Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1986

The mobilization of the gay liberation movement

Ramom de Souza Torrecilha
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

de Souza Torrecilha, Ramom, "The mobilization of the gay liberation movement" (1986). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 3661.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.5545>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Ramom de Souza Torrecilha for
the Master of Arts in Sociology presented July 23, 1986.

Title: The Mobilization of the Gay Liberation Movement.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

Dr. Charles D. Bolton,
Chairperson

Dr. Jan Hajda

Dr. Robert W. Shotola

This thesis examines the development and evolution of the gay movement. It raises the questions as to why the gay movement was not organized prior to the 1960's. The study starts in the 1940's and ends in 1970. It employs qualitative research methods for the collection and analysis of primary and secondary data sources. Blumer's description of general and specific social movements and Resource Mobilization Theory were used as theoretical frames of reference. The former explained the

developmental stages in the career of the movement and the latter focused on the behavior of movement organizations.

The study shows that the establishment of a cohesive community base was the leading factor in the ascendance of the movement. Prior to the 1960's homosexuals lacked a well grounded community structure that could support the movement. It was also found that changes in the movement's goals and tactics were instrumental in altering the structure of social movement organizations. Shifts in goals and tactics also affected the overall structure of the movement and the mobilization of its participants. That is, the stage in the career of the movement which focused on personal change developed a decentralized structure with exclusive membership. Subsequent shifts in focus to institutional change gave rise to a centralized structure with inclusive membership. The study also shows that the costs of mobilizing were reduced by changes occurring in society, and that the movement's evolution was not towards greater conservatism. Lastly, the movement was able to develop a middle-class constituency and co-opt outside resources, but direct beneficiaries were those who initiated actions and generated the bulk of resources for the movement during the period being studied.

THE MOBILIZATION OF THE GAY LIBERATION MOVEMENT

by

RAMOM DE SOUZA TORRECILHA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
SOCIOLOGY

Portland State University

1986

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Ramom de Souza Torrecilha presented July 23, 1986.

Dr. Charles D. Bolton,
Chairperson

Dr. Jan Hajda

Dr. Robert W. Shotola

APPROVED:

Dr. Grant Farr, Head, Department of Sociology

Bernard Ross, Acting Dean, Graduate Studies and Research

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of

Silvio Augusto de Souza Torrecilha

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to recognize those who have contributed to the completion of this thesis. First, I thank my thesis committee members for their guidance during the writing of this research. I would also like to thank the staff of the National Gay Archives for their assistance in the collection of the data. A warm thank you goes to Carla Mikkelsen for her support and all the years of typing. Last, my appreciation goes to my partner who has provided me with encouragement, love, and support throughout the execution of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of purpose	1
Review of the Literature	5
General and Specific Social Movements	5
General Social Movements	7
Specific Social Movements	8
Resource Mobilization Theory	11
Social Movement Formation	14
Mobilization as a Process	17
The Structure of Social Movement Organizations	23
Success and Failure of Social Movement Organizations	26
II METHODOLOGY	31
III PRESENTATION OF THE DATA: FINDINGS	35
Gay Life in the 1940's	39
Gay Life in the 1950's	55
The Beginning of the Homophile Movement	62
The Lesbian Contingency	92
The Structure of the Homophile Movement: 1956 to Early 1960's	99
Changes in Perception of Homosexuality	109
The Mobilization of San Francisco's Gay Community	137
The Homophile Movement Assessed	144
The Gay and Lesbian Liberation Movement	151
IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	162
V REFERENCES	177

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

History testifies to the existence of homosexuality for many centuries. However, only in this century have homosexuals been able to improve their lot in society. Why has it taken so long for homosexuals to organize? After surveying the history of homosexuality it is apparent that homosexuals became subject to a labeling process which defined them as outcast, sick individuals who should live in isolation from one another and from society at large. This misconception prevailed until the mid-1960's when out of nowhere a sizeable homosexual constituency was mobilized. Suddenly mainstream America was confronted by a call for homosexual rights, a claim for recognition of their minority status, and a demand for "gay power" in a manner never done before. Their militancy paid off, though certainly not to the extent for which they had hoped; but in a fairly short period of time a well-grounded gay movement was developed. By the early 1970's, and as a direct result of the gains made by the movement, homosexuals had successfully and openly established their institutions, language, customs, and over one thousand different organizations. It became possible for gays and lesbians to live in an all "gay world" and participate in their own political organizations, churches, school, social clubs, banks, publishing houses, gas stations, libraries, bookstores and professional organizations.

However, if lesbians and gay men lived in isolation from one another as was believed to be the case, how did the lesbian and gay liberation movement explode in the 1960's? More importantly, why was there not a gay liberation movement prior to the 1960's? What was necessary for the formation of such a movement? And, once formed, what was the movement trying to accomplish? Did the movement change its goals in the course of its career? What kind of structure did the movement have? Did the structure of movement organizations change as the movement changed its goals and tactics? And how did organizations manage to mobilize the lesbian and gay community? How did they maintain their membership? Did different movement organizations work with one another? And finally, did the movement accomplish its goals? Did the movement function as an agent of social change?

Questions about the movement could be enumerated at much greater length. But given the scope of this research, the study will concentrate on the formation and early evolution of the movement, roughly the period between the Second World and 1970. Reasons why the movement did not take place prior to the 1960's will be analyzed and organizational factors which affected the formation, growth and survival of the movement will be explored.

It is my contention that the lesbian and gay liberation movement did not take place before the 1960's because, unlike other social movements, the homosexual community was ill-defined and lacked the structures necessary to support the movement. Gay men and lesbians were a dispersed, not necessarily isolated, aggregate group without a pre-existing structural base for their movement. Homosexuals had ways of communicating with one another; they had unique body language which

they used to signal their intentions when cruising, and they had a unique vocabulary which reflected their feelings and experiences. But homosexuals lacked the formal organizations and institutions which are instrumental in establishing, legitimizing and diffusing a movement's cause.

To illustrate the point, consider the position of blacks in this society. In spite of their ethnicity, blacks have learned about white culture. They are socialized into mainstream culture. They are taught to speak the prevailing language, some participate in mainstream politics; most eat hamburgers and french fries and still others call themselves Christians. However blacks, like other minorities, created their place in society and developed their own institutions and culture. But despite their quasi-autonomous status, for more than two centuries blacks in the United States were chained, first to slavery and later to segregation and discrimination. On the surface they appeared content with their lot, but this was not really so and they slowly began to rebel against their inferior status. It was in the middle of the twentieth century when the black revolution arose, protesting social, economic and political inequality between blacks and whites. During the 1950's the movement was relatively calm with only sporadic disturbances. Then came more incidents. Freedom riders began demanding equal treatment at bus terminals and sit-in demonstrators began asking for service at "white only" lunch counters. Then in 1963 came the Birmingham riot, with police dogs and fire hoses turned on black marchers. Suddenly it began to dawn on white Americans that this was a full-fledged social revolution. It became clear that blacks did not want just a place in a white school or a seat at a white lunch

counter. What they wanted was nothing less than the full equality which is supposedly the birthright of every American regardless of his/her color. It should be noted, however, that by the time the Civil Rights Movement came into being, blacks had already established an institutional base for the movement and for the mobilization of the black community. Morris (1981) has documented the fact that the resources for the civil rights movement came directly from pre-existing community structures. Black churches, for example, were transformed into the movement's headquarters. They not only provided the physical space for mass meetings but also functioned as recruitment sites. Interpersonal bonds among church members facilitated strengthening solidarity. They also provided the means of communication among blacks concerning the affairs of the movement. Black churches were also financial resources and served to legitimate the causes of the movement. Other pre-existing community structures soon joined the black churches in their support for the movement.

When inspecting the history of the gay movement, one finds that the homosexual community lacked the very infrastructure which was present in the black community prior to the ascent of the civil rights movement. Furthermore, by defining homosexuality as a sickness, crime or sinful act, society slowed down the crystallization and legitimization of the gay and lesbian subculture and its institutions. Homosexuals could not have started to change their position in society without first establishing community structures and without creating the organizations and institutions which would support and generate the very resources needed for the movement, especially in its initial phase. The absence of such background structures forced homosexuals to

oscillate between the heterosexual world and loose individual scripts of the homosexual act. It also prevented many from supporting the causes of the movement. Gay activists therefore first had to arrange and negotiate with one another and among the different elements of gay subculture. They also had to establish a sense of group identity among homosexuals. Following, they had to fortify community structures that would sustain the subculture and movement. Only then could gay militants begin to mobilize their community effectively.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I have chosen to draw upon Blumer's description of general versus specific social movements and on Resource Mobilization Theory in order to address the questions posed by this study. What follows is a review of this literature. A clarification of the theoretical issues relevant to this research and the relevance of each frame of reference chosen will be presented first.

General and Specific Social Movements

This review begins with Blumer's concept of general and specific social movements. The history of homosexuality in this country shows that gay men and lesbians, responding to structural changes during and after the Second World War, gradually started to question their position in society. They also began to inspect their rights and obligations. These changes fostered the discovery of the gap between homosexuals and mainstream society. It became clear to a number of homosexuals that society maintained an outmoded notion of what it meant

to be a homosexual and that mainstream culture had no place for homosexuality. These psychological changes, occurring at the level of the individual, provided the first incentives for the formation of a social movement. However, a social movement is not formed instantly. It calls for establishing organizations and amassing group resources, including people who share similar experiences and whose position in society the movement will strive to change. Homophile organizations first had to devise ways to bring forth internal questioning by gay men and lesbians, and in so doing, identify commonalities in their experiences binding them together. At the same time, organizations which constituted the movement had to maintain the impulse and effectively remind homosexuals of their position in society and of where they wanted to go. Blumer's analysis delineates these developments as they pertain both to individuals and to the career of the movement. Such delineation will be applied to the study of the lesbian and gay liberation movement due to its accurate theoretical description of what took place during the formation of the movement.

The lesbian and gay liberation movement started amorphously, with a very vague body of literature and without a defined membership. Slowly, however, social unrest led to the formation of a "we consciousness," that is, the notion that gays and lesbians do form a minority group. Shortly after the emergence and development of the movement's mission, activists began to strive for liberation rather than adjustment. At the same time, there was development of and experimentation with different tactics in the career of the movement. By following the progression of the movement and correlating it with Blumer's analysis, the stages and paths taken by the movement will be

shown.

General Social Movements. Blumer (1939:255), on the question of social movements, referred to such phenomena as a "collective enterprise" striving to establish a "new order of life." He stated that social movements come about when society experiences social turmoil accompanied by an increase in dissatisfaction with the present order and by a search for a "new scheme of living". Blumer (1939) also made a differentiation between forms of social movements, i.e., general versus specific. His concern, however, lies in the evolutionary process of a movement's career. Accordingly, movements are first characterized by an amorphous structure, with no organization. As they progress, social movements develop characteristics similar to a society, such as a set of traditions, a clear division of labor, rules and values, and structure.

The initial formative stage of a social movement is colored by a slow alteration in the value system of those involved, creating a "cultural drift" (Blumer 1939:256). Such a drift alters people's perceptions, especially in what pertains to their rights and privileges, giving rise to a new interpretation of their situation and to hope for a different future. New hope, in turn, calls for a new array of values, which may change the way people look at their own lives. But note that the new concept of the self often runs against people's actual position in society.

At this point, however, the new concept of the self is merely a response to cultural drift. It is "vague" and ill-defined, and any behavioral response to it is "uncertain. . . without aim" (Blumer 1939:256). Such psychological development, however, marks the

beginning of a general social movement, which moves very slowly, without organization, leadership or a recognized body of members.

General social movements are also characterized by a literature which, despite its inconsistency, outlines the basic philosophy of the new values and emerging self-concept. Blumer (1939) points out that such literature serves the movement, allowing the propagation of a view which, hopefully, will stir hope and accentuate dissatisfaction. The leadership of general social movements is not likely to have direct control over the affairs of the movement and its members. Rather, they function as "pacemakers", arousing hope and breaking down resistance (Blumer 1939:257). Finally, general movement participants tend to interact informally, through talking, reading and group discussion.

Specific Social Movements. Just as cultural drift forms the background for a general social movement, the latter constitutes the basis for a specific social movement. Specific movements can be thought of as the materialization of people's "motivation, hope and desire for a new scheme of living" (Blumer 1939:258). Specific social movements can be classified as reform movements or revolutionary movements. In both instances one finds organization, structure, a recognized leadership, a body of participants who share a "we consciousness", a set of traditions, values, philosophy, expectations, and a division of labor.

Reform and revolutionary social movements are concerned with changing the existing social order and society's institutions. They differ, however, in the magnitude of their objectives. Reform movements are concerned with modifying limited aspects of the existing order. Revolutionary movements strive for the destruction and

reconstruction of the entire order. They are usually perceived as a threat, and therefore forced to go underground. Reform movements often manage to acquire respectability, which allows them to develop alongside the institutions they wish to reform. Their function is to recall the ideal values of the existing order, not to dichotomize society into "us versus them". Furthermore, reform movements will forward their cause for the oppressed and thus gain alliances with middle-class supporters. Revolutionary movements will forward their cause by the oppressed themselves, thus concentrating on the lower strata of society (Blumer 1939).

The organization and culture of specific social movements tend to evolve as the movements progress. Blumer (1939) and others, e.g., Dawson and Getty, have divided a movement's career into stages. The first stage in the career of a social movement is "social unrest". This stage is characterized by the susceptibility of movement participants to embark on appeals and suggestions which mirror their discontent. It follows that agitation becomes the leading tactic during this stage, allowing the movement to grow and to become organized. Agitation can arouse and magnify people's dissatisfaction. It functions as a catalyst, "speeding up" the break between movement participants and their previous attachment to the old scheme of living (Blumer 1939). However, in order for agitation to be successful, it is necessary that people's attention be retained, that they get excited, and that they direct their feelings and impulses through opinions, ideas, criticisms and suggestions. Blumer (1939) also points out that the agitator's main function lies in altering people's self-concept and their views toward their rights, leading them to unrest or maximizing

their discontent.

The second developmental stage, known as "esprit de corps", is characterized by the formation of a sense of belonging and identification among the movement's participants. A feeling of closeness based on common experiences of participants is also shared, which in turn forms a select group. Interactions are characterized by cooperation, and the function of this stage is to stress the new concept of personhood which by now becomes supported by the collectivity (Blumer 1939).

Development of morale is the next stage. Morale provides the movement with persistence and determination. Morale also determines the extent to which group solidarity can endure adversity. Blumer (1939) points out that the ingredients which sustain morale are conviction in the movement's purpose, faith that ends will be met, and the belief that the movement has a "sacred mission".

The fourth stage entails the manufacture of a group ideology. Ideology, being a set of ideals, beliefs and myths, can have two natures: scholastic or popular. An ideology is generally comprised of a statement of purpose, objections about the existing order, justification of the movement's objectives, a statement about its policies, tactics and practical action, and myths about the movement. Ideology's main function is the provision of movement philosophy, which in turn gives direction, justification, and inspiration for participants (Blumer 1939).

The last stage has to do with the role of tactics. Tactics cannot be uniform and static; different situations may call for different tactics. In this sense, tactics should be free to adjust to the

movement's cultural background. At its core, it refers to a successful way of recruiting and maintaining a body of members, as well as accomplishing a movement's goals and objectives.

Resource Mobilization Theory

While Blumer's analysis will serve to delineate and explain the general progression taken by the movement, Resource Mobilization Theory will be used for the analysis of the internal dynamics of the movement and its organizations. There appears to be evidence to support the theory's assertion that long range changes in group and organizational resources, as well as changes in opportunities of the group for collective action, facilitate the formation of the movement. Specifically, the changes taking place during the Second World War contributed to the formation of an urban gay and lesbian subculture, which in turned reduced the cost for mobilizing the community.

Second, Resource Mobilization Theory maintains that organizational structure is a variant of and relative to a movement's goals. That is, the structure of movement organizations changes as the movement changes its goals and tactics. Can we find evidence in the history of the movement that would support this proposition? And furthermore, how did changes in goals and tactics affect the mobilization process of gay men and lesbians?

Third, some theorists working within the resource mobilization framework demonstrate that recent social movements have been able to develop support from a middle-class constituency which does not necessarily benefit from victories of the movement. When inspecting

the history of the gay liberation movement, can we say that the movement was successful in mobilizing outside support? Also, was it direct beneficiaries or outside supporters who initiated and carried out the struggles of the movement? Lastly, according to Resource Mobilization Theory, mobilization can give best results when a program of collective incentives based on group solidarity and commitment to moral purpose is put together. To what extent was the lesbian and gay movement able to develop such a program? Exactly what was necessary for such a program to come into existence? And, how much did pre-existing group organizations play a role in the mobilization of the gay and lesbian community?

When an inspection is made of sociological theories of social movements, one finds that a prevalent concern has been the explanation of individual participation in these social phenomena. Classical theories of social movements, i.e., collective behavior theory, mass society theory, and relative deprivation model, have given a great deal of attention to identifying increased individual grievances reputedly caused by "structural strains" of rapid social change. Classical theories also assume that movement participation is relatively rare, discontents transitory, movement and institutionalized actions sharply distrustful, and movement actions irrational (Jenkins 1983).

However, social movements which took place in the 1950's and 1960's and the subsequent body of propositions and theories which were generated have challenged assertions made by the classical model and have reoriented the study of social movements. Later theorists of social movements have shifted major theoretical assumptions and generated alternative theories for the study of social movements.

