Society for Individual Rights (S. I. R.) in September 1964, combining a militant stance with social activities. This led to the first gay community center in April 1966, and made S. I. R., with nearly a thousand members, the largest homophile organization in the country.

Other milestones in San Francisco saw the involvement of liberal clergymen and then whole religious groups (Council on Religion and the Homosexual, founded by the Rev. Ted McIlvenna in December 1964, and spreading to a number of other cities later in the decade); and the beginnings of productive political involvement with candidates for office and city officials (August 1966). These innovations heralded San Francisco's later reputation as the "gay capital" of the United States.

Southern California contributed the first nationally distributed large-circulation homophile news magazine, *The Advocate* (1967 onward). Dick Michaels, the magazine's editor, represented a new type that became influential: the journalist-activist. In October 1968, Los Angeles witnessed the founding by the Rev. Troy Perry of the first gay church, the Metropolitan Community Church; from the start the MCC and its leaders were heavily involved in the homophile movement and provided major financial and personnel support.

Another organizational breakthrough of lasting importance was the establishment of the homophile movement in academia, beginning with the founding of the Student Homophile League at New York's Columbia University by Stephen Donaldson (Robert Martin) in October 1966. Granted a charter by the university in April 1967, and making front-page headlines around the world, the student movement spread quickly and contributed a major impetus first to the spread of militancy and later to the radicalization of the homophile movement.

An important victory on the issue of employment discrimination came with the Bruce Scott case, in which the U.S. Court of Appeals reversed Scott's disqualification for federal employment in a June 1965 decision. This set the ground for the Civil Service Commission's acceptance of homosexuals in the 1970s. Piece-meal progress was made on the issue of security clearances, while efforts to gain admission to the armed forces remained stymied.

Another result of the new militancy was the recognition by the American Civil Liberties Union of the movement as a legitimate civil rights activity. The national ACLU reversed its policy in 1967 under pressure from the Washington, D.C., area affiliate, which began backing homophile causes in 1964, supported by the two California affiliates; this decision did much to legitimize the movement and

gave it much-needed support on a wide range of legal and legislative issues.

On a local rather than a national scale, homophile organizations were often involved in contesting police practices, and were successful in halting raids on gay bars and entrapment of homosexuals in New York, San Francisco, and other cities. This effort probably had the greatest impact on the life of the average homosexual in the cities concerned.

A major transformation in the movement of the 1960s led from the closeted, fearful members of the early 1960s, operating under pseudonyms and avoiding involvement with the public, to the highly visible and equally vocal activist of the latter part of the decade. Landmarks in this evolution were the first public demonstrations organized by the movement in the spring of 1965 at the United Nations in New York in April and at the White House on May 29. The latter picket, with seven men and three women participating, gained nationwide television coverage, thus exposing the new gay militancy to a nationwide audience for the first time.

These changes in philosophy, strategy, and tactics did not come easily, but were accompanied by bitter struggles within the movement between the new militants and the old-guard "accommodationists"; the New York Mattachine Society, which was captured by militants in a crucial election in May 1965, and the Daughters of Bilitis in particular were wracked by internal struggles and eventually founded. New groups took their place; a tendency by the movement to devour its leaders generated continual organizational instability. Despite these problems, the period witnessed a growth in the total membership of its groups from under a thousand in 1961 to an estimated eight to ten thousand by the spring of 1969.

While there is a popular tendency to believe that nothing of importance happened in the homophile movement until it expanded to the dimensions of a mass movement in the summer of 1969,

such a view proves on examination to be highly superficial. The explosion of the 1970s was made possible only by the laborious efforts of the pioneers of the 1960s, and in particular by the victory of the militants. As John D'Emilio points out, "their decisive break with the accommodationist spirit of the 1950s opened important options for the homophile cause. The militants' rejection of the medical model, their assertion of equality, their uncompromising insistence that gays deserved recognition as a persecuted minority, and their defense of homosexuality as a viable way of living loosened the grip of prevailing norms on the self-conception of lesbians and homosexuals and suggested the contours of a new, positive gay identity."

North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO). One of the characteristic developments of the homophile movement in the 1960s was its attempt to forge a semblance of first regional, then national, and finally continental unity under the umbrella of a common organization. Frank Kameny initiated this effort, stimulating the formation in January 1963, in Philadelphia, of the East Coast Homophile Organizations (ECHO). It was this loose confederation of four groups which sponsored the series of public demonstrations launched in May of 1965 at the White House, and it played a major role in gaining control of the movement on the East Coast by the militants.