In contrast to the classical approach to social movements, resource mobilization theorists have devoted attention to the inspection of links between "movement and institutionalized action, rationality of movement actions, strategic problems confronted by movements, and the role of movements as agencies for social change" (Jenkins 1983:528). More specifically, resource mobilization theorists have argued that: (1) social movements are rational, adaptive responses to the costs and rewards of different lines of action; (2) the basic goals of movements are defined by conflicts of interest built into institutionalized power relations; (3) grievances generated by such conflicts are sufficiently ambiguous that the formation and mobilization of movements depend upon change in resources, group organization and opportunities for collective action; (4) centralized, formally structured movement organizations are more typical of modern social movements and are more effective at mobilizing resources and maintaining sustained challenge than decentralized, informal movement structure; and (5) the success of movements is largely determined by strategic factors and the political processes in which they become enmeshed.

When contrasting classical theory and Resource Mobilization Theory, a further difference is the fact that the former defines movements as phenomena which include any "set of noninstitutionalized collective action. . . oriented towards social change and possessing a minimum of organization" (Jenkins 1983). Consequently social movements are seen as an extension of elementary forms of collective behavior encompassing both movements directed towards personal change and movements directed towards institutional change. Resource Mobilization Theory, on the other hand, stresses the notion that social movements are basically an

extension of institutionalized action. The perspective has focused on institutional types of social movements which attempt to "alter elements of (the) social structure and/or the reward distribution of society" (McCarthy and Zald 1977:1218), organize previously unorganized groups against institutional elites (Gamson 1975:16-18), or represent the interest of groups excluded from the polity (Tilly 1978, 1979).

It has been argued (Jenkins 1983) that those movements which focus on institutional change will follow the basic resource mobilization model: rational actions oriented towards clearly defined, fixed goals with centralized organizational control over resources and clearly demonstrated outcomes that can be evaluated in terms of tangible gains. However, the application of Resource Mobilization Theory has been problematic when applied to movements of personal change "where expressive actions are intertwined with rational-instrumental actions" (Jenkins 1983:529).

Notice that in personal change movements goals are formulated through interaction, leadership is controlled by a charismatic leader, and outcomes are diffused. Due to the above characteristics, the collective behavior model might be more applicable to this type of social movement. However, as Jenkins (1983) suggests, it is possible that Resource Mobilization Theory is applicable to organizational aspects of personal change movements; but the model does not deal adequately with analysis of personal and cultural change.

Social Movement Formation. Classical theorists, on the question of social movements, have emphasized the sudden increase in short-term grievances created by "structural strains" of rapid social change (Gusfield 1968). Resource mobilization theorists, on the other hand,

assert that grievances are secondary for movement formation (Tilly 1978) because constants are built into social institutions of society (Oberschall 1978a). Furthermore, the theory addresses the formation of social movements as being the result of long-term changes in group resources, organization and opportunities for collective action. Grievances are given attention but in relation to changes in the power structure of society or by structural conflict of interests (Korpi 1974).

Within the resource mobilization approach one finds, however, the works of McCarthy and Zald which explain movement formation from an entrepreneurial perspective. According to this approach, major factors in the formation of social movements are "the availability of resources", especially cadres, and "organizing facilities". Grievances, it follows, are either structurally given or increased with mobilization by entrepreneurs. Support for McCarthy and Zald's model can be found in studies of the public interest movement. For example, Berry (1977:17-27), in a survey of public interest organizations, found that the majority of these organizations were formed by entrepreneurs acting without increased grievances. The entrepreneurial model can also be applied to the Civil Rights Movement and the Student Movement. Both movements were centered among deprived groups with few resources. Numerous political experiences but little prior organizational development experiences made outside organizers critical in the formation of the movements.

In this context, Jenkins (1983) suggests that the entrepreneurial model appears most relevant for movements encompassing broad unorganized collectives and deprived groups. It follows that

entrepreneurs are typically generated by the factionalization of previous movements, and their success depends on their ability to win major interest advantages and redefine long-standing grievances in new terms.

Another important aspect of movement formation is the change in organization resources and opportunities of groups. For example, it has been argued that the emergence of the civil rights movement in the 1950's stemmed from the urbanization of the Southern black population, increased numbers of middle-class and working-class blacks, growing black college enrollments, and the organizational expansion of black churches. These changes simultaneously altered black's subordination to traditional paternalistic social controls, and at the same time increased levels of black organization and resources, placing the black voter in a strategic position in national politics (Watson 1973:140-52; Piven and Cloward 1977:189-94; Morris 1980; McAdam 1982).

In general terms, the formation of movements is linked to improvements in the position of disadvantaged groups in society, but not because of grievances due to the "revolution of rising expectations", but because these changes contributed to the reduction of the costs for mobilization and improving the margin of success (Jenkins 1983:532). In short, a multi-factored approach to the question of movement formation might be necessary. This reflects the fact that social movements are formed through a wide range of routes, depending on the elements absent in the pre-movement phase. A multi-factored approach could then combine McCarthy and Zald's emphasis on organizational resources and at the same time take into consideration aspects of structural strain theories of grievances.

Mobilization as a Process. Mobilization has been defined as "a process by which a group secures selective control over the resources needed for collective action." Such a definition involves three major factors: (1) "resources controlled by the group prior to mobilization efforts; (2) processes by which the group pools resources and directs these towards social change; (3) the extent to which outsiders increase the pool of resources" (Jenkins 1983:532).

Theorists using this frame of reference have developed classificatory schemes of resources based upon the usefulness of particular resources in controlling actions. However, little agreement seems to be present on the types of resources that are significant. For example, Rogers (1974) has differentiated between instrumental resources used in actual influence attempts and intra-resources which condition the use of instrumental resources. Jenkins (1982a) has written about the differentiation between power resources, that is, those providing the means for controlling the actions of targets, and mobilizing resources such as facilities which provide for mobilizing power resources.

However, classificatory schemes of resources are bound to be problematic due to the multiple use of resources. Such limitations have led some theorists, for example McCarthy and Zald, to distinguish among "assets" which are frequently utilized in the mobilization process, such as labor, capital, facility and legacy. Freeman (1979:1972-75) distinguishes "tangible assets", such as money, facilities and means of communication, from "intangible assets", such as organization, legal skills, and labor of supporters.

Another aspect of the process of mobilization addressed by resource

mobilization theorists is the impact of "outside contribution to the co-option of institutional resources by contemporary social movements" (Jenkins 1983). Recalling the classical approach assumption that movement resources are generated primarily from direct beneficiaries of the social change, and since social movements rest outside institutionalized politics, it follows that resources are generated from noninstitutional sources. In contrast, McCarthy and Zald (1977) have argued that recent social movements (1960's and 1970's) have mobilized a "conscience constituency" of the wealthy and affluent middle class and, furthermore, co-opted institutional resources from private foundations, social welfare institutions, mass media, universities, governmental agencies and even business corporations.

In this light, they maintain that social movement organizations experience a shift in form. That is, "classical" organizations were characterized by indigenous leadership, volunteer staff, extensive membership, resources from direct beneficiaries, and action based on mass participation. In contrast are professional social movement organizations which are likely to have outside leadership, full-time paid staff, small or nonexistent membership, resources from "conscience constituents", and actions which speak for rather than involving the aggregate group.

However, when adopting McCarthy and Zald's assertion that there was a shift towards professional social movement organization and that the co-option of institutional resources increased in social movements of the 1960's, one should be aware that these organizational features do not account for the mobilization of generalized political turmoil during that period. Furthermore, the literature also states that

social movements of that time were not comprised of professional social movement organizers and did not receive external resources for their crucial victories.

Morris (1980;1981) and McAdams (1982) show that external resources were "largely reactive, not initiatory and not consistently beneficial". They further maintain that the civil rights movement was indigenously led by black clergy and students, who for the most part mobilized resources from local community networks and tapped "conscience constituencies" only after generalized turmoil had been mobilized.

In addition, McCarthy and Zald's model does not successfully explain the middle-class and student participation in various movements of the 1960's. Note that because of its emphasis on economic changes which facilitated involvement, the theory ignores changes in cultural values and elite actions which lead to an interest in movement parties (Jenkins 1983). Ladd and Hadley (1978), Inglehart (1977), and others argued that middle-class participation was due to changes in "postmaterialist" values which called people's attention to self-fulfillment and supported moral concerns and political decisions affecting the lot of others.

In fairness to McCarthy and Zald, it should be mentioned, however, that their approach does identify significant aspects of recent social movements. The student movement and the anti-war movement did rely, quite heavily I might add, on the mobilization of "transitory teams" coupled by the mass media.

Considering what was said above, direct beneficiaries of some recent social movements have been the major contributors. How then did

social movements manage to mobilize them? Olson (1968), in addressing such a question, argued that "self-interested individuals" will not contribute to the affirmation of "collective goods" because of the "superior rationality of riding free". It follows that mobilization occurs only if "selective benefits" (i.e., distinct divisible benefits) are offered, if the group is sufficiently small so that benefits to individuals are greater than the costs of securing the collective good, or if the group is privileged.

Olson's solution to the problem of collective goods has been under a considerable attack, especially from those who follow the "by-product" theory of mobilization based on selective incentives. According to this model, movement entrepreneurs, who are themselves motivated by the selective incentives of career opportunities, offer selective incentives to social movement members for their contribution, which in turn generate a cycle of collective actions and further mobilization (Oberschall 1978b).

Olson's theory, however, cannot be discounted. Bailis (1974) points out that the National Welfare Rights Organization (NWRO), which was formed by professional organizers, used a "selective incentive", meaning aid to those seeking inflow of special cash assistance, in order to mobilize welfare recipients. However, when professional organizers switched to nonmaterial incentives, few prospective members were receptive. In accordance with Olson's theory, as soon as members learned the procedure required to secure welfare benefits for themselves, contributions to the NWRO trailed off, leaving behind a handful of activists.

Echoing Jenkins (1983), I assert that Olson is correct in stating

that mobilization around collective material benefits is not always adequate, and further, that the "free-riding" phenomenon presents a problem to the process of mobilization. How, then, do social movements overcome these problems? According to Jenkins (1983) a promising strategy is developing a movement program which offers collective incentives based on group solidarity and commitment to moral purpose. Group solidarity and purpose incentives are collective in that they combine personal and collective interests. It follows that movement supporters act in terms of internalized values and sentiments as well as self-interest calculations. Given that, mobilization entails generating solidarity and moral commitment to the broad collectivity.

Tilly (1978:62-8) has proposed that the potential for mobilizing a given group is determined by the presence or absence of pre-existing group organization. That is, groups with "distinctive identities" and "dense inter-personal networks" are highly organized, hence ready for mobilization. Notice that prior solidarity and moral commitment allow group identity and networks to provide the basis for the operation of collective incentives. Consequently, "block recruitment" of pre-existing solidarity groups becomes most efficient and furthermore characterizes the mobilization process of large scale institutional change movements (Jenkins 1983). Conversely, groups with ill-defined identities, scarce networks and strong ties to outsiders are less like to be mobilized.

Jenkins (1983) has transposed these factors of group mobilization to recruitment strategies. Strategic campaigns which are bound to purposive and solid incentives, which focus on pre-existing or "natural groups", and bridge changes with pre-existing group culture, are more

effective. Further, individual recruitment, as opposed to "block recruitment", by definition, requires a greater array of resources and is less efficient. Lastly, Brill (1971) suggests that organizations drawing from cultural symbols of the target population have a better chance of success than those emphasizing abstract ideologies.

Not surprisingly, "differential recruitment" follows essentially the same pattern. According to a number of theorists, recruitment tends to select individuals who are more involved in interpersonal networks, who are active in political organizations that support social change, who are ideologically committed to social change (Bolton 1972) and available for participation in the activities of the movement. However, one finds evidence in the literature which indicates that "differential recruitment" changes as the movement expands. Early adherents to the student movement shared a high socioeconomic background; a sizeable number were attending elite universities, were active in political organizations, and were more committed to social change ideologies than later recruits (Wood 1974). Furthermore, recruits from different social classes respond differently to incentives. Wilson (1973) pointed out that middle- and upper-class groups are more receptive to purposive incentives, while lower-class groups responded better to selective incentives (i.e., distinct divisible benefits) and collective solidarity.

When examining the ways in which classical theories of social movement have dealt with "differential recruitment", one finds attention being channeled to the role of personality characteristics. However, while such differences play a role, existing evidence has been unable to demonstrate that personality traits are independent of social

characteristics which lead to differential recruitment and movement participation (Jenkins 1983).

The Structure of Social Movement Organizations. Social movement organizations have been the subject of careful studies by a number of theorists. There are those who subscribe to a "centralized bureaucratic" model of movement organizations, e.g., McCarthy and Zald, and those who see social movement organizations from a decentralized informal perspective, e.g. Gerlach and Hine.

The centralized bureaucratic model argues that formalized structures with clear division of labor can maximize mobilization. The model also holds that a centralized decisionmaking structure increases "combat readiness by reducing internal conflict" (Gamson 1975:89-109). In contrast, Gerlach and Hine (1970:34-56) have stated that decentralized social movements with minimal division of labor and integrated by informal networks and an encompassing ideology are more effective. Such decentralized structure can provide extensive interpersonal bonds which reinforce ideological commitment and generate solidarity, thus maximizing mobilization. In addition, a decentralized structure can be adaptive, providing room for tactical experimentation. It would also minimize internal subgroup competition and is less vulnerable to co-option and suppression by authorities (Jenkins 1983).

However, the question of structure - that is, whether a social movement should opt for centralized as opposed to decentralized structure - is, according to Zald and Ash (1966), relative to the movement's goals. Due to the character of goals in most personal movements, one finds that those movements have the tendency to adopt a decentralized structure with exclusive membership rules, while

institutional change movements tend to opt for a centralized structure with inclusive membership.

In addition, a social movement is often composed of a vast array of social movement organizations which may or may not be characterized by a centralized structure or by a more autonomous loosely coordinated structure. Tilly (1978) and others have presented a comprehensive analysis of social movement organizations and their diverging degrees of centralization. The analysis has documented organizational shifts from short reactive actions to long proactive actions maintained by large-scale special purpose associations. This analysis suggests that organizational shifts will move along the decentralized-informal structure to centralized structure routes.

When accounting for such a shift it has been argued that organizational transformation will mirror broad social developments of society in general. For example, the growth of capitalism and the making of the modern state has had a destructive impact on autonomous, small, solidarity groups, forcing participants into the larger, political industry where bureaucratic structure is prevalent. In addition, the impact of urbanization and the mass media have reduced the "costs of large-scale mobilization", making the bureaucratic structure more feasible. At the same time, one could reasonably assert that such structural shifts would cause shifts in organizational goals and tactics as well.

Despite shifts taking place in organizational structure to a more centralized format, it should be pointed out that decentralized social movements have continued to emerge. Jenkins (1983:541) points out that some decentralized social movements "are products of deliberate choices

by redemptive or personal change movements attempting to embody ideas in the hope that these will serve as models for emulation." The student movement, for example, adopted a decentralized leadership model in order to maximize values of direct participation and communal involvement, which at the same time minimized the dangers of oligarchy and co-optation.

The question of centralization-decentralization of social movement organizations has also been treated in the literature as a variant of membership participation. Freeman (1979) pointed out that the two branches of the women's movement assumed different structures because of the political experience, values, reference standards and target relations inherited from initial organizers. That is, the older branch of the women's movement embodied women whose experience reflected participation in conventional reform politics and whose values and reference standards emphasized changes of society's institutions. It follows that bureaucratic structures were adopted due to the fact that organizers were familiar with that structural form and had used it in the past. On the other hand, the young branch of the movement emerged from the late phase of the student movement. Consequently its emphasis was toward direct participation and personal transformation, thus calling for a less bureaucratic constituency.

The adoption of a centralized or a decentralized structure by a social movement does not mean that the given structure will be static, fixed, or free from transformation. According to the Weber-Michels model, change in structure is always directed towards greater bureaucratization. However, Carden (1974) has documented that the National Organization for Women, a leading voice in the women's

movement, was able to expand in the mid-1970's as a result of internal diversity and the development of a looser, decentralized structure which tried to accommodate diverging ideologies and interests of its membership. Also following this line of argumentation, Hertz (1981) has shown that the growth of the welfare rights movement in the late 1960's gave rise to a multi-organizational field of informally coordinated organizations, providing the movement with advantages for its decentralized structure.

These evidences should support Zald and Ash's (1966) assertion that different approaches to organizational structure reflect differences in tasks. Bureaucratic structures do provide the movement with technical skills and coordination, both important factors for institutional change. But such structures appear to be less efficient when trying to mobilize grass roots participation. In contrast, a decentralized structure can maximize grass roots participation and insure group maintenance; at the same time, one could question its strategic effectiveness.

Realistically speaking, however, social movement organizations would most likely adopt aspects of both types of structures. As McAdam (1982) points out, the Civil Rights Movement suggests that informal coordination among social movement organizations bound by an ideology and goals can highlight the advantages of decentralization and at the same time allow for the formation of a central core able to tap the advantages of bureaucratization.

Success and Failure of Social Movement Organizations. The outcomes of social movements have been dealt with in terms of a "closed system" model. Theorists subscribing to this model have argued that social

movements experience an evolutionary sequence which results in either collapse or bureaucratization and institutional accommodation (Hopper 1950; Lang and Lang 1961).

Resource Mobilization Theory, in contrast, argues from an "open system" perspective, pointing out that a given movement outcome is directly affected and shaped by the larger political environment. It follows that strategies and postures taken by political elites, as well as the support or opposition of interest organizations and other movements, play a significant part in determining the movement's outcome.

Gamson (1975) analyzed the success and failure of 53 randomly selected social movement organizations active in the United States between 1800 and 1945. In general terms, Gamson asserts that successful organizations were those following a bureaucratic model with narrow goals, selective incentives, sponsorship, use of unruly methods, and the making of their demands during periods of sociopolitical crisis. However, Gamson's analysis has been criticized for its failure to adequately define the concept of "success" as it pertains to social movement organizations; that is, only tangible forms of success are considered while intangible success, clearly significant to many movement goals, is ignored altogether.

Tilly (1978:125-133), in addressing the question of success and/or failure of a social movement, forwards the thesis that central to a movement's success is its ability to enter into the political machine and establish alliances with policymakers. The reasoning behind this argument is that "polity access creates a qualitative increment in the return to collective actions and shelters the movement against

repression". The question which follows Tilly's thesis is: under what circumstances is political access possible? Tilly has offered a political interpretation: that is, the formation of a member/challenger alliance will depend largely on the short-term advantage for polity members. If the polity is divided, causing members to lose their familiar coalition partners, or if members are in jeopardy for want of resources, the entry of a social movement into the polity is more likely to be accepted (Tilly 1978:213-14).

Other theorists have argued that social movements secure access into the political structure when a crisis is created by major economic dislocations. Major dislocations can weaken dominant groups and accentuate cleavage among elites thereby increasing the likelihood of an elite division which would lead to elite support for movements (Piven and Cloward 1977).

Further, Jenkins (1983) suggested that shifts in political power also create opportunities for access by reform movements. "Liberal democracies" are characterized by their rotation of the power system which in turn is regulated by the mobilization of the general population. It follows that polity access is somewhat controlled by shifts in public opinion and the mobilization of electoral coalitions which bring about changes in governing elites. If a favorable elite is in power, reform movements with large organized leadership can offer electoral support in exchange for a ticket into the polity. For example, the success of the moderate wing of the Civil Rights Movement in the mid-1960's was a product of change in political power.

Shortly after World War II, whites residing in the southern part of the country gradually became more tolerant of race relations reform,

presumably because of changes in the significance of the plantation economy which historically had been tied to the Jim Crow system. In addition, black migration to northern cities gave blacks a power position in national elections. Such electoral swings forced national candidates to pay increasing attention to black voters. In short, broad electoral shifts that are connected to changes in coalitions also play a part in the expansion and contraction of the "social movement sector". Jenkins (1983) asserted that the dynamic of expansion is largely a product of two factors: the stimulus of increasing opportunities and the "demonstration effect" of movement success. That is, where a "center/left" governing coalition is in a dominant position, opportunities for reform movements are generally increased by reduced repression and increased sponsorship by polity members. Likewise the demonstration of a movement's successful effect can boost morale of challengers, provide models for effective tactics, and often free up institutional resources.

However, the dynamic can also work in the reverse. The proliferation of social movements can in turn undermine electoral coalitions by interjecting issues which stimulate a backlash by former coalition members who then transfer their electoral support to a center/right governing coalition. Once in a position of power this center/right coalition can demobilize the "social movement sector" through increased repression against activists and curtailment of institutional support for movements. Generally speaking, this dynamic appears to explain the expansion and contraction of social movements in the United States during the 1960's and 1970's (Jenkins 1982b).

Lastly, rules mobilizing political governing coalitions also play a

part in the composition of the social movement sector and its link with the electoral processes. It is well-known that in the United States the two-party system relies more on patronage of its members than their ideological commitment. As a result, social movements in the United States are more likely to be independent of partisan alliances, often adopting single-issue strategies rather than linking their program to electoral campaigns and broader ideological definitions of political issues (Jenkins 1983).

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The methodology applied to this project took a qualitative format. What follows is a discussion of the procedure used in collecting the data and the sample procedure, the period covered by this study, and the shortcomings of the methodology used.

Scientific knowledge can be acquired in many ways. "Science," says one author, "is not only theory making and hypothesis testing. It is also weighing and assessing of past trends and non-quantitative evidence." (Kerlinger 1979:397). Despite variation in approaches to scientific knowledge, most in the scientific community appear to agree that the choice of methodology for an endeavor should be delimited by the method's ability to penetrate the content area of research interest. The historical method was selected as a methodological tool for this project because it provides the means for investigating events, developments and past experiences involved in the formation and evolution of the lesbian and gay liberation movement.

The data collected for this project were compiled by researching primary and secondary accounts of the gay movement. According to the historical method, primary sources constitute "the original repository of an historical datum." (Kerlinger 1979:307). Such sources are vital in determining the accuracy of the events being reported. In this study a good portion of primary sources came from the files of the National Gay Archives. Newsletters, minutes of meetings, government documents, correspondence among homophile organizations and their

members constituted the categories of original data examined. Secondary sources, those that are one or more steps removed from original sources, were also utilized. These materials were located in several libraries in the Portland, Eugene, and Seattle areas. They included newspaper articles, books, magazines published by homophile organizations, anthologies, diaries and professional journals.

The research technique used in this project produced a snowball effect. That is, primary and secondary sources often led to the discovery of another source, which made data collection a cumulative process. In addition, the snowball effect facilitated the tracking down of events and directed the research towards a chronological sequence. The study begins around the 1940's and finishes by the early 1970's. The data accounting for the initial phase of the movement rely heavily on unpublished sources from the National Gay Archives, while the materials for the latter part of the movement, from the mid-1960's on, were located mainly in published sources. Also, the developments reported focus on gay organizations that were initially formed by gay men. Only one section of the thesis is devoted exclusively to the participation of lesbians in the movement. In all the sources researched, the Daughters of Bilitis has been cited as the only lesbian organization taking part in the initial phase of the movement. It wasn't until much later that the number of lesbian organizations increased in response to the calls of the women's movement; the investigation of these organizations lie outside the scope of this project. I was successful in locating a substantial number of early homophile publications, original books and mainstream accounts of the events which took place during the period studied. Furthermore, the

utilization of documents from the National Gay Archives enhanced the credibility of the data in this study. I believe that the material presented in this study is a good, accurate account of the lesbian and gay liberation movement.

However, as in any other project there were some problems. Whenever one is trying to discover what took place in the past and uses historical analysis as a tool, one is likely to encounter the possibility of finding gaps in existing accounts of the events. Also, conflicting reports of what happened are not uncommon. This leaves the researcher with the difficult task of deciding on the best description of what really happened. In this research both problems were encountered. That is, there were times when data were missing. The files of the National Gay Archives and the materials located in local libraries were by no means as complete as desired. A lot of original sources have been destroyed and lost because homophile organizations were not considered to be legal at the time when the pioneer organizations were formed. These organizations owed to their members total confidentiality and this requirement may have led to the destruction of many of their original documents. Also, low circulation of homophile publications and the disapproval of this type of material made it difficult for libraries to receive and purchase these publications. In addition, homophile materials found in libraries have been the subject of vandalism. It was not uncommon to find missing pages in books and magazines and abusive language written on these materials.

The other most frequent problem was the inability to verify the accuracy of the sources used in this study. An attempt was made to

rigorously follow the basic rule of historical research: use primary sources. However, even in primary sources the content of historical accounts is fixed. As a researcher one cannot generate a new set of historical records. Therefore, like historians, I have to take those accounts on face value. Only on occasion was a second source reporting on the same event, period or development found.

Lastly, limited resources prevented me from gathering a more complete set of original materials. I chose to research the files of the National Gay Archives because the Mattachine Society, a central organization in my study, was initiated in Los Angeles where the Archives is located and also because one of the initial members of the movement is the present procurator of the Archives. Mr. Kepner was instrumental in assisting me during the collection of the data. However, for a more complete inquiry I would have had to visit other homophile organizations and their archives, especially Mattachine's chapter in New York City. My emphasis on the development of the movement on the West Coast does not mean that the movement was dormant in the East. Rather such focus reflects, in part, my inability to have researched the data elsewhere. Also, it would have been beneficial to the study if I had been able to locate those individuals who were initially involved in the formation of the movement and conducted structured interviews. Perhaps such will be done in a later research.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA: FINDINGS

The central purpose of this research is to show that the lesbian and gay liberation movement did not materialize prior to the 1960's because homosexuals lacked an infrastructure in their community and a cohesive subculture that would support the movement. As indicated in Chapter 1, I have chosen to apply Blumer's description of general and specific social movements in order to identify developmental stages in the career of the movement under study. In addition, Resource Mobilization Theory will be used as a theoretical tool for evaluating the role played by preexisting structures in the formation of the liberation phase of the movement and to account for the behavior of social movement organizations. This chapter will present the findings on the formation and development of the gay movement. I will relate the course of events to the theoretical frame of reference identified above. There are four intertwined themes in the history of the movement. A brief exposition of these themes should aid the reader in relating them to the questions posed by this study.

In order to evaluate the role played by preexisting community structures and the changes in opportunity for collective action for the formation of the movement, an account of the crystallization of the subculture - the first theme - will be given. Prior to the Second World War homosexuals were confined to underground clubs and other secret methods for socialization and communication with one another (Licata 1981:165). Elements of homosexual subculture existed

in an uncoordinated fashion. There were homosexuals and there were feelings about what it meant to be a homosexual. But, for the most part, the reality and experiences of gay men and lesbians reflected individual biographies and individual descriptions of the homosexual act. The crystallization of the subculture and the establishment of a homosexual community was the by-product of dislocations taking place in society during and after the war years. The Second World War had a disturbing effect on American life. It brought divorce to marital relations, it removed men and women from their communities, and it created a labor shortage. More importantly, the war gave the young an opportunity to leave the institution of the family and, for some, to facilitate the discovery and diffusion of homoeroticism.

With the end of the war those who discovered their homosexuality and established contacts in gay circles had no reason to go back to their "old scheme of living". Homosexuality continued to take on larger proportions and the community was responding accordingly. Also, for the first time in history, homosexuals gained the stamp of academic approval with the publication of the Kinsey studies. These reports not only criticized the stigma placed on homosexuality, but they also encouraged homosexuals to find others who shared their preference. However, such positive developments were met with resistance by most in society, and once again homosexuals became the subject of persecution, assault, and discrimination.

Concurrent with these developments was the formation of the Mattachine Society, whose goals were to change the status of homosexuals in society. This marks the second theme. Mattachine

Society was formed by a handful of gay men who saw the position of homosexuals as the same as other minorities in society. For them, only a social movement with focus on institutional change and collective action constituted the tools for change. Original founders were instrumental in forming an organizational structure. But their ideology, coupled with attacks made by McCarthyism, soon led to their displacement. A new leadership took over and changed not only Mattachine, but the direction and structure of the entire movement. For the new leaders the only difference between homosexual and heterosexual individuals was their choice of sexual partners. According to these new leaders, change in the position of homosexuals would come about if gay men and lesbians would adjust to social institutions and support the work of respected professionals who were researching questions of sexual deviation. The shift in the movement's focus from institutional change to personal adjustment marks the third theme in the evolution of the movement. In this period, homophile organizations experienced a great deal of internal dislocation. The body of the paper identifies the factors involved in such shifts and their impact on the overall direction taken by the movement. For the time being it is sufficient to say, that despite the movement's inability to attract large numbers of homosexuals during this phase, the movement did develop a broader organizational structure.

Juxtaposed with the process of subculture crystallization and the formation of the movement are the characteristics of its general and specific phases as outlined by Blumer. This transition marks the

fourth theme and was accounted for by increments of specialization in the career of the movement.

This theme in the evolution of the gay movement is the rise of militancy. Once again, larger structural changes taking place in society led the way to dislocations in the career of the movement. The scenario in American cities slowly became colored by protest, riots, and other demonstrations. Specific groups within society started to challenge the establishment and demand social reform. In agreement, homosexuals responded by redirecting their movement again. Gay liberationists, unlike homophile leaders, rejected the movement's reliance on professionals and disputed the classification of homosexuality as mental illness. Instead, gay activists encouraged direct participation and collective action of fellow homosexuals in their struggle to change society's major institutions. As movement organizations responded to the call of liberationists with a change in their structure, the structure of the movement was also affected. Gay liberationists were successful in bringing about change in the position of homosexuals in society. However, by the time they took over the affairs of the movement there was a well-organized community with stable structures to support their calls for action.

Finally, a differentiation between the homophile movement and the lesbian and gay liberation movement must be made before presenting the data. The homophile movement and the liberation movement represent a differentiation in time in the career of the movement, and in attitudes of homosexuals toward the movement. It

also reflects differences in the movement's goals and tactics. The homophile movement refers to the initial phase of the movement. For the most part its organizations were characterized by their focus on personal adjustment of individual homosexuals and their reliance on respectable professionals. While there were some in the movement who rejected the adjustment model, on the whole the movement maintained such a focus. Gay liberation refers to the later phase of the movement. This time the history of the movement is characterized by a return to the institutional focus first established by original leaders, and by the selection of collective action as the leading tactic. Note also that the two major stages in the evolution of the movement reflect the general climate of society at large. That is, the homophile stage is marked by the focus on personal change on the part of the movement and by conservatism in the domestic political arena. Conversely the liberation phase focused on institutional change and it was developed during the last wave of liberalism. With this in mind, we begin.

GAY LIFE IN THE 1940'S

A good number of American cities experienced a gradual change in the composition of their population during the 70 years between 1870 and 1940. A previously unorganized category of people began to recognize that their erotic interest in members of their own sex was shared by a significant number of others as a fundamental part of an identity which set them apart from the majority. Jonathan Katz, in Gay American History, has compiled case histories, newspaper

articles, diary entries, and personal correspondence which show the diversity of gay lives during that time. The group included men and women, professionals and unskilled workers, native-born and immigrants, whites and blacks, single and married. The majority of them, however, appear to have lived in isolation, while only a handful had formed lasting relationships with other homosexuals. Slowly these networks began to diffuse and individual homosexuals started to find ways to meet one another and to patronize places which fostered a group life. By 1915 one observer of male homosexual life prematurely referred to it as "a community distinctly organized" (Katz 1976:52). Meeting places for public liaisons and institutions such as bars and friendship networks, spread in the urban scene. During the 1920's and the 1930's, homosexuals acquired a measure of stability, slowly growing in numbers and differentiating themselves by social background and styles. Gradually a subculture of homosexuals was developing in American cities, which later helped to create a collective consciousness among participants and to strengthen their sense of identification with a group.

In the not distant future, life in American cities became disrupted by the events marking the Second World War. Rapid urbanization relocated thousands of civilians from their familiar rural communities to impersonal metropolitan centers. Family life was also disrupted with divorce, desertion, and instability in the social relations of the sexes. Men left their homes to serve their country, and massive numbers of women entered the paid labor force

1

for the first time. It has been suggested that World War II created a new trend toward sexual permissiveness and an "erotic situation" (Williams and Weinberg 1971:57) which was conducive to articulating and disseminating a homosexual identity as well as evolving a gay subculture.

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 called for the registration of more than 16,400,000 males between the ages of 21 and 35. The armed forces took all those who were "fit" to serve the country, but it preferred men who were young, single, with few or no dependents. Clearly this population included a disproportionate number of gay men. Of course the question of homosexuality surfaced among officers and enlistees, but such questions were dealt with by psychiatric examinations which, for the most part, did not last more than a few minutes. The screening process was ineffective and the patriotic fervor of those years was so great (as was the stigma attached to homosexuality) that most gay men concealed their sexual preferences and identity. Further, the medical establishment responsible for weeding out the "unfit" used superficial signs of homosexuality, e.g., body type or recognition of homosexual slang. Menninger (1948:227), commenting on the unreliability of screening procedures, stated that "for every homosexual who was referred or

1 There is an extensive literature on the state of American society during the war years. For a more complete description see Richard Polemberg, War and Society, Philadelphia, 1972; Francis Merrill, Social Problems on the Home Front, New York, 1948; William H. Chafe, The American Woman, New York, 1972.

came to medical departments, there were five to ten who were never detected." Furthermore, the sex-segregated nature of the armed forces brought homosexuality closer to all military personnel. Living conditions and the dependence on one another for survival formed emotional attachments between men of different sexual persuasion. Equally important, the setting proved to be a safe environment for gay men to find one another, and even a degree of sympathy and acceptance from fellow heterosexuals could be detected. In one training camp in the Midwest, for example, a number of young homosexual soldiers formed a tight circle of friendship which in turn helped to solidify their emerging gay identity (D'Emilo 1983). As Donald Vining wrote in his diary, "the war is a tragedy to my mind and soul...but not my physical being; it's a memorable experience." Diary entries point to a number of sexual encounters and love affairs with soldiers, sailors, marines and civilians. Like many others, Vining was able to develop an active sex life, have several gay friends and gain knowledge of homosexual meeting places (Vining 1979:220-27). In short, while the military establishment never abolished its anti-homosexual posture, it facilitated the formation of a gay subculture and the spread of information about it.