The next step was the formation of a national grouping, established at a Kansas City conference of fifteen groups in February, 1966, as the National Planning Conference of Homophile Organizations. Meeting in San Francisco in August of 1966, this loose assembly reconvened in Washington a year later, where it changed its name to the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO), developed an organizational structure with officers, by-laws, and established three regional subsidiaries (ECHO became ERCHO).

Though wracked by infighting among the groups, NACHO provided a largely informal but no less important boost to a sense of common purpose and identity among the leaders who attended its annual meetings and more frequent regional conferences, and to a certain extent among the rank-and-file members who read of its activities. It facilitated the spread of a militant approach on a nationwide basis, and presented the national media and other nationally-organized groups with a more formidable-looking movement.

Much credit for holding NACHO together was due to its secretary and coordinator, Foster Gunnison. Among its more tangible accomplishments, it established a national legal fund, coordinated public demonstrations on a nationwide basis, undertook a number of regional projects, and officially adopted and publicized the "Gay Is Good" slogan (adopted in Chicago in 1968). Furthermore, NACHO and its regional affiliates were instrumental in spreading the movement from its bicoastal base by colonizing the major cities of the North American heartland. And from 1968 until its demise in 1970 it provided a major forum for the growing radical wing of the movement.

The Stonewall Uprising and After. The slow pace of the American movement in the 1950s was accelerated in the early and mid-1960s in part under the influence of the black civil rights movement ("Gay Is Good" derives from "Black Is Beautiful"), then injected with the tremendous energies that accompanied the opposition to the war in Vietnam. With American involvement in Vietnam at its peak, student uprisings shook the campuses of Columbia and Harvard Universities in 1968 and 1969, and by the late spring of 1969 the country was in a mood of unprecedented mass agitation. It was against this background that the Stonewall Rebellion of June 27-30, 1969, marked the start of a new, radical, and even more militant phase of the homosexual movement in the United States.

Beginning as violent resistance to a police raid on the Stonewall Inn, a bar in New York's Greenwich Village, the popular movement found a new expression in the Gay Liberation Front (GLF). The GLF was conceived as uniting homosexuals (without guidance or even participation from sympathetic heterosexuals) around their own identity and grievances against an oppressive American society and as organizing them to force their own **liberation** from the persecution and powerlessness that was their lot even in the "land of the free." The radicals saw themselves as part of a broad alliance of oppressed groups developing autonomously but in an atmosphere of mutual support.

Superficial as was the New Left rhetoric of the Gay Liberation Front, since its analysis of the whole problem began virtually "from scratch," it had the merit of giving its followers a sense of identity as a group inevitably oppressed by the established social structure. The black and feminist movements as well as their homophile predecessors supplied the ideological resources that the growing organization needed to legitimate itself in its own eyes, if not those of the larger society.

The new Gay Liberation activists quickly collided with the pre-Stonewall movement leaders, whom they saw as part of an established structure too rigid for the kind of gay guerrilla warfare unleashed by Stonewall. Only two months after the riot, at the August 1969 NACHO convention in Kansas City, the Youth Committee under Donaldson issued a 12-point "radical manifesto" which stated, "We regard established heterosexual standards of morality as immoral and refuse to condone them by demanding an equality which is merely the common yoke of sexual repression." The youth leaders further demanded the removal of strictures against prostitution, public sex, and sex by the young; urged the development of independent "homosexual ethics and esthetics," denounced the Vietnam War and declared "the persecution of homosexual-

ity" to be "part of a general attempt to oppress all minorities and keep them powerless."

The committee report was voted down, but the battle had just begun. The next confrontation came at the November 1969 meeting of ERCHO in Philadelphia, when GLF and SHL delegates pushed through a resolution declaring "freedom from society's attempts to define and limit human sexuality," a step beyond the movement's previous insistence on equality into the realm of social autonomy. Chaos ensued and the meeting broke up in disorder.

The handwriting was on the wall: when NACHO reconvened in San Francisco in August, 1970, gay liberation was over a year old and had no use for complex continental organizations with their by-laws, officers, and parliamentary procedures. Deeply divided between reformers and revolutionaries, itself the object of disruption by feminists on its first day and by radicals on its last, NACHO broke up in disorder as the more conservative delegates fled before an invasion by non-delegate radicals. Thus the five-year effort to bring all of North America's movement groups under a single roof collapsed in a tidal wave of gay activists.

In New York, those who called for a return to the "single issue" approach seceded to found the Gay Activists Alliance, which retained radical tactics of confrontation but focused on the specific problems of homosexuals in American society. "Zaps," sit-ins, blockades, seizures of lecterns and microphones, and disruptive tactics of all kinds were featured in highly publicized scenes which astonished the American public, long used to an image of homosexuals as passive and weak. And now it was not just repeal of the sodomy laws that the movement demanded, but the enactment of positive legislation protecting the rights of homosexual men and women in all spheres of life. None of this would have been possible without the ability of the new groups to call out hun-

dreds and then thousands of supporters, drawing on the post-Stonewall mass base which the homophile movement had never been able to mobilize.

This new wave of mass "coming out" led to the formation of hundreds of gay associations with particular identities: political clubs, student groups, religious organizations, professional caucuses, social clubs, and discussion groups in towns and neighborhoods from one end of the country to the other. Far from the margin to which it had been confined until the end of the 1960s, the movement became an institutionalized part of American life. In the two decades that followed the Stonewall uprising, the movement grew to a network of interest groups as diverse in its origins, as multi-faceted in its identities and aspirations as America itself. National marches held in Washington in 1979 and again in 1987 brought tens of thousands of participants from all sections of the country, rallying behind the banners of hundreds of different groups all demanding their place in the sun.

The proliferation of gay groups in the 1970s led to a fragmentation of concerns and a lessening of a sense of focus for the homophile movement as a whole. Victories were attained on the psychiatric front (the American Psychiatric Association's vote in 1974 and subsequent defeat of a campaign to reverse that vote) and in a number of nationwide professional associations, but the struggle for decriminalization continued to be fought on a state-by-state basis, and with the demise of NACHO there was no longer a clearly legitimized national leadership. The Rev. Troy Perry was the most visible homophile spokesman as his Universal Fellowship of Metropolitan Community Churches expanded to nearly two hundred congregations and Perry engaged in highly publicized hunger strikes, led marches, and addressed protest meetings, even as arson destroyed a number of his church buildings. In 1974, Dr. Bruce Voeller, formerly president of GAA in New York,

founded the National Gay Task Force (NGTF), a membership organization rather than a federation. The NGTF lobbied on nationwide issues and in the next decade moved to Washington, but it never developed a mass following.

Much of the movement was turning its attention in the seventies to the adoption of gay civil rights laws, ordinances, and executive orders, and to the blocking of numerous attempts to repeal their scattered successes. In the absence of major progress towards a federal civil rights law, this was a local effort, though the campaigns pro and con often drew considerable nationwide publicity. Portland, Oregon, and St. Paul, Minnesota adopted rights ordinances in 1974, San Francisco in 1978, Los Angeles and Detroit in 1979, and New York City in 1986; Wisconsin adopted the only statewide gay rights law in 1981. Two Christian fundamentalists, the singer Anita Bryant and the Rev. Jerry Falwell led extensive homophobic campaigns which produced repeal of rights measures in Miami (1977), St. Paul, and Wichita, Kansas. Their efforts, however, suffered a major setback with the defeat in a California statewide vote of the Briggs Initiative, which would have banned gay teachers, in 1978.

Gay men and lesbians became visible in party politics and sent openly homosexual delegates to Democratic national conventions, forcing battles over "gay rights" planks (a weak one was adopted in 1980), and making homosexuality a presidential campaign issue; under the Carter administration a gay delegation was received by aide Midge Costanza in the White House and military discharge policies were changed to provide for fully Honorable Discharges, though the exclusion of known homosexuals from the armed forces remained intact. Notable here was the effort to avoid discharge by Air Force Sgt. Leonard Matlovich, whose fight brought him a *Time* cover in 1975. In San Francisco, the movement rallied behind supervisor (councilman) Harvey Milk, who

was first elected and then assassinated in 1978; elsewhere the movement welcomed the emergence (usually but not always involuntary) of gay legislators and congressmen from their closets.

Reinforcing this movement activity was a thriving gay subculture, with its bars, baths, bookstores, guest houses, and services of all kinds, and above all a press that discussed the issues that confronted the gay community as a segment of American society.

World Perspectives. Given the extent of America's influence on popular culture throughout the world, this subculture became a model for gay life everywhere, from Norway to Taiwan—though the Islamic world still resisted this aspect of Westernization. The American example inspired countless imitators of the "life style" of the affluent and hedonistic America of the 1970s. In Europe bars adopted incongruous American names, such as The Bronx and Badlands, while gay rights organizations, retreating from their earlier radical stance, adopted American terminology and tactics.