It is also known that the military fostered the development of lesbian identity and even encouraged the formation of networks among them. For example, the Women's Army Corps became during the war years "a quintessential lesbian institution." While the number of women serving the country was less than the number of men enlisted, one finds that lesbians were well represented among the enlistees.

In 1943, for example, 70 percent of all women in the Women's Army Corps were single, 83 percent were childless, 40 percent were under 25 years of age, and 67 percent were under the age of 30. Also, in an attempt to avoid pregnancy, the female personnel were kept segregated; however, socialization and recreation opportunities among themselves were provided (Treadwell 1954:625-26, 767, 778). The popular stereotype about the Women's Army Corps being conducive to lesbianism, the policies toward unwanted pregnancies and the encouragement of women's networks may have kept heterosexual women away from enlistment, but at the same time recruited a large proportion of lesbians.

It appears that despite the military's anti-homosexual posture and the dominance of heterosexuality as the prescribed sexual preference, war time did encourage same-sex eroticism. It temporarily loosened social patterns which automatically channel men and women towards heterosexuality. It also made it possible for a number of Americans to discover and embark on gay relationships. For gay men and lesbians who had discovered and accepted their identity prior to the war but who, at the same time, felt constrained, the war years eased the coming out process and facilitated the formation of the gay subculture and well as their entrance into that world. More importantly, the war allowed homosexuals and lesbians to strengthen their ties with gay life, making it more visible and accessible.

The return to peace could not undo these changes. Gay males and lesbians, in association with one another, slowly began to create their first institutions. In the 1940's, for example, exclusively

gay bars appeared for the first time in a number of cities. In addition, a number of honorably discharged gay men formed the Veteran's Benevolent Association in New York City. The organization was to function as a social club sponsoring dances and parties which on several occasions attracted 400-500 homosexuals (Katz 1976). In Los Angeles, the Knights of the Clock were formed in 1949 to combat both homophobia and racism. And in 1947, Lisa Ben, a young lesbian, published a lesbian-oriented periodical called Vice-Versa: America's Gayest Magazine. She produced nine issues between June, 1947 and February, 1948, but ended it because the work load proved too heavy.

Of all the developments set in motion by the war, the formation and proliferation of gay taverns was perhaps the most significant. From their beginning, gay bars have been the basic unit of social life in the homosexual world. Compared to straight bars these establishments perform a much larger role in homosexual life. They foster an identity which was both public and collective, making it possible for homosexuals to meet others like themselves and to express themselves in ways denied to them in other places. At that time, as now, gay bars offered an all gay environment where the pretension of heterosexual conduct was dropped. Furthermore, when those places became the target of police harassment and brutality, the crowd suffered as a group. In this context, gay bars were the seedbeds for collective consciousness which one day might develop into political action.

Another important development was the publication of the Kinsey Reports in 1948 and 1953. For the first time in history, society was

presented with scientific evidence which called for the reformulating of conventional moral attitudes towards homosexuality, altering the nature of public discussion of sexuality as well. By the use of face-to-face interviews, Alfred Kinsey and Associates investigated more than 10,000 white American men and women. His data included the frequency and range of the sexual experience of his subjects: sexual encounters outside of marriage, marital relations, alone or with others, in youth or old age, and with the opposite sex, same sex, or with animals.

The results of his survey shocked many, if not most, Americans. Among men, he found that masturbation was nearly a universal practice that virtually all men interviewed had established as a regular sexual outlet by the age of fifteen. In addition, about half of the husbands in the survey engaged in extramarital intercourse and 95 percent of white American men had violated the law in some way at least once along the way to orgasm (Kinsey 1948:302, 392, 499, 585). Contrary to the common assumption that females were slower in responding to physical stimuli than men, Kinsey found that ineffective techniques of male partners accounted for the differences in responses between men and women (Kinsey 1953: 164, 233, 286, 416, 468, 584). However, for all his data, nothing was more daring and challenging than his statistics on homosexuality. Kinsey found that 50 percent of his male subjects admitted to having erotic responses to their own sex, 37 percent had at least one postadolescent homosexual experience leading to orgasm, four percent were exclusively homosexual throughout adulthood and for one out of eight

men same-sex eroticism predominated for at least a three year period. While the proportions were lower for women, the data revealed extensive lesbian activity among his white female subjects. Of all the women interviewed, 28 percent responded erotically to their own sex, 13 percent had experienced orgasm with another woman, and the percentage of women either exclusively or primarily homosexual in orientation was between one-third and one-half the corresponding male figure (Kinsey 1948:610-66: 1953:446-501).

Perhaps the most important aspect of Kinsey's survey was the questioning of the previously unchallenged assumption that all adults were permanently and exclusively either heterosexuals or homosexuals. Furthermore, the prevalence of homosexuality "in spite of the severity of the penalties that our Anglo-American culture has placed upon it through the centuries" led Kinsey to suggest that "such activity would appear in the histories of a much larger portion of the population if there were no social constraints". He concluded by dismissing the notion that homosexuality is abnormal, unnatural or neurotic and instead asserted that the phenomenon is "an inherent physiological capacity." (Kinsey 1948:659-60).

It is not surprising that Kinsey and Associates came under attack from various segments of society. Some in the scientific community, for example, charged that he used an inadequate sample. Others raised questions about the reliability of his statistical methods. Religious leaders and politicians spoke about the indecency and depravity of such a study. But despite such outbursts of rage, no one could erase the impact of his work. Kinsey informed white

America that their private "transgressions" were not sufficient to label them deviants or exceptional. Furthermore, he encouraged the revision of existing social norms in a manner which would reflect the prevailing practices. In addition, opinion polls taken at the time the research was published showed solid support from the vast majority of Americans who believed that sexual behavior was a fit subject for scientific investigation.

However, the impact of his studies upon attitudes towards gays and lesbians was ambivalent. Kinsey himself suggested that his study should constitute enough evidence that homosexuality ought not to be punished. At the same time, his findings were used by some to magnify the danger which homosexuality "poses" to society. In the long run, his reports became a crucial element in the rationale for law reform.

The reports implicitly encouraged those struggling in isolation against their homosexuality to accept it and search for sexual partners. In this sense the reports were a driving force for the emergence of a solid urban gay subculture.

Another event significant to the movement taking place in the 1940's was the publication of The Homosexual in America by Donald Webster Cory. In his book, Cory spoke about hostility, persecution and discrimination against gays. He also presented a colorful description of homosexual lifestyles and the institutions which sustain gay subculture. But of most importance was the new view of homosexuals he forwarded:

we who are homosexuals are a minority, not only numerically, but also as a result of a caste-like status which is similar,

in a variety of respects, to that of national, religious and other ethnic groups in the denial of civil liberties, in the legal, extra-legal and quasi-legal discrimination, in the assignment of an interior social position, in the exclusion from the mainstream of life and culture (Cory 1951:3, 13-14).

It is difficult to report with authority on the magnitude and impact of the above changes on homosexuals. It is equally difficult, however, to deny the fact that such developments were not accompanied by psychological changes in individual homosexuals. As such, it appears that events taking place during the 1940's mark the first manifestation of the gay and lesbian subculture. The data presented thus far indicate that changes taking place during the 1940's led homosexuals to establish their first cultural institutions and organizations after realizing that mainstream institutions did not cater to their needs and as a result of changing social conditions. But to seek alternative institutional settings means that at some level and at some point, one must feel that he or she has the right to do so. Homosexuals could not have initiated their institutions without realizing that they, too, had a place in society. Such internal questioning on the part of individual homosexuals led them to reevaluate their rights and privileges, which eventually caused alterations in their self-concept. Changes taking place during the 1940's caused homosexuals to develop a new view of what they believed themselves to be entitled. These realizations are very visible in Cory's message. The very appearance of his book indicated that homosexuals had begun to question their position in society and that at least some of them were receptive to new ideas.

It appears that the elements which compose gay subculture were

present in society prior to the 1940's, but they were not necessarily connected with one another by a set of above-ground institutions. The scope of this paper neither defines what a subculture is or presents a complete picture of what the gay and lesbian subculture was back in those days. However, a brief elaboration of the elements of the homosexual subculture is both relevant and sufficient for the purpose of this study.

Gay and lesbian subculture included institutions of the gay world such as bars, gay centers, gay newspapers, lesbian clinics, gay language, humor, and the ideas of gay people. In considering the elements of gay and lesbian subculture, it is important to note its relationship to mainstream culture. Gay people are probably the most integrated, yet the most isolated, minority in this country. Unlike other subcultures, gay people are not necessarily relegated to certain jobs, social strata, or neighborhoods. While there are some occupations and communities that are disproportionately gay, gays and lesbians can be found in every workplace and neighborhood. One can also find gays in a good number of families. Because of this, the gay subculture is different from other subcultures. Gays and lesbians are not born into gay subculture; rather it is something that they enter as adults or young adults. Also, gay subculture is not passed down with the family tradition, but is distinguished by being outside of the family structure. Nonetheless, as documented in Katz's (1976) Gay American History, homosexuals have a historical tradition.

Because of the diversity of gay people, lesbian and gay sub-

culture has less geographical or ecological focus than other subcultures, and a greater emphasis on social and personal institutions. The concrete institutional focus of lesbian and gay subculture is the bars. The bars have been the cornerstone of the gay and lesbian community and subculture. They are a place to meet others, to talk, to dance, to find sexual partners, and also a place where gay people go and learn about their existence as homosexual individuals. Note that "straight" bars are not the major structure where a heterosexual person acquires knowledge about what it means to be a heterosexual individual. Gay and lesbian bars, being the major institution of that subculture provide much of the definition and guidelines for homosexual behavior. A heterosexual person can take for granted that which is involved in being and acting as a heterosexual individual. Most do not need to patronize a bar or tavern to learn how to interact as a heterosexual or to feel that he or she is part of the heterosexual majority. This information is available to him or her outside of these commercial establishments, and it is passed on to them through the social institutions of the heterosexual world. The same is not so with homosexuals. Gay and lesbian bars are more than a place where gays and lesbians go for entertainment. They provide the subculture with a family-like structure where the essentials for living as homosexuals are transmitted. At some point almost every gay person goes to the bars. Some people never feel comfortable in the bars while for others they become a second home. In between is a large group of people who go to the bars on occasion. It is not uncommon for large

cities to have many gay and lesbian bars. These establishments differ in atmosphere and clientele. Some will be women's bars while others will be primarily for men. There are black and Latino bars, leather bars and drag bars. While there may be a generalized bar crowd, each bar will tend to have its own specific world and crowd. Going to bars means learning bar behavior in the context of gay subculture. There are no guides for bar behavior nor formal rules of etiquette, but there are informal rules. Many bars have rules, often unwritten, about what is proper attire. Bar owners will sometimes ban someone from their bars for what they consider improper behavior. And there are some unwritten rules for interactions among the customers - at whom and how you look at them, how to buy a drink for someone, ask for a dance or strike up a conversation. Much of this sets the standards for cruising, an important part of bar behavior for both gays and lesbians. Since gay bars have been one of the few places where gay people can meet potential lovers, the presence of cruising behavior is no surprise.

The bars have been and remain the focal point of the lesbian and gay community. They are the most stable institution in a frequently unstable world. True, they are not highly bureaucratized, but they, like many other institutions in this subculture, do have an integrated structure. They appear as a "concretion" around and through which the subculture, and the movement, has flowed. They shaped the subculture even as they are shaped and changed themselves. They are gay territory and while some in the gay community, especially feminist lesbians, often criticize the bars,

their importance for the subculture cannot be denied.

Gay people have often been associated with the arts, another component of gay and lesbian subculture. They have often been thought of as shapers of art and fashion. At the same time, the arts have often shaped the lives of gay people. Art is the arena in which gay people have been most frequently accepted and at the same time most ghettoized. There appears to be a certain glamour attached to the arts that somehow softens the impact of gayness for many non-gay people.

The impact of gays in art goes beyond the high culture of opera and ballet to the more recent and popular forms like disco. One characteristic of its popularity comes not so much from radio, but from cabarets, bars and clubs. In this sense, disco was made for the gay scene which also has a focus in the bars. Disco stars often got their starts in gay bars and still have gay followings. However, heterosexuals seem to avoid acknowledging its origin and its connection with gay life. Disco has roots in other subcultures as well, but gay subculture helped shape disco by giving it much of its emotion, energy and sensuality. Disco also brought changes in gay subculture. It reinforced the role of the bars and at the same time opened them up. Many 1950's and 1960's gay bars had not allowed dancing; disco changed that. It also made it possible to dance in an emotional and sensual way without attaching that to a particular person, which in turn changed the nature of many interactions among gays when dancing in their clubs.

In order to communicate, people within a subculture often

develop their own "lingo". Gay subculture is no exception. While the language in the United States is English, there are words and phrases that have taken on different meanings, meanings that are only known to those within the lesbian and gay community. Many of these "gay words" have obscure origins. An effort to compile a gay dictionary and trace word origins has been made in The Queen's Vernacular. The meanings and uses of words vary from place to place and from time to time, but some words have been in use for a relatively long period of time. For example, "gay" itself has a long history, as do the phrases "coming out" and "in the closet". These phrases have no equivalent in heterosexual vocabulary because they describe the common experiences of gay people that are not a part of heterosexual life. Gay language has also been used as a way to communicate with and to seek out one's gay companions without revealing the subject matter to heterosexual people. The entry of "gay words" into everyday vocabulary has many positive aspects in terms of greater openness about gays. It also has some negatives, both in terms of preventing use of gay words as code words and in terms of corruption of language.

Closely related to language of the gay subculture is camp and gay humor. One author who has discussed camp is Sontag (1966:275) who described camp as a sensibility:

Camp is not a natural mode of sensibility, if there be any such. Indeed the essence of camp is its love of the unnatural: or artifice and exaggeration. And camp is esoteric - something of a private code, a badge of identity even, among small urban cliques.

She goes on to describe camp as an aesthetic, a vision of the world, a love of the exaggerated. The camp taste in persons responds to the feminine in virile men and to the masculine in feminine women, and conversely, to the exaggerated masculinity in men and femininity in women.

Newton goes one step further in her book Mother Camp: Female Impersonation in America. She describes camp as a homosexual ethos, a strategy for the situation. Taking Newton's identification of camp with the gay subculture along with Sontag's description of camp, one could place the origin of camp in the life situation of gay people. For most gay people, living and staying alive require an ability to be what one is not, or to redefine and play a role. Gay language, as has been seen, is often based on double meanings. And homosexuality, on some level, explodes the myths of the naturalness of masculinity and femininity and reveals them for the exaggerations that they are. Camp is a strategy used by gays for dealing with prescribed heterosexual forms of behavior that do not fit the reality and the experiences of the homosexual individual. Camp is also a system of humor, a system of laughing at one's incongruous position.

There are many other aspects of gay and lesbian subculture. However, the sheer ignorance of most heterosexuals prevents the majority from seeing its richness. For too many heterosexuals, gay means sexual. The only thing that distinguishes homosexuals from heterosexuals, in the minds of many, is the sexual act in which homosexuals engage. But sex is not the only thing that sets homosexuals apart from the majority. In inspecting these elements of

gay and lesbian subculture one can see the complexity, diversity and richness of the group. Homosexuals have been able to maintain these elements through the institutions of their world, which has given the subculture a degree of continuity and autonomy from the larger institutional structure of society.

GAY LIFE IN THE 1950'S

Changes affecting gay life during the 1940's were not matched by a growth of social tolerance of homosexuality in the 1950's. Social discrimination, moral attitudes and religious beliefs, and the views of the medical establishment and the legal system remained intact. Also, easier access to gathering places for lesbians and gays and their increased visibility, the most significant changes during the 1940's, became key factors in making the gay subculture vulnerable during the 1950's. Furthermore, the Cold War and the struggle against Communism also contributed to forming a social setting where persecution and attacks towards homosexuals and lesbians took place.

Congressional hearings about the loyalty of government employees in the State Department led to the entanglement of homosexuality in domestic politics and the fight against Communism. On February 28, 1950, Undersecretary John Peuritay testified before members of the Senate Appropriations Committee that most of the 91 employees dismissed for moral turpitude were also homosexuals (White 1950:1)

Within no time, the danger posed by sexual "perverts" to national security became a rhetorical device among members of the government. Shortly after the hearings, Senator Joseph McCarthy

charged that an unnamed person in the State Department had forced the reinstatement of a homosexual despite the threat to the nation's safety. It was June, 1950 when the Senate decided to authorize an investigation into the alleged employment of homosexuals and "other moral perverts" in the government (New York Times June 15, 1960:6).

After the investigation, the Senate developed a report delineating their line of reasoning and justifying the exclusion of homosexuals from government services. Their first concern was in relation to the "character" of the homosexual: "those who engage in overt acts of perversion lack the emotional stability of normal persons" and such acts "weaken the moral fiber of the individual". The report also asserted that the presence of homosexuals in government offices was debilitating and posed threats to everyone around them. Even one "sex pervert in a government agency" the Committee warned, tended to have a damaging influence upon his fellow employees. These perverts will frequently pursue normal individuals to engage in "perverted practices" (U.S. Senate 1950:3-5).

The committee emphasized in their investigation the threat posed by "sexual perverts" to national security. The report called attention to "the social stigma attached to homosexuality", and in case of detection the pervert's life would be ruined. In addition, "gangs of blackmailer's" could take advantage of such vulnerability by making "a regular practice of preying upon the homosexual." The Committee felt that espionage agents "can use the same type of pressure to extort confidential information", and that homosexuals lacked the "character" to resist the blandishments of the spy. They

would betray the country, the Committee asserted, rather than live with the consequences of exposure. As evidence for their contention about blackmail practices and homosexuals, the Committee used the case of an Australian intelligence officer whose homosexuality made him a tool of the Russians in the years of World War I (U.S. Senate 1950:5-13).