Canada, being most intimately related to the United States, developed a homophile movement early on with the establishment in Vancouver of the Association for Social Knowledge (ASK) in 1964. Decriminalization passed in Canada in May of 1969, followed by emergence of the main Canadian group, the Community Homophile Association of Toronto (CHAT) in February, 1971. The influential gay newsmagazine, *The Body Politic*, also began publishing in 1971, surviving government harassment until 1986. The Canadian province of Quebec adopted an antidiscrimination law in 1977, followed a decade later by the provinces of Ontario and the Yukon, while the city of Vancouver passed a rights law in 1982.

In Latin America the first organization seems to have been Argentina's Nuevo Mundo (1969), but this promising development was cut short by the imposition of a cruel military dictatorship. Other

organizations, often short-lived, appeared in Mexico (FHAR, 1978, followed by street demonstrations in 1979), Colombia, and Peru (Movimento Homosexual de Lima, 1982). In Brazil a major journal, *O Lampião*, began in 1976, and stable organizations appeared in Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, and São Paulo.

In Japan economic prosperity contributed to the expansion of the gay subculture, but traditional reticence impeded the formation of gay associations. Elsewhere in Asia, gay conferences were held in both India and Indonesia in 1982. In 1988 Israel discarded the sodomy law that it had inherited from the British mandate.

The Movement in Europe and Australasia. The watershed year of 1969 saw law reform in West Germany, while the next year witnessed the establishment of a gay Italian journal, *Fuori*, in Turin. By 1971 there was a proliferation of gay liberation groups in Britain and West Germany, while the Front Homosexuel d'Action Révolutionnaire was getting established in France. London's sole wide-circulation gay newspaper, *Gay News*, was established in 1972 and soon ran into major problems with the government, including an obscenity conviction which was upheld by the House of Lords. In Milan, 1973 saw the establishment of the Italian Association for the Recognition of Homosexual Rights.

By the mid-70s, the gay church in the form of the UFMCC was putting down roots in Britain, France, Denmark, Belgium; it even found a predominantly heterosexual congregation in Nigeria. Northern Ireland got a Gay Rights Association in 1975. In Spain, the Front d'Alliberament Gai de Catalunya (FAGC) was launched with marches in Barcelona in 1977. Catalonia remained the most important focus of activity, though other groups appeared in Madrid, the Basque country, and Andalusia.

Coventry, England, was the site of the formation in 1978 of the Interna-

tional Gay Association, like the defunct NACHO, a coalition of independent groups. The same year saw gay marches in Sydney, Australia. In the following year Austrians organized the Homosexuelle Initiative (HOSI) in Vienna.

The 1980s saw major advances in the European and Australian movements, with British decriminalization extended to Scotland in 1980. In 1981 the Assembly of the Council of Europe voted in favor of gay rights, the European Court of Justice in Strasbourg struck down a homophobic statute in Northern Ireland, and Norway adopted antidiscrimination legislation. In the same year Greece organized the group AKOE and Finland began the Sexuaalinen Tasavertaisuus (SETA). The Australian state of New South Wales adopted gay rights legislation in 1982, while New Zealand not merely repealed its criminal laws, but enacted a gay rights measure in 1986.

The European Parliament went on record in favor of gay rights in 1984, with France becoming the largest jurisdiction to adopt such protections in 1985. Progress, however, has not been uniform. In Great Britain in 1988 Parliament adopted Clause 28, which prohibited the use of public money for any activity deemed to "promote" homosexual behavior. Conversely, in the Netherlands gay studies programs became established in all major Dutch universities. The officially supported international conferences in Amsterdam in 1983 and 1986 set new standards for gay and lesbian scholarship.

The Challenge of the 1980s. The 1980s, with their conservative trend in most major industrial countries, confronted the movement with new obstacles and challenges. The spread of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) in the United States and Western Europe meant that ever larger resources of time and money had to go into lobbying around the issues of research on the causes and cure of AIDS and the financing of health care for victims of the syndrome.