The homosexual hunt proceeded as a major theme of domestic culture and politics throughout the McCarthy Era. Legislation questioned federal officials about the enforcement of security measures, and heads of agencies, in order to avoid charges of negligence, loudly publicized homosexual cases to demonstrate their watchfulness. From 1947 through April 1, 1950, when the sexual pervert issue surfaced, the dismissal of homosexuals from civilian posts in the executive branch average five per month. But in the second half of 1950 the figure increased to more than 60. In April, 1953, shortly after Eisenhower's inauguration, the new president issued Executive Order 10450. This Order revised the Truman administration's loyalty security program. In one section, the order explicitly listed "sexual perversion" as sufficient and necessary grounds for dismissal from federal jobs (Executive Order 10450:156-58). Furthermore, in its first 16 months of operation, the Eisenhower administration averaged about 40 dismissals of homosexuals from government jobs per month.

The military also intensified its hunt for homosexuals. The 1950 Senate investigation had praised the Armed Forces for their responsive approach to the problem. The average number of military

personnel discharged in the early 1950's was about 2,000 per year, but the figure had risen by another 50 percent by the beginning of the 1960's. Furthermore, the Armed Forces used procedures for dealing with gay men and lesbians which seriously infringed their rights. The military generally bypassed the court-martial proceedings required for dishonorable discharge. In its place administrative mechanisms were used. Termination was issued on the basis of undesirability with no need to substantiate charges with facts (Williams and Weinberg 1971). Homosexuals who left the Armed Forces with such discharges were damaged for life.

The persecution of homosexuals and lesbians during the 1950's went far beyond federal agencies and the military. States and municipalities also subscribed to the posture taken by the federal government on the question of sexual perversion. They also demanded loyalty and traditional moral conduct from their personnel.

Note that once the government assumed the position that lesbians and homosexuals were a threat to the welfare of the country it became necessary to develop ways of unveiling the identity of homosexuals. Furthermore, since hidden homosexuals supposedly posed the most serious danger, national security then depended upon the ability to break through their masks. In 1950 the FBI, charged with the responsibility of supplying the Civil Service Commission with background information on employees and job applicants, took on the task of establishing liaison with police departments throughout the country. However, the investigation of particular individuals seeking government employment was not enough. It was felt that a

preventive strategy should be adopted by the FBI. The FBI sought help from squad officers who supplied arrest records on morals charges regardless of whether or not a request for investigation had been issued. Regional FBI offices gathered information on gay establishments and other places frequented by homosexuals. They also collected press articles which provided information about the gay world (Hoover 1954: D'Emilo 1983).

The labeling of lesbians and homosexuals as moral perverts and the threat which they supposedly posed to national security gave local police departments across the country a green light to harass gays. Gays throughout the 1950's were subject to and suffered from brutal physical abuse from police officers. Gay men faced arrest primarily in bars and cruising areas such as public restrooms, beaches, transportation depots, and parks. Lesbians generally faced the police in and around lesbian bars. The number of arrests in numerous cities testify to the vulnerability of gay men and lesbians. In the District of Columbia, arrests exceeded 1,000 per year during the early 1950's. Like many other police departments, police officers in Washington, D.C. would entrap gay men by disguising their identities in plain clothes and cruising as homosexuals at Lafayette Park and downtown movie houses. In Philadelphia misdemeanor charges against lesbians and gay men averaged about 100 per month during the 1950's. In 1953 the New Orleans vice squad packed 64 lesbians into police headquarters after clearing a lesbian bar in the French Quarter. Baltimore police, in October, 1955, arrested 162 gay men in a single raid. Dallas,

Seattle, Wichita, Ann Arbor and Memphis were cities which saw comparable increases of police action against homosexuals (D'Emilo 1983).

Furthermore, the stigma attached to homosexuality made lesbians and gay men easy targets for petty criminals. Increasing numbers of male homosexuals became the victims of abuse and assault when cruising parks and other public places. Pickups of sexual partners were no longer a safe practice. The majority of these incidents went unreported to the police due to the lack of legal protection and the persecution of homosexuals at that time.

Taking into account all of what has been presented, one can assert that the persecution of homosexuals during the 1950's showed a change in approach to homosexuality when compared to the treatment that they received in the previous decade. During the 1940's, homosexuality appeared to have been more visible. The Armed Forces did question the sexual orientation of its recruits, but homosexuals for the most part were left alone. Furthermore, the sex segregated nature of military life was influential in the forming and mobilizing gay and lesbian networks. As stated above, such conditions triggered the articulation of psychological changes which in turn led homosexuals to perceive and desire a new position in society. At the same time, as the subculture began to solidify and take on larger proportions, systematized persecution and oppression over took the gay world. Note that the data presented above support another aspect of Blumer's delineation of a general social movement. He explains that while those in the group acquire new dispositions and new images

of themselves, their actual position in society at this point in time does not coincide with their aspirations. While homosexuals had developed new aspirations as a result of realizing their rights and privileges, the events taking place during the 1950's made clear to them that the gap between their aspirations and their real position in society was still very wide. Furthermore, it is also the case that the attacks on gay men and lesbians had a damaging effect on their search for a new self-image. Condemnation sustained the belief that homosexuals were perverts, deviants, and sinners. Many homosexuals had internalized such descriptions of themselves; as a result, the psychological process which would take them to a new vision of themselves and a different place in society was impaired. As Blumer's theory holds, however, the new images of themselves that homosexuals began to develop were vague and indefinite. Consequently, the crystallization of the process and its transformation into a fully developed social movement could not have taken place at this point. For the time being, these psychological developments formed the backdrop for future actions. According to Blumer, and the subsequent developments support his assertion, this stage in the history of the movement merely provides incentives to the group and to individual homosexuals to carry on and form a general movement. More specifically, these trends served to remind homosexuals of their dissatisfaction with the existing order.

THE BEGINNING OF THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT

The homophile movement, which later evolved into the lesbian and gay liberation movement, developed in the mid-twentieth century. As Blumer stated, a general social movement is marked by psychological developments on the part of the individual which slowly materialize into action, organization, ideology, tactics, goals, and the end result - a "new scheme of living". The initial phase of the homophile movement contains many of the characteristics of a general movement as delineated by Blumer. For example, those who initiated the movement appeared to have experienced a shift in their value system and were ready to change their new dispositions into action which would express their discontents with the "old scheme of living". However, the original founders of the movement lacked direction, a strategy on how to go about mobilizing the gay and lesbian community, and institutional support for their efforts. Furthermore, homophile leaders also had to identify the components of gay subculture and find a way of bringing it together into a cohesive whole.

The formation of the homophile movement was marked by the establishment of Mattachine Society in 1951. One could argue that the formation of a movement organization implies a higher level of development, bureaucratization, and specialization, thus best classifying the movement as a specific movement in Blumer's continuum. I dispute the above argument, however. The data show that the fact that Mattachine was formed did not mean that the

homophile movement had made its leap into its specific phase. The organization was fragile and ill-defined. Its structure was that of a loose interaction among its participants. The organization also reflected the psychological confusion felt by its founders between where homosexuals stood in society and their hopes for a better "scheme of living". It also lacked a program for action and a recognized leadership. Lastly, the career of the movement in its initial phase was interrupted by numerous setbacks. However, Mattachine managed to live through these and carry the movement forward; it gave the movement a beginning and it played a decisive part in shaping the movement's career.

The Mattachine Society was initiated by a group of gay men who at some time in their lives either belonged to the Communist Party or were members of left-wing circles. This linkage with alternative politics proved to be an important factor. The founders brought into the emerging society a great deal of organizational skills gained from their participation in other progressive organizations. In addition, the original structure of Mattachine Society resembled that of the Communist Party. The founders adopted a secret, cell-like structure which allowed for participation with a degree of anonymity and protection from exposure. Lastly, despite the lack of a comprehensive theory of homosexuality, the founders developed a political program which would convince homosexuals and society at large that gays and lesbians constituted an oppressed minority. The founders also maintained that what made homosexuals different from heterosexuals was the gay subculture and not ascribed

characteristics. Furthermore, in their effort to change the position of gays and lesbians in society they also tried to wash away the self-hatred and shame of being a homosexual and at the same time convert those feelings into pride in belonging to a minority group.

No other individual gave more of his time and energy to Mattachine than Henry Hay. Born in 1912, Hay spent his childhood and adolescent years in southern California. In 1930 he enrolled at Stanford University where he developed an appreciation and interest in drama. While at Stanford, Hay was introduced to the gay world, establishing contacts and making friends. He then returned to Los Angeles where friends from San Francisco initiated him into the homosexual circles in southern California (Katz 1976:406-20; D'Emilio 1983:58-9). The year 1933 presented Hay with some important decisions which changed the course of his life. Due to the bad economic times of those days Hay had difficulties finding employment as an actor, but soon decided to join a left-wing theater group which performed propagandistic plays. This experience planted the seeds for a developing political consciousness in the young actor. He later discovered that all of his fellow activists were members of the Communist Party, which he also joined. In the course of the next 15 years of Hay's life, his time was consumed by the party's activities and his personal life was also affected. However, in the midst of all these developments, Hay discovered that Stalin had reversed the official party line towards homosexuality and had started a campaign persecuting homosexuals in Russia. He was unable to reconcile his sexual identity with this new posture taken by the party and decided

to disclose his conflict to party officials who advised him to repress his homosexuality. In 1938, Henry Hay married another party member, Anita; however, he could not break away from his homoerotic desires.

An unexpected event in the summer of 1948 reversed the course of Hay's life. At that time the Communist Party was concentrating on Henry Wallace's presidential bid. Hay was invited to attend a social gathering in early August and found that all of the guests were gay. He then began to address the question of Wallace's presidential bid to other guests when some men in the room suggested, rather jokingly, that an organization aimed at the mobilizing gay men should be formed under the progressive party. They even suggested a name for the organization: "Bachelors for Wallace" and stated that in exchange for a sexual privacy plank in Wallace's platform they would work for his campaign. So much for talking - the organization never materialized. But the possibility of establishing a political organization for homosexual rights was planted in Hay's mind (D'Emilo 1983).

Shortly after, Hay began to seriously question his make-believe heterosexual identity. Two years had passed since that summer night in 1948, but the possibility of a homosexual rights organization was still alive in his mind. Hay decided to approach progressive professionals who despite their heterosexual orientation might have been open to his ideas. With no success, Hay was then convinced that a campaign on behalf of homosexuals would have to be initiated by homosexuals themselves. Sympathetic heterosexual professionals could

only help in the emancipation of homosexuals to a point.

In the spring of 1950, Hay approached Bob Hull, a close friend of his, and spoke about his idea of an organization for homosexual rights. Hull, showing interest almost immediately, passed the word to his roommate, Chuck Rowland, who also became interested. The three men decided to meet one evening in order to discuss the idea. Up to this point Hay had not been sure about Hull's sexual orientation. However, to Hay's surprise, Hull and Rowland were not only gay but also had been members of the Communist Party.

Hay's involvement with the arts led him to recruit another member. In early July, 1950, Hay met R., a Jewish costume designer and dancer with the Horton Company in Los Angeles. R. left Austria with his mother in 1939 to escape Nazi persecution. They came to the United States and made Los Angeles their home. Hay approached R. with a one-page prospectus for the political organization which would defend the rights of homosexuals. R. expressed interest and upon reading the proposal decided to join the organization (D'Emilo 1983). Meanwhile, Hull and Rowland introduced the venture to another friend, Dale Jennings, a progressive writer who, at the time, was active in the campaign to defend the civil liberties of Japanese Americans. Shortly after his recruitment into the organization a general meeting was organized on a Saturday afternoon in November, 1950. The five men: Hay, Hull, Rowland, R. and Jennings met at Hay's home to discuss forming the organization. Subsequent meetings gave rise to the Mattachine Society.

The newly established society reflected the leftist orientation

of its founders, a feature which distinguished it from most of its successor organizations. Its secret, cell-like hierarchical structure reflected Hay's, Hull's, and Roland's involvement with the Communist Party. As part of Mattachine's concern with unveiling the causes of gay oppression and analyzing homosexuals as an oppressed subculture, the founders stressed the need to formulate a theory of social change conducive to mobilizing homosexuals. Given that, forming a large, militant, gay constituency became their top priority. As Marxists the founders understood that injustice and the oppression of homosexuals was not the result of prejudice and misinformation, but stemmed from the very structure of society. This in turn led the founders to reject a narrow approach to the question and instead to focus on reform goals that would upgrade the status of homosexuals and society.

The political climate of those years, as well as firsthand experiences of Mattachine's founders, accentuated the need for secrecy. Rowland lost his position with the American Veteran's Committee because of anticommunism. R. had fled his country in order to escape persecution and extermination, and Hay feared repression by the California Anticommunist Investigating Committee. Consequently Mattachine's structure resembled a pyramid made up of five orders of membership with increasing levels of responsibilities as members climbed the structure. Each order had one or two representatives from a higher order. As the membership increased, orders were expected to subdivide into distinct cells so that each layer of the pyramid could expand horizontally. And as the number of cells grew,

members of the same order but from different cells would be unknown to one another. A single fifth order, composed of the founders, was solely responsible for providing leadership and establishing policies which would flow downward.

The need for a comprehensive understanding of gay oppression led the founders of Mattachine to inspect their own life histories. Through the winter of 1951 the five members met regularly and discussed their biographies, focusing on gay experience. The intent of those meetings was to delineate patterns among their homosexual experiences. Their concerns were broad ones: "How did one become a homosexual? Was homosexuality an ascribed or achieved characteristic? Were homosexuals really sick individuals? Did they have a psychopathological personality? If not, why then were some homosexuals so disturbed? Were homosexuals a group of people who shared sexual orientation only or did they have a common ground which could lead them into political action?" (D'Emilo 1983:65).

Out of these informal discussions an analysis of homosexuality came about. Founders were convinced that homosexuals constituted an oppressed subculture; that is, individuals develop their identities from interactions taking place in heterosexual nuclear families. These structures provide and accentuate a mode of conduct which the individuals learn. Homosexuals, like heterosexuals, internalize this system of gender roles as "natural". However, such a process often generates feelings of inadequacy, undesirability and self-deceit. As victims of a culture which does not admit and validate homosexuals, and as members of a subculture, gay men and lesbians remain trapped

in mainstream society unaware of their minority status.

It was important to the founders of the Mattachine to stress this concept of homosexuals as an "unaware minority". They made the differentiation between a class "in itself" and a class "for itself". They understood that a class "in itself" is nothing but an objective social category, where a class "for itself" is one in which common interests are recognized among the people of that class. In other words, the difference between the two was one of consciousness. Furthermore the shift from class "in itself" to class "for itself" is accompanied by a degree of cohesiveness among members and the ability to struggle on their own behalf.² Homosexuals, according to the founders of Mattachine, were trapped by a false consciousness, by a cultural ideology which had labeled their sexual identities as an aberration.

Accordingly, homosexual liberation would flow if 1) homosexuals themselves would challenge society's view, and their own internalization of what it means to be a homosexual; and, 2) if a gay community, aware of its status as an oppressed minority, would develop this awareness and turn this into a proud homosexual subculture. Furthermore, the new self-image would generate a unified movement of homosexuals ready to fight oppression.

Mattachine and the developments following its initiation did give the homophile movement its first sense of direction and purpose. The members of the fifth order were able to identify the

² The differentiation between a class "in itself" and a class "for itself" comes from Marx's, The Poverty of Philosophy.

movement's priorities and also develop a theoretical framework explaining the position of homosexuals in society. Formulating such intellectual tools was important in that it gave legitimate purpose to the movement. Furthermore, the fifth order could now approach potential members and speak about the need for and the importance of the movement and about its function in the process of emancipating homosexuals in this society.

In order to begin its program, members of the fifth order decided to sponsor semipublic discussion groups. However, these discussion groups failed to attract participants with only a few returning for a second meeting. But despite such a bad response, the group was able to recruit a pair of lovers, James Gruber and Konrad Stevens. They were originally contacted by Rowland, who offered them membership in the fifth order. The couple decided to accept the offer and their membership in the society marked a turning point: that is, neither one of them had any knowledge of Marxism, which in turn forced others in the group to frame their ideas in a language that was accessible to non-Marxists.

With that in mind, in April, 1951, the seven members wrote a one-page document stating the purpose of the society. Accordingly, the society was to unify isolated homosexuals, to educate homosexuals so that they could see themselves as an oppressed minority, and to lead them in the struggle for their own emancipation (Mattachine Society Missions and Purposes: April, 1951).

The semipublic discussions finally took off in the summer of 1951. The founders designed a questionnaire which facilitated

discussion among participants. Also, many participants experienced such systematic questioning for the first time in their lives. The questionnaire tapped their experiences with the law, visits to bars, the extent to which they were out of touch with their families and co-workers, and questions pertaining to discrimination and social attitudes about homosexuality.³

By early autumn of the same year, the seven-member fifth order could no longer handle the semipublic discussions due to the increase in membership. They then formed first order units which they called "guilds". Guild facilitators were individuals who had the skills and willingness to lead group discussions and were carefully selected by the seven-member fifth order. However, first order members did more than facilitate group discussions. In an interguild conference arranged by the fifth order, first order members were instructed on how to develop among participants a unified view of gays as a minority group. They were also encouraged to push the idea of developing a homosexual subculture and preparing participants for political action.