The stigma that linked homosexuality with a contagious and fatal condition was exploited by sensation-mongering media eager to profit from public curiosity and fear. The columns of the gay press began to print, week after week, the obituaries of those who had died of the consequences of AIDS, and new organizations such as New York's Gay Men's Health Crisis and ACT UP (AIDS Coalition To Unleash Power) were formed to deal specifically with this new challenge. In October 1988 AIDS activists from across the country staged a blockade of the Food and Drug Administration in Rockville, Maryland, charging that it was dilatory in making newly developed drugs available to the public. The AIDS Memorial Quilt was displayed first in Washington in 1987 and then in other major cities, providing a public symbol of grief. The new activism showed some similarities with that of the sixties, but it was accompanied by a battle-scarred realism regarding means and ends.

Homosexuals may take no small comfort from the ability of the movement to adapt to this crisis in creative and publicly effective ways, sustaining a sense of community and gaining a strong voice in government efforts to deal with the disease. Efforts to protect the rights of AIDS victims, recently being pressed as a medical necessity, may end in opening the door to long-denied measures on behalf of homosexuals in general.

The movement everywhere still faces the task of articulating the concerns of a minority in a society that continues to harbor hostility toward homosexuals. Fearing this hostility, the majority of male homosexuals and lesbians tend to remain in the closet, and the claims of the gay movement to represent them rest at best on silent consent. Movement leaders seek to become players in a political process still largely geared toward responding to economic interest groups mobilized to influence officeholders and alter public opinion, and toward accommodating ethnic minorities that have achieved voting

cohesion. In the closing years of the century, the movement still aspires to achieve for its followers the same degree of political rights and social acceptance that the democratic countries have gradually accorded to other minorities in their midst.

Stephen Donaldson

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Barry D. Adam, *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*, Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1987; John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1983; Hans Hafkamp and Maurice van Lieshout, eds., *Pijlen van naamloze liefde: pioniers van de homo-emancipatie*, Amsterdam: Uitgeverij SUA, 1988; Laud Humphreys, *Out of the Closets: The Sociology of Homosexual Liberation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972; John Lauritsen and David Thorstad, *The Early Homosexual Rights Movement (1864-1935)*, New York: Times Change Press, 1974; Jim Levin, *Reflections on the American Homosexual Rights Movement*, New York: Gay Academic Union, 1983; Toby Marotta, *The Politics of Homosexuality*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981; James Steakley, *The Homosexual Emancipation Movement in Germany*, New York: Arno Press, 1975; Donn Teal, *The Gay Militants*, New York: Stein and Day, 1971; Rob Tielman, *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland*, Amsterdam: Boom Meppel, 1982.

MUJUN

This Arabic word denotes frivolous and humorous descriptions of indecent and obscene matters in stories and poems, what is sometimes called **pornography**. It is an important theme in Arabic literature, appearing often in combination with *sukhf*, scurrilousness and shamelessness. The most famous example of mujun is the stories of the *Thousand and One Nights*, in which the story-teller saves herself through the power of her imagination. Mujun can be considered as a verbal liberation from the shackles of decency, a kind of literary protest against social, and therefore also Islamic, norms and values.

With its obscenity, slander, and blasphemy, it meant to shock society. It stood for enjoyment of pleasure, drinking of wine, and spending the night with wide-buttocked beardless youths or licentious women—not secretively as Islamic morals required, but openly, ignoring blame which would arise from behaving in such a sinful and shameful way. In principle it ought not to go beyond words, but of course it did. Nonetheless, mujun texts undoubtedly went far beyond practice and therefore have to be used very carefully when drawing conclusions about reality. But fantasies, especially when they are popular, give us insight into a social reality which exists next to official Islamic morals.

For the most part, sexual and scatological humor of this kind would be covered only in the language of the people, and not in literature. Only in periods of cultural bloom and a high level of social tolerance did it acquire a place in literature.

In the ninth and tenth centuries mujun was highly popular with the ruling elite of the Abbasid caliphate in Baghdad. Learned and religious people became fascinated by it, as for example the vizier Ibn 'Abbad (ca. 936-95). The most popular mujun writer of that time was Ibn al-Hajjaj (ca. 941-1001), whose work consisted of obscenity and scatology in its purest form. He compared his poetry with a sewer and with an involuntary emission from the anus: "When I speak the stench of the privy rises up towards you." Ironically, he himself served for some time in Baghdad as the official in charge of public morals!

Mujun was also used in an educational sense, rationalized by the idea that humor would stimulate and refresh the mind. Highly learned and respectable theologians and lawyers suddenly diverted their readers by digressions of mujun. Shaykh Salah ad-din as-Safadi for example wrote an essay about the size of the body-openings of women and boys in the middle of a very serious juridical work. Probably the best mujun, written with style and