Furthermore, discussion groups made it possible for members to establish a rapport among themselves. This form of interaction allowed for the development of informal fellowships where members of the organization got to know one another as people and not as institutional symbols. The interaction which developed out of these informal fellowships led participants to experience common sympathy

³ A copy of the questionnaire can be found in the Kepner's file at the National Gay Archives in Los Angeles.

and a sense of intimacy which was beneficial to affirming and developing group solidarity.

By this point the discussion groups and interguild conferences were going well, but not much action had been taken. The fifth order, while aware of the need for political action, had no idea of where and how to start. However, the course of events changed in February, 1952. Dale Jennings, a fifth order member, became the victim of police entrapment. A plain clothes police officer accosted him in a Los Angeles park, charging him with dissolute behavior. Jennings was arrested and released on bail. Shortly after, the fifth order called an emergency meeting to decide how they should handle the matter (Jennings 1953). Given the political climate of those years and the anti-homosexual campaigns, it was only natural that Mattachine founders feared the exposure of the society to the outside. They then decided to create an ad hoc Citizen's Committee to Outlaw Entrapment. The creation of such a committee would allow them to publicize the case without having to expose the organization.

The Committee tried to publicize the case by contracting the press and releasing statements and letters to radio stations and television networks. They had no response. It became clear to the fifth order that an alternative avenue was necessary to gain publicity. They then decided to write a number of pamphlets about the case and circulate them throughout the Los Angeles area. They also met with gay shopowners in West Hollywood and requested their cooperation by informing their gay clientele about the case. In selected supermarkets, gay clerks were asked to drop a pamphlet into

the packages of gay customers.

The publicity campaign was a success and the Committee received a goodly amount of correspondence as well as financial support. The trial for the case was set for June 23, 1953. At the trial Jennings admitted that he was a homosexual but denied that he was guilty of the charges against him. After 36 hours of deliberation the district attorney's office dropped the charges and the Citizen's Committee had their first victory.

The pamphlets about the case, as well as Jennings' open defense of the right to be a homosexual, had a positive impact on the Mattachine Society. The organization experienced growth, doubling its size from one meeting to another. Also, Mattachine networks began to expand geographically throughout southern California. By 1953, chapters were created from San Diego to Santa Monica to San Bernardino. In May, 1953, the total number of participants reached more than 2,000. But the growth of Mattachine extended beyond southern California. In February, 1953, Gerry Brissette from Berkeley wrote a letter to the society requesting information about their chapters, purposes and activities. Rowland enthusiastically invited him to Los Angeles to discuss the possibility of having a chapter in Berkeley. Their meeting was successful and upon Brissette's return to Berkeley, a new chapter was formed. From there chapters were also initiated in Oakland and San Francisco.

The geographical spread of Mattachine indicates that the means used by the leadership to mobilize the gay community was effective. The fact that homosexuals were responding to the calls of the

movement also showed that individual gays and lesbians were validating the movement by participating, and at the same time reinforcing each other's need to be a part of a group.

With growth in membership came diversity. Chapters in southern California were composed largely of males with only a few lesbians attending. In the northern part of the state, however, Brissette attracted many lesbians to the Bay area chapters. The Laguna chapter drew its membership from the gay business community, and a chapter close to University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) took in several faculty members. Mattachine chapters also experienced an expansion of their activities. The chapter dominated by faculty members from UCLA embarked on research about current theories of homosexuality. Other chapters became responsible for collecting printed materials on vice squads and morals arrests. But the most important development was the decision to initiate a homosexual magazine (Lambert 1955). It was clear to the fifth order that mainstream media were not interested and would not publicize the movement's actions and grievances. In January, 1953, the first issue of the magazine, entitled One, came out, marking a step forward in the history of the movement. The magazine was intended to voice gay's minority views to other homosexuals and to society at large. Despite the fact that One was independent of Mattachine, most of the editorial board members were guild members and Dale Jennings was One's first editor. Within a few months of publication sales reached over 2,000 per month. Early issues contained articles about the Mattachine Society and the letters to the editor indicated that the

magazine was reaching all corners of the country. This in turn helped pass the word that a homosexual rights organization was now in existence.

Because of the successful response to the Citizen's Committee on the matter of Jennings's trial, the fifth order decided to incorporate Mattachine Society as a non-profit educational organization in the state of California. They called it the Mattachine Foundation.⁴ If successful, the foundation would accelerate the process of reaching out to society at large, but more importantly, it would serve to spread the word about Mattachine to professionals and public officials. The fifth order also saw the foundation as a way to gain heterosexual allies and achieve legal status which in turn would alleviate member's anxiety about the possible illegality of participating in a homosexual organization. As D'Emilo (1983) reports, the fifth order then went about contacting professionals in the community and asked for their support. Gruber and Stevens managed a meeting with Christopher Isherwood, a novelist, and Dr. Evelyn Hooker, a psychologist at UCLA. both professionals, while sympathetic to the foundation, refused to be part of its board of directors. Other contacts were made but no support was found for legalizing the foundation.

It appears that the transition of the movement from a general to a specific phase was initiated at this time. Organizations

⁴ For a discussion of Mattachine Foundation, see "By-Laws of Mattachine Foundation, Inc." July 29, 1952. Mattachine Society, Los Angeles. A copy of the By-Laws can be found in the National Gay Archives.

representing the movement had managed to bring homosexuals together and to establish the boundaries of the homosexual world. These organizations had begun to provide individual homosexuals a sense of belonging to a group and also united them in their common experiences. By the end of 1953, the fifth order could evaluate their progress with satisfaction. They were no longer a small group of leftist homosexuals. Instead they had formed organizations, established a division of labor, tried out different tactics for recruitment, expanded their activities, and provided a sense of direction and purpose to the group.

Mattachine's growth, structure, and visibility created some problems for members of the fifth order. The secretive nature of the society and its leadership's past involvement with the left made the organization vulnerable to attack. In addition, unlike the Communist Party, Mattachine members shared only a common sexual identity and not a political ideology. Its membership was too diverse and lacked uniformity in political action and consciousness. The rapid influx of new participants led the fifth order to enlist guild members who did not subscribe to the notion that homosexuals constituted an oppressed minority. Consequently consensus and uniformity became problematic.

Problems began to arise when Paul Coates, a Los Angeles newspaper reporter, wrote an article in March, 1953, exposing Mattachine members of the fifth order. Anxious to gain access to local politicians, they had sent a letter to candidates for city council and school board positions requesting the candidates'

opinions on homosexuality and sex education in public schools. Coates managed to get a copy of the letter and went on to investigate the secret society. In his column in the Los Angeles Mirror, Coates elaborated on the theme that homosexuals were "found to be bad security risks in our State Department". he also stressed the danger of having homosexuals band together for political action.⁵

Within no time the news hit Mattachine, provoking a heated reaction. A Los Angeles discussion group insisted that fifth order members should "make themselves known" and that actions should be taken in order to put an end to "subterfuge". Such pressure forced the fifth order to call a democratic convention for the purpose of restructuring Mattachine as an above ground organization. In April, 1953, about 100 participants gathered for a two-day convention at Reverend Maxey's Universalistic Church for the purpose of writing a constitution, adopting by-laws, and electing officials for the society.

At the convention, Rowland, in an opening speech, reminded the participants that homosexuals are a minority group within their own culture. He stated that "we must disenthral ourselves of the idea that we differ only in our sexual directions and that all we want or need in life is to be free to seek the expression of our sexual desires". As outsiders in mainstream society, homosexuals had no other choice but to develop their own culture. Rowland also called on participants' pride in their unique identity and pride in

⁵ Paul Coates, "Well, Medium, and Rare." Los Angeles Mirror, March 12, 1953. Clipping in National Gay Archives, Los Angeles.

elaborating "an ethical homosexual culture" (Rowland 1953).

However, a Los Angeles guild member, Kenneth Burns, voiced his opposition to Rowland's call and managed to be selected to chair the committee responsible for the new constitution. Burns also contacted Marilyn Rieger, a guild member, and together they strove to amass a constituency which opposed the fifth order's ideas and views. One of their allies was Hal Call, a delegate from the San Francisco chapter. Call distinguished himself from others in the crowd. He was a journalist in the Midwest, but upon his arrest in Chicago in 1952 he lost his job and moved to San Francisco. There he joined the first discussion group. He was aggressive and outspoken in his determination to expel radical members from the society (D'Emilo 1983).

Matters could not be resolved at the first convention, and a second one took place in May, 1953. The opposition was much more organized this time. Rieger took the stand and spoke against the view of homosexuals as a minority group. According to her, homosexuals were no different from heterosexuals, "our only difference is an unimportant one to the heterosexual society, unless we make it important". Further, she forwarded the notion that equality could be achieved if homosexuals were to integrate with heterosexuals: "(our) homosexuality is irrelevant to our ideals, our principles, our hopes and aspirations," she said. her speech had a mixed impact on participants. She successfully touched many at the convention when she said that "we are first and foremost people", but to claim that homosexuality was an unimportant aspect of their lives

was a mistake.

Shortly after, Hal Call and David Finn, heads of the San Francisco delegation, began to accuse the fifth order of Communist subversion. Call insisted on a motion which would introduce into the constitution a statement concerning the society's position in relation to "subversive elements" (D'Emilo 1983:79-80). In the end, the May convention had split results. The majority of delegates voted against the opposition, Call's motion was defeated, and affirming homosexuals as a minority group needing to build on "ethical homosexual culture" emerged victorious. However, such gains did not undo the impact of subversive accusations upon members of the fifth order. They felt that such allegations would, in the end, weaken the society and decided to resign their posts and turn over leadership of Mattachine to others.

It was also decided that Mattachine should take the form of a membership organization, headed by an elected committee which had the authority to designate working committees. Regional offices, then called area councils, were free to elect their own officials and be part of the main coordinating committee. Burns was elected head of the coordinating committee along with Rieger, Call, and Finn. R., Gruber, and Hull decided to disassociate from Mattachine altogether. Jennings concentrated on his editorship duties at One. Hay suffered the most, sinking into depression and never again achieving a central position in the movement.

The organizational shifts resulting from the May convention gave Mattachine a new direction, orientation, and structure. The new

leadership eradicated the position taken by the founders; they abolished the proposition that homosexuals constitute a minority group and that Mattachine's leading role was to consolidate a homosexual culture. In its place, the new leadership maintained that homosexuals were basically the same as heterosexuals except for their sexual preference. Furthermore, they advised homosexuals to "adjust to a pattern of behavior that is acceptable to society in general and compatible with (the) recognized institutions of home, church and state", and that Mattachine's principal goal was to aid professionals and organizations embarking on the study of "sex variation problems" (Burns 1954).

The above organizational shifts were significant for the movement and for Mattachine, too. It confirmed the movement's leap to its specific phase. That is, by correlating the above developments with the sequence set by Blumer in the career of a specific social movement, one finds that the first stage is marked by "social unrest". The data indicate that homophile leaders were able to promote unrest by establishing the semipublic discussion groups. Those groups not only fostered the development of solidarity among participants but also kept their discontent with the existing social order in check. The analysis formulated by the original founders of Mattachine about the position of homosexuals in society was used as an agitating tool, and guild members took the role of agitators. Blumer points out that agitation is successful if the attention of a movement's participants is retained and if it directs their feelings, impulses, ideas, criticism, and suggestions. Discussion groups were

able to deliver such functions. Its forum-like format served as a coordinating device for the group. Also, Blumer points out that the agitator's main function lies in altering people's concept and view of their rights. The data indicate that while homophile leaders and guild members were trying to accomplish these psychological changes by convincing those in the discussion groups of the fact that homosexuals formed a minority group, not everyone in those groups accepted this rationalization. Despite this, their discontent with the system was being aroused.

The second stage in Blumer's classification scheme is what he called "esprit de corps". Discussion groups were instrumental in the development of this stage, too. They not only brought gays together, but fostered a "common identification" as well. Informal yet structured interactions of participants in these groups gave rise to feelings of intimacy and closeness. Members had a chance to share their experiences and began to experience what it meant to be part of a selected group. For many homosexuals these groups were the first and perhaps only place where they could find collective support. "Esprit de corps" slowly bound lesbians and gays together; it transformed their individual experiences into group experience and solidified their commitment to the objectives of the movement.

Perhaps the most important aspect of "group morale" - the third stage in Blumer's scheme - is the conviction about the movement's purpose experienced by participants. Group morale fosters the belief that the movement has a "sacred mission" which is not only attainable

but necessary if the group is to change that which is unjust in society. The data on the homophile movement show that while there was disagreement in relation to movement tactics, there was general support for the purpose of the movement. Without such support it would have been very difficult for Mattachine to have expanded its activities, increased its membership, and diffused geographically.

It appears that homophile leaders were able to fulfill the requirements set by the first three stages that Blumer describes for specific movements. However, the original leadership failed to enlist support from the majority of participants for the movement's ideology. The formation of a cohesive group ideology - Blumer's fourth stage - gives the movement a statement of purpose, it delineates the movement's objections to the existing order, it justifies the existence of the movement, and it plays an important part in the identification of the movement's "practical operations". The original leaders of Mattachine were able to develop a group ideology. They were able to prioritize their goals, find direction and justify and establish a body of defense for their objectives. More importantly, the ideology established by the fifth order criticized and condemned the existing structure which the movement was attacking and trying to change. As such, it was a political statement, too. But its radical bent prevented the original leadership from securing adherence from the movement's participants. Blumer (1939) points out that an ideology has no value unless it has popular support. The data indicate that the subsequent leaders of Mattachine were successful in gaining the endorsement of movement

participants. Their ideas had popular appeal because they spoke more directly to the experience of those involved in the movement and to their background. It was also less threatening for participants and for society. But as an ideology it was apolitical. It reflected the personal change approach that the new leadership was trying to implement, and it also spoke more directly to the psychology of the movement. Nevertheless, the new leadership's apolitical philosophy did establish a new orientation for the movement, it sustained the movement's new purpose, and it functioned as a guide for the "practical operations" of the movement, thus serving as a quasi-ideology. This transition marked the movement's leap into its specific phase. This does not mean, however, that the movement had achieved its final form and therefore ceased to evolve. Rather it meant that the movement was now composed of more specialized structures that had the characteristics of a true collective enterprise.

Mattachine's new position in relation to the difference between heterosexuals and homosexuals was detrimental to the evolution of the movement. Minimizing such differences indicated that the need to establish and affirm gay subculture and its institutions was not as great as original movement founders perceived it to be. It also meant that the question of homosexuality and the position of homosexuals in society should be dealt with by a personal attribution form of approach and not as a systemic question. The new position taken by Mattachine superseded the accomplishments made by the organization in its early phase. It did not destroy the movement,

but by choosing personal attribution as the cause for the movement, the process which developed and sustained the sentiment of belonging to a group was interrupted. It affected group solidarity and caused the movement to adopt exclusive guidelines for recruiting its participants since only those homosexuals in need of help would profit from the movement. In addition, the movement's new focus inhibited identifying problems with mainstream institutions, which prevented the affirmation of homosexual subculture. In short, organizational activities and the structure and tactics of movement organizations were all affected by changes in the movement's goals.

Discussion groups, for example, no longer helped develop a political consciousness among participants, but became therapeutic rap groups for homosexuals in need of assistance. This in turn fostered the disintegration of the discussion groups; the group in San Diego was terminated shortly after the convention; Los Angeles groups and Mattachine's unit in East Bay were also reduced. A few discussion groups, still loyal to the old Mattachine, tried to restructure themselves as "task-oriented" units. But their actions depended upon approval of the coordinating committee.

It was November, 1953, when disputes between the old and new leadership reached their peak. The new leadership called for another convention in Los Angeles. At this convention the new coordinating committee successfully removed the remaining vestiges of the older leadership, disposing of "any direct, aggressive action". Further, it was decided that Mattachine should "limit its activities to working with and through persons, institutions, and organizations

6

which command the highest possible respect". However, Rowland voiced his opposition to such measures. It was then that Finn "ruled him out of order and announced...that he would turn (in)...to the FBI the names of (those) in the convention who failed to reject the communistic principles supported by the old leadership" (Winters 1954:4-8). Such an announcement was not taken lightly by a number of delegates because of its violation of anonymity. Subsequently all other resolutions forwarded by the new leadership at that convention were defeated. However, independent of such a heated scenario, the organization did take on new directions, leaving behind it the militant posture of its first three years of existence. This latest convention contributed to the overall decline of Mattachine, especially membership. In the following convention in May, 1954, only 42 members participated and the turnout for the following year's convention was even smaller.

Meanwhile, One was striving to keep alive the militancy of earlier times. The magazine would often criticize Mattachine perspectives and policies. It also continued to promote the message that homosexuals should be proud of being gay and that lesbians and gays were the only real authority on issues and concerns of gay life. Furthermore, the magazine would not only speak against the medical outlook on homosexuality, but also exposed police brutality and harassment against gays. Without question, One served as open forum where homosexuals could freely express their views. Equally

⁶ Mattachine Society, convention for the adoption of By-laws, "Minutes," November 14-15, 1953, Los Angeles, National Gay Archives.

important, it played an important role in shaping the consciousness of some gay men and lesbians.

The following year, 1955, appeared to be a promising one for Mattachine. The society slowly began to expand again, forming new chapters in New York and Chicago. In January of that year the organization began to publish its own magazine, The Mattachine Review. It was published by the San Francisco chapter, headed by Hal Call. The publication helped to develop a considerable amount of growth in that chapter, and in 1956 San Francisco became the headquarters for Mattachine's national office.

Thus far the data presented on the homophile movement have been correlated to Blumer's description of general and specific social movements. However, the applicability of Resource Mobilization Theory in explaining social movement formation and the behavior of the organizations which constituted the movement will be tested. At this stage, the fundamentals of Resource Mobilization Theory will be related to the data already presented.

Unlike the classical approach to the study of social movements, Resource Mobilization Theory is concerned with the rationality of movement actions. This concern includes an assessment of the costs and rewards of lines of action that, if successful, would change the institutional structure of society. In other words, this perspective argues that a social movement is a rational process. The data presented above certainly sustain this assertion. The homophile movement was not formed overnight, nor was it an accident of the result of mass hysteria. Rather, the movement represents the

materialization of a rational scheme that transformed psychological changes and structural changes into a string of innovative lines of action.

The original leaders of the movement responded to changes in their value system. They experienced the need for an institutional structure that would best reflect their existence and best respond to their needs. Then the fifth order carefully explored their biographical histories, sorting the patterns and highlighting the commonalities among themselves. By virtue of identifying that which was common to them, they began to elaborate a strategy which would counteract their grievances and change society. Preceding this phase of the process, homophile leaders came to the realization that the costs involved in mobilizing their liberation were justifiable given future rewards. It is true that at the beginning of the movement the risks involved in bringing the movement above ground were more than many participants were willing to take. However, these risks were not enough to stop mobilization and the movement proceeded with its plan of attack.

The events reported thus far also support a second general proposition of Resource Mobilization Theory. That is, the perspective holds that the basic goal of a social movement reflects conflicts which are built into institutionalized power relations. Whether one inspects the goals of the original founders of the movement or the goals of subsequent leadership, one finds that they are similar in content. all phases of the movement, in essence, were fighting for the amelioration of the position of homosexuals in society.

It is common sociological knowledge that people, homosexuals and heterosexuals alike, do not live in a cultural vacuum. As soon as a collection of people become a group and start to interact with one another, common meanings and interactional patterns are likely to develop, followed by institutionalization. Homosexuals in contact with one another developed their own worlds, but this opposed major institutions of the heterosexual world. That is, gay men, by giving up the privilege of having an individual woman directly under him, not out of guilt but out of his own desire, betrays male supremacy. He calls into question the real value of powers attached to the male role. But for his betrayal he is subject to social and legal abuse. Lesbianism is also threatening to the heterosexual world. Lesbianism is women getting in touch with one another and defining themselves in their own terms. It is women giving each other the value that the power structure only allows them to give to men. This is a threat to male domination and the power structure it serves. In short, the institutionalization of homosexuality weakens the sex stratification system of society. Homosexuals do not reproduce male dominated nuclear families, but instead disregard the narrow sex roles that have warped and constricted so many. They undermine subjugation and attempt to interact with one another as equals. All this sends shock waves to heterosexual institutions. this is the reason there appears to be conflict in power relations between heterosexuals and homosexuals. The heterosexual majority, by refusing to legitimize gay and lesbian subculture, also minimize the possibilities of homosexuals existing as a group. And as long as the group did not

exist, institutional monopoly was secure. The legitimation and institutionalization of homosexuality is diametrically opposed to the interests of major institutions of society. The affirmation of lesbian and gay subculture contradicts the moral system of the heterosexual majority, it undermines the institution of the family, and it implies a redefinition of the functions of sexual intercourse. All the above factors were sufficient for society to ensure the monopolization of sexual behavior in compulsory heterosexuality. Any change in the sexual system of society implied an alteration in heterosexual culture, but such was counterproductive to the social order. However, homosexuals brought these conflicts out in the open and persisted in their pursuit of liberation.

A closely related proposition of Resource Mobilization Theory states that grievances formed as a response to institutionalized conflicts are too ambiguous and therefore cannot, by themselves, be responsible for the formation of a social movement (Tilly 1978). It follows that social movements are the result of long-term changes in group resources, organization, and opportunity for collective actions. The history of the homophile movement indicates that grievances had a place in its formation, but structural changes appear to take a key role in the process.

In a manner similar to the civil rights movement, the homophile movement resulted from changes taking place in society due to the Second World War. More specifically and as stated above, the war made it possible for homosexuals to live outside the family sphere; urbanization increased anonymity; and homosexuality was brought

closer to the surface by military life which facilitated establishing networks among homosexuals. There was also the spread of gay bars and a qualitative change in the approach to homosexuality suggested by Kinsey's report encouraging homosexuals to respond to new calls. All these changes simultaneously gave homosexuals reason to question their position in society, and, at the same time, increase resources and group organization of the homosexual community as well as increasing the opportunities for collective action. The effect of this increase was a long-term reduction in the cost of mobilizing and a greater margin for the success of the movement.

Lastly, there is the question of whether the centralized structure of a movement's organization is both more typical of recent social movements and more efficient. As presented in the literature, many theorists working with the Resource Mobilization framework have given substantial attention to changes in the structure of movement organizations. Zald and Ash (1966) maintain that the goals of personal change movements will tend to induce the development of a decentralized structure with an exclusive membership, while institutional change movements are typically centralized and inclusive. Notice that Zald and Ash are referring to the structure of social movements in general, which is different from the structure of social movement organizations. This distinction is seldom made among theorists working with Resource Mobilization Theory. However, Zald and Ash (1966) also maintain that the structure of social movement organizations is relative to the goals and tactics of the movement. The data show that developments resulting from changes in

leadership had an impact on the overall direction and structure of the organization and of the movement.

The data leave no question about the structure of the movement. Mattachine, being first established as a secret organization, had a centralized structure. Such structure was, in this case, transferred to the movement since Mattachine initially constituted the movement. Note also that at that point in the history of the movement the focus was on institutional change. However, establishing new leadership changed the goals and tactics of the movement. That is, new leaders were more preoccupied with providing the means for the adjustment of troubled homosexuals in society. The new emphasis also caused the movement's tactics to shift from collective action to cooperation with respectable professionals. All these dislocations, but especially change in goals, developed a decentralized structure for the movement. These developments confirmed Zald and Ash's (1966) assertion that movement structure is relative to movement goals. the data show that the initial structure of the movement reflected the movement's commitment to institutional change. Furthermore, once there was a change in focus, the movement responded by developing a decentralized structure. Attempts towards decentralization of the movement appeared much later with another shift in the movement's goals and tactics.

THE LESBIAN CONTINGENCY

From its very beginning Mattachine Society was an organization which represented gay men. Women's participation in the organization was minimal. Discussion groups hardly addressed specific questions and concerns related to lesbianism. The development of a lesbian contingency required that those involved in the movement would be willing to take on sexism as well as homophobia. Lesbianism, therefore, posed a greater threat to society. It called for economic emancipation of women as well as a type of eroticism which is divorced from procreation and without male participation. Because of these factors a lesbian identity was slower in developing. However, once formed, it reflected the disparity of women's existence in the nineteenth century. One brand of lesbianism took after the normative role of "proper" Victorian women. An alternative represented the experience of working class lesbians who tried to "pass" as men in the public eye but who, at the same time, centered their lives around an intimate female relationship. This dichotomy prevailed in the lesbian world for a long time, forcing newcomers to choose and follow-up with one of the prescribed models.

Lesbian bars did not proliferate as readily as the male equivalent. In mid-sized cities the lesbian community was usually too small to support its own bars and even in big cities mixed establishments were more often the rule. The city of Boston, for example, saw the opening of 24 gay taverns during the 1950's and only one exclusively lesbian bar. Cory (1964) estimated that in 1963 only

30 bars catered to lesbians nationwide while the city of San Francisco had that many bars for gay men. This discrepancy in numbers between lesbian and gay bars has been explained by the smaller number of lesbians, the fact that married women are excluded from lesbian life while married men have more freedom to explore gay life, and the fact that women on the average have less spending cash to patronize bars. Other factors included the location of those establishments and the fact that frequenting a lesbian bar implied an open acknowledgment of their sexual identity. That is, lesbians were pretty much restricted to bars as a meeting place, while gay men could meet others in parks, bus stations, and public restrooms. However, the impact of those establishments on the formation of a lesbian identity was significant. It allowed for a collective manifestation of lesbian existence, it played a part in shaping group consciousness among women, and it brought lesbianism closer to the public eye.

Equally important were the social changes which took place during World War II and the effect of those changes on women and lesbians. The Second World War made it possible for a large number of women to enter the work force, giving them means to earn a living and increasing their geographic mobility. Also, the presence of women in the labor force helped to ease hostility toward women holding jobs. However, these trends changed shortly after the end of the war. A good number of women lost their high paying positions, and a call for compulsory heterosexuality was reinstituted. The average marriage age dropped and the rate of marriage reached a peak. In addition, the market became flooded with a brand of

literature which reminded society at large that woman's place was in the home.⁷

In 1955, a group of female homosexuals began to organize for their own emancipation. Their primary concern reflected the isolation and invisibility of lesbians and their status in society. The formation of a lesbian contingency proved difficult. For one thing their very numbers were less when compared to gay men. This in turn made recruitment harder. Second, there were fewer options available for lesbians due to economic constraints. And lastly, the conservative climate of American society during the 1950's pressured them towards conformity.

The Daughters of Bilitis was the first lesbian political organization. Its existence was made possible through the efforts of Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon, who throughout the years held every position in the organization. They kept the organization alive by contributions from their own pockets and also gave assistance and shelter to lesbians in need of help.

Del Martin, who was born in San Francisco in 1921, discovered her lesbianism at a late phase of her adolescence. Such a discovery, however, did not prevent her from getting married at the age of 19. Shortly after the birth of her daughter, Martin got a divorce and in 1949 moved from San Francisco to Seattle. In Seattle Martin found a job with a publishing company where she met Phyllis Lyon, who was a

⁷ On the status of women after World War II, see Betty Freidan, The Feminine Mystique, New York, 1963; William H. Chafe, The American Woman, New York, 1972: 199-225; Lois Basnner, Women in Modern America, New York, 1974: 211-27.

graduate in journalism. Martin was open about her sexuality and over the next three years the two women became friends and lovers (Tobin and Wicker 1975:47-50).

In 1953 the couple decided to return to San Francisco and set up a household together. After going through a period of isolation and lack of knowledge about lesbian activities, they were invited to attend a meeting where the possibility of a social club for lesbians was discussed. On September 21, 1955, eight women met and discussed the organization; after subsequent meetings over the next few weeks the Daughters of Bilitis was formed. However, disputes over the direction of the organization soon surfaced. Martin and Lyon proposed that the organization should disguise itself as a "woman's lodge" but that the "club" must include in its agenda a program what would lead to changing the prevailing attitudes toward lesbianism. At the time of its formation, the group discovered the Mattachine Society chapter in San Francisco and used it as a model for their own organization. But internal tensions within the membership of Daughters of Bilitis continued to escalate, causing a split which in the end left the organization with only six members. Shortly after, Daughters of Bilitis joined forces with Mattachine Society and with One. Together they represented the homophile movement.

Gradually Daughters of Bilitis's activities expanded. In January, 1956, in an attempt to promote education, a number of members travelled to Los Angeles in order to attend One's mid-winter institute of Education Seminar. In April of the same year the group took part in its first public event. Together with Mattachine

Society, they cosponsored a forum to discuss differences between the problems, concerns and social position of gay men and lesbians. Daughters of Bilitis's membership was still small, about 12 members, despite increased activities. However, the group decided to start their own publication and such a measure boosted membership. the first issue of The Ladder came out in October, 1956. Two hundred copies were sent to lesbians and professionals in the community.

The interaction between Daughters of Bilitis, Mattachine Society and One continued throughout the 1950's. Cooperation among these organizations was almost mandatory. First, the movement was too small and organizations could not have survived on their own. Secondly and more importantly, cooperation made it possible to recruit a diverse membership, offering different rewards to different individuals. Mattachine Society welcomed the Daughters of Bilitis participation precisely because the former was aware of its inability to attract women. Furthermore, both organizations had similar agendas; that is, they both saw education as the primary mechanism to change the status of lesbians and gays in society. A major difference between Daughters of Bilitis and the other two organizations was the fact that from its very beginning the Daughters of Bilitis was concerned with specific needs of lesbians. The organization was not only committed to change in the legal system and in attitudes towards lesbianism, but also served as a self-help resource center for women and lesbians. They provided assistance for those lesbians seeking employment or in need of tax and insurance help, or help with the custody of their children. The members

understood that their concerns differed, to a degree, from those of gay men. They also fought against male superiority and chauvinism in interorganizational dealings, preventing the role of auxiliaries, and wrote into their constitution that "daughters could not join or affiliate with any other organization" (D'Emilo 1983:105). But despite such differences, mutual dependence and similar purposes, tactics, and goals kept Daughters of Bilitis associated with the other two organizations.

As stated in the literature review, Resource Mobilization Theory maintains that mobilization of unorganized groups is relative to long-term changes in opportunities and resources of the group. While such an assertion applies to the homophile movement as a whole, it is also applicable to the formation of the movement's lesbian constituency.

The structural changes taking place during and after World War II gave women the opportunity to make a living and exist outside of the institution of the family. The war not only put a massive number of women into the labor force but also discredited the notion that women were not suited for what was considered a man's domain. Lesbians benefited from such changes. They shared with heterosexual women a dependency and a subjugation to the patriarchal system. But unlike heterosexual women, their ability to support themselves was directly related to the affirmation of their lesbianism. Being able to participate in the working sector implied a greater geographical mobility, freedom from marriage, and better chances to meet others who shared the same lifestyle. All these trends gave a boost to the

position of lesbians in society. It became possible for them to amass the resources necessary for mobilizing their networks.

Resource Mobilization Theory has also maintained that there is a link between social movements and institutional actions. In other words, movement actions are likely to reflect what goes on in the larger society. This proposition describes well the position of lesbians in the homophile movement and in society. Note that lesbians, unlike gay men, had to overcome their secondary status in the movement as well as in society. As the data suggest, gay men, just by being homosexual, did not automatically understand the subjugation of lesbians as women. Nor were they concerned with implementing movement tactics which were more sensitive to the position of women in society. On the contrary, Mattachine was a male organization which looked after the interests of gay men. The most that Mattachine members were able to do was to relate to the position of lesbians in what pertained to the realities of homosexuality. But in order to understand the position of lesbians as homosexuals one needs to be aware of what it means to be a woman. Consequently, it became necessary for lesbians to form their own institutions and organizations. But lesbians and their organizations were not free from male chauvinism which transpired from their relations with gay men, and which led them to resist being considered as appendages to the movement.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT: 1956 TO THE EARLY 1960'S

By 1956 the homophile movement had managed to develop an organizational structure which persisted until the end of the decade. The movement was essentially represented by the Mattachine Society, One Inc., and the Daughters of Bilitis. The three organizations agreed that education on the question of homosexuality was their top priority. However, they disagreed over those who needed educating and over the contents. Such disagreements made a difference in the selection of tactics of these three organizations. Mattachine Society and Daughters of Bilitis, from the very beginning, took a moderate approach; they proposed education for homosexuals seeking adjustment to the prevailing social order and for society at large with the help of accredited professionals. One, on the other hand, directed its efforts to mobilizing the gay community. It opposed mainstream culture and maintained that only gay men and lesbians could speak with authority about homosexuality.

Publishing was the primary activity of the movement, even though the three organizations had plenty of barriers and constraints. For example, the work load often exceeded the amount of labor. When The Ladder first appeared, Daughters of Bilitis had about 12 members; One was also a small collective and Mattachine's membership was on the decline when the organization decided to start publishing the Review. In addition, sales depended upon subscriptions as few bookstores and newsstands would carry the publications. At the same time, the organizations had to deal with fear of subscribing by the

members of these organizations. The circulation of these magazines was small. On the average, One would sell about 5,000 issues per month, the Mattachine's Review about 2,200, and The Ladder only 500 (D'Emilo 1983:110). However, readership was larger than that. The letters to the editor for those publications testify to the fact that they were reaching all corners of the country and that copies were possibly passed on to others through friendship networks.

The Ladder, Mattachine Review, and One all tried to inform their readers about current events, especially those with direct effects on homosexuals. They also provided a forum for dialogue between gays and lesbians, and equally important, exposed and documented discrimination and harassment which gays and lesbians suffered. One took special efforts to publish incidents of police brutality. James Kepner, with the collaboration of readers, published clippings of police incidents toward gays and wrote several articles about them. The Ladder and Mattachine Review dealt with the issue of police harassment in a more conservative fashion. For one thing, The Ladder, being a lesbian-oriented publication, rarely dealt with police entrapment since lesbians were seldom the victims of such incidents. In addition, the Mattachine Review and The Ladder's moderate approach to the issue reflected their willingness to accommodate the status quo. Since most states had laws prohibiting homosexual behavior, both organizations avoided addressing and

advocating illegal activities. Instead they would speak of the constitutional rights of homosexuals pertaining to the right of association, police raiding of gay bars and revocation of their liquor licenses. Del Martin specifically spoke against the closure of gay establishments as an unconstitutional act (Martin 1959). And Hal Call suggested in the Review that it would be better to keep homosexuals in their bars and taverns where they would offend "the least number of heterosexuals" (Call 1966:11-19).

The Mattachine Review and The Ladder were also used as an educational resource. Editors operated under the assumption that misinformation maintained the negative self-image internalized by gay men and lesbians, and their eagerness to legitimate homosexual behavior led them to publish a number of biographical portraits of famous homosexual writers. In addition, The Ladder had a regular column which would cite and review new as well as old books dealing with lesbianism. The Review also produced an extensive bibliography with over 1,000 entries.⁹ Publications were also used as a means of publicizing gains made during the 1950's. For example, when the American Law Institute, in 1955, released a new model penal code which eliminated the sodomy statutes, the Mattachine Review produced

⁸ For a good example of the position taken by Mattachine and Daughters of Bilitis see: "What Does Mattachine Do?" Mattachine Review, April, 1957: 22; and "What About the D.O.B.?" The Ladder, November, 1959:18.

⁹ Examples of biographical portraits appearing in these publications included: Gene Damon, "Radclyffe Hall," The Ladder, December 1959: 8-9; David Russell and Dalvan McIntire, "In Path Untrodden: A Study of Walt Whitman," One, July 1954: 4-16.

a long article praising the actions of the institute and the model itself.

But for all the functions which those publications served, perhaps the most important was the opportunity which it gave for lesbians and gays to voice their opinions on a host of issues and to establish contact with one another. Furthermore, a review of the debates contained in a number of issues of The Ladder and the Mattachine Review showed a division between the leaders of the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis and the potential membership. That is, those in leadership positions in these organizations would often use the publications for advertising their positions and points of view. The Ladder and the Review repeatedly tried to minimize the differences between homosexuals and heterosexuals. On several occasions they also called for self-reform on the part of gays and lesbians. Del Martin (1956:9), in one editorial, stated that "her only difference lies in her choice of a love partner." Bob Bishop (1958:15), writing for the Mattachine Review, stated that gay men were "average people in all other respects outside of our private sexual inclinations", and Burns (1956:27), the president of the Mattachine Society, reminded his readers that "we (homosexuals) must blame ourselves for much of our plight...when will the homosexual ever realize that social reform, to be effective, must be preceded by personal reform?" However, the readership responded strongly, rejecting the proposition that homosexuals don't differ from heterosexuals and arguing against conformity.

In short, these publications were the only media available for homosexuals to converse and played a part in creating of a shared vocabulary which could speak about gay and lesbian experiences and subculture.

Other than these publishing activities, not much was taking place. New chapters of Mattachine and Daughters of Bilitis were not being established. Consequently organizational growth wasn't taking place. During the 1950's, the Mattachine Society did manage to open new chapters in Boston, Denver, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, and Washington, D.C., while the Daughters of Bilitis added groups in New York, Los Angeles and Chicago. By 1960, Mattachine had a total membership of 230 and Daughters of Bilitis only 110 (D'Emilo 1983:115). Fear of exposure prevented potential members from joining these organizations and subscribing to their magazines.

In addition, these organizations did not advocate collective action; on the contrary, their programs called for mutual support among homosexuals and self-education. They also failed to introduce new guidelines for action. They continued to maintain that homosexuals were not in a position to speak for themselves and that prominent allies should articulate their cause instead. In this light, they continued to search for sympathetic professionals. On some occasions, however, these professionals caused more damage than good. This was the case with a minister who spoke before the Mattachine chapter in 1955 and told those present that "homosexuality is not part of God's plan for man...no homosexual who persists in following his desires can achieve ultimate peace." However, some

sympathetic professionals were found. Among them were Evelyn Hooker, Wardell Pomeroy, and Blanche Baker, a psychiatrist in San Francisco who often spoke before Mattachine and Daughters of Bilitis and urged participants to "stop despising yourselves, stop being ashamed...learn to take out your resentments on those responsible for them. Otherwise you will eventually take them out on yourself." (D'Emilo 1983:117).

Considering the small size and lack of accomplishments of these organizations, annual gatherings of gays and lesbians were important. As Blumer (1939) explained, large assemblages can reinforce the development of "esprit de corps" among participants. Its value stems from the fact that these assemblages allow the members of the movement to experience the collectivity's support for the movement and at the same time transmit the feeling of being involved in an important cause. Such psychological experiences can foster group solidarity and also contribute to forming a common identity among movement participants. Among organizations of the homophile movement, One, for example, sponsored a midwinter seminar series every January; Mattachine Society had a yearly convention and Daughters of Bilitis held a general assembly twice a year. These organizations worked a great deal in order to hold these meetings. They would rent hotel spaces, announce the events in local papers, and list their programs with bureaus. On one hand, such publicity was important because, besides passing information about the existence of such organizations and their coming events, the publicity also affirmed their right to congregate in public.

However, these meetings posed risks and dangers for so fragile a movement.

The annual Mattachine convention for 1959 was held in Denver, and the events taking place there testified to the vulnerability that the organization could experience when promoting a convention. Carl Harding was the driving force behind the Mattachine chapter in Denver. At a previous convention, in 1958, Harding suggested that Denver should host the annual meeting for 1959, and his request was approved. With no time to waste, the Denver chapter began to organize for the event. They contacted 112 potential speakers in the area and managed to get a commitment from Robert Allen, majority leader in the Colorado State Assembly, and from a member of the board of directors of the ACLU-Colorado Chapter, Mr. William Reynard. Harding and others decided to take a radical step and suggested a public press conference at the convention. His proposal was approved and the convention got good coverage from local papers. The publicity was well-received, bringing new blood into the Denver chapter and increasing membership. Activists from other chapters recognized the importance of the achievement. The Ladder reported the event in its October, 1959 issue, and the New York Mattachine chapter announced in its newsletter that the "Sixth Annual Convention Makes Mattachine History".

However, problems were just around the corner. Two police officers disguised in plain clothes infiltrated the convention and on October 9, 1959, the police broke into Harding and Bill Matson's apartment. Matson was subject to most of the harassment. At that

time, Matson was the librarian for the Mattachine chapter in Denver and photographs of male nudes were kept in his apartment which was reason enough to be arrested since the possession of such materials was a violation of a local anti-pornography statute. The following day the event was all over the press. The Denver Post wrote an article about the raid and connected Matson with the Mattachine chapter. Matson served 60 days in jail, lost his job at a local hospital, and was forced to move to another city. The event was sufficiently notorious to cause turmoil among Denver Mattachine members since the police had confiscated a list of the names and addresses of Mattachine members. The panic spread to other chapters as well and caused a slow deterioration of the Denver chapter, which never regained its strength or popularity.

Looking back, ten years had gone by since the formation of Mattachine. Its most important achievement was the very fact that the organization had managed to survive and spread beyond its place of birth. The homophile movement, with its three organizations was still marginal; it did not speak for the great majority of gays and lesbians in society. The organizations representing the movement had not managed to succeed in achieving their primary goal: to establish a dialogue between prevalent attitudes and public policy towards homosexuals. Furthermore, factionalism within Mattachine was detrimental to the organization. The national structure was dissolved not too long after disputes between the New York Chapter and the San Francisco chapter began to surface. Growth had been taking place in the New York chapter, which by 1960 was the largest

chapter in the nation. New York members resented having their membership dues sent to the national Mattachine headquarters in San Francisco. Rumors started that Call and Lucas were responsible for fiscal irregularities in the national books of the national organization.¹⁰ These charges came to a head at the annual Mattachine convention in San Francisco in September, 1960. Shortly after that (March 1961), Call proposed to the national board of directors that the organization should dissolve its national structure and make each chapter independent. The measure passed but its impact was devastating. A number of chapters had been able to sustain themselves partly because of the connection they had with other chapters. Once the national structure was dissolved such connections disappeared, causing the collapse of the Boston and Denver chapters. The Chicago chapter was reduced and the Philadelphia chapter reorganized itself and changed its name to the Janus Society. The San Francisco chapter kept the Mattachine Review and requested that the New York chapter drop Mattachine from its name; the New York members ignored San Francisco's request.

Given all the years of hard work, why had the homophile movement remained so weak? For one thing, external constraints aggravated the social conditions of homosexuals who faced police brutality, job discrimination, and other penalties. All this led homosexuals to develop a great deal of anxiety and fear of having their sexual

¹⁰ The dispute between the Mattachine chapters of New York and San Francisco is well documented in: "Factionalism is Not the Answer", by Ralph Trash, in Boston Mattachine Newsletter, February 1960, National Gay Archives.

identity known. This in turn prevented participation in homophile organizations.

At the same time, those homosexuals who were willing to disclose their identities and to struggle for their rights had no support from the community and from homophile organizations. These organizations were not supporting liberation but instead advocated adaptation to the social order. Consequently they had little to offer to those homosexuals seeking a radical change in their conditions. They were unable to devise a program which would attract a good number of homosexuals. Furthermore, the objectives of those organizations didnot validate gay and lesbian subculture. They found no fault in mainstream culture, despite the fact that such culture negated the very existence of homosexuals.

In addition, these leading homophile organizations transferred to the movement their own fears and conservatism, all of which was reflected in their choice of approach and tactics. As Martin and Lyon admitted later, "It wasn't until much later that we (the leadership) realized that we knew a whole lot more about homosexuality than Joe Psychiatrist and Jill Lawyer. Back then we didn't know...we were just as scared as everybody else." (D'Emilo 1983:125). In any case, fear and dependency on reputable professionals crippled the homophile movement. Homophile leaders were trying to voice their cause in a respectable manner when most of society perceived homosexuals as beings not deserving of respect.

CHANGES IN PERCEPTION OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Gay and lesbian activists had little chance of winning their battle as long as homosexuality was equated with sin, sickness or criminal behavior. Consequently any proposition which alluded to the fact that homosexuals constituted a minority was ineffective in gathering support for mobilizing and forming a strong homosexual movement. In addition, as Jenkins (1983) explains, part of the process of mobilization includes the group's ability to enlist outside supporters and co-opt outside structures of society. Changes in definition and perception of homosexuality was another requirement for a successful mobilization. The shift would be beneficial if society and homosexuals would look at homosexuality as a social phenomenon and would stop supporting the personal attribution position. Given that, the movement might then maximize its possibilities for gaining support for its demands, might increase resources, and more importantly, might gain allies in the heterosexual community. The pages which follow illustrate the beginning of such a process. More specifically, the mass media, academia and the legal system, in response to changes in the value system of society, showed a change in perception and recognition of homosexuals and their position in society during the 1960's.

The decade was marked by relaxation of rigid social morals. An unprecedented, contagious fascination with the erotic won the attention of many, especially the young. This, in turn, had a positive impact on the spread of information about homosexuality.

Coverage of gay life and the gay world increased in popular mass media, literature and the pornography industry. Such an increase brought a multifaceted picture of what constituted the homosexual world and the different life styles present in it. For the first time homosexuals were being portrayed as a group and not as single, deviant casualties. It is true that when a review of these descriptions is made much was exploitative, derogatory, and unsympathetic. But the content of these exposes was not as important as its volume. At this point all that activists could hope for was publicity, and that they got.

The evolution of lesbian pulp novels offers a measure of the literary changes taking place during the 1960's.¹¹ Barbara Grier, a librarian from Kansas City, carefully surveyed lists of books coming out of publishing houses every year. For the year 1957, Grier found only four paperbacks whose themes dealt with lesbianism; by 1959, the number jumped to 34 and by the years 1964-65, 348 original paperbacks were found. Grier, writing about the increase in the number of lesbian books, commented on their quality by saying that it varied from "nearly pornographic tripe to lyric and beautiful writing...The poorest are so poor that they are indescribable. Yet even the cheapest paperback publishers are issuing some quite well written, fairly realistic and highly realistic novels" (Grier 1960:14-15).

¹¹ On lesbian pulp novels, see Fran Koski and Maida Tilochon, "Some Pulp Sappho," in Karla Jay and Allen Young, eds., Lavender Culture, New York, 1978: 262-74.

In addition, breaking legal constraints against the publication and distribution of sexually explicit books and magazines had a big impact on gay male pornography. The Supreme Court decisions clearing male physique magazines of obscenity charges opened the way to unrestricted publication. Such a decision was made when Manual Enterprises, a large publisher of physique magazines, took its case to court. In 1960, Manual Enterprises was selling 40,000 copies per month when the Post Office seized its distribution. The Supreme Court, however, eliminated the obscenity charges, and by 1965 the total number of sales of physique magazines reached 750,000 per month (Polak 1965).

Also, popular literature slowly began to offer novels which dealt with same-sex love as major themes. In 1966 Grier called attention to the fact that lesbian fiction per se no longer existed. She wrote that "there is no such thing as a separate lesbian literature." According to her, the experiences and existence of gay women are being "taken for granted" as an aspect of social life, and that a "complete integration" of lesbian themes into mainstream literature had been achieved (Grier 1967).

Hollywood had also attempted to change its posture in relation to homosexuality. In October, 1961, the Production Code Administration stated that homosexuality may be portrayed on the screen "provided any references are treated with care, discretion, and restraint." (Archer 1961:41). However, it soon became known that the new code was nothing but a nice gesture. In November, 1961, the Production Code Administration denied approval to the British

film "Victim". The film, one of the first of its kind, sympathetically portrayed male homosexuals as victims of outmoded laws. Approval was denied because of the film's "candid and clinical discussion of homosexuality (and its) overtly expressed plea for social acceptance of the homosexual" (The New York Times, November 16, 1961: 45). But not too long after, American filmgoers could view several movies which dealt with homosexuality: "The Children's Hour", "Advise and Consent", "Walk on the Wild Side", and "The Best Man" were all movies which received the Production Code Administration approval. But their content, despite the visibility that was offered to homosexuality, showed that Hollywood still viewed homosexuality as a perversion (Bunzel 1962:88-102).

The press also responded to society's new discovery of the homosexual world. For the first time, large newspapers in the nation began to report about the gay subculture. On December 17, 1963, The New York Times headline read "Growth of Overt Homosexuality in City Provokes Wide Concern". The front page article exposed the paper's readers to the homosexual world, highlighting its underground bars and cruising areas. Other large magazines followed the trend. Life magazine's "Homosexuality in America" and Look magazine's "The Sad 'Gay' Life" presented photo reviews; Time magazine offered an extensive article on the topic, and Harper's gave its readers a glimpse inside of a male gay bar. The coverage of gay life and the gay world by the press varied in content and viewpoint. Some were sympathetic and pointed to the number of diverging views of homosexuality. Others, such as the article in Time concluded that homosexuality:

Deserves fairness, compassion, understanding and, when possible, treatment. But it deserves no encouragement, no glamorization, no rationalization, no fake status as minority martyrdom, no sophistry about simple differences in taste - and, above all, no pretense that it is anything but a pernicious sickness (Time January 21, 1966:41).

But regardless of such negative outlooks, the publicity was good. It served as a way to reach those searching for the new subculture. These articles often would give names of the establishments, their locations and those of other cruising areas as well. More important, from changes in numbers of lesbian novels to daily coverage of the gay subculture, society was being told that homosexuals constituted a statistical minority, and a cultural minority, and that the homosexual world was sustained by a host of institutions and resources which in turn shaped their social identity. These shifts were significant precursors to changes that were about to come. Society slowly began to acknowledge the existence of a gay subculture; that is, a gay culture could no longer escape detection.

Furthermore, this new exposure of the homosexual world and of homosexuals themselves contributed to a significant alteration of the definition of homosexuality. The discovery of gay subculture changed the notion that homosexuals lived in isolation and that the phenomenon could no longer be perceived as a sin, sickness, or crime. Instead, there were those proposing that the homosexual world, with its cultural dimensions, had altered the urban environment and therefore should be seen from a social science perspective. Such propositions spurred the interests of many social

scientists. However, initial attempts to see homosexuality from a social, rather than individual, perspective came from psychoanalysis.

Libido theory, with its emphasis on the individual's sex drive and family relationships, was soon discarded by some psychoanalysts, who embarked on recasting "...the adaptational context in order to demonstrate the crucial role of societal forces." (Ovesey 1954:243-50). It followed that modern men were the subject of massive social disorders such as depression and war, anxiety about the nuclear age, competition, rapid technological changes, shift of gender roles, pressure to conform, all of which contributed to the emergence of the modern male homosexual. Furthermore, the proposition continues, male homosexuality is not a defensive response against immature infantile desires or unresolved oedipal conflict, but rather a large-scale "flight from masculinity induced by external stress" (Ruitenbeek 1963).

Psychoanalysis continued to perceive homosexuality as a pathological condition; however, adaptation theory shifted the emphasis from the individual onto the social system. Cure was still perceived as the goal, but individual homosexuals were no longer the patients - society became the patient. The profession advocated social reform and not punishment, discrimination, and censure to homosexuals.

At about the same time, sociologists also rediscovered the phenomenon of homosexuality. Students of the sociology of deviance in particular launched an attack on additional interpretations of homosexuality. Until the 1950's deviance had been treated as social

pathology by sociologists. After World War II, however, a change in approach began to take place. Sociologists slowly came to view deviance as a sign of change in social norms governing behavior. Deviants became members of a subculture, and labeling theory, with its emphasis on the process and impact of a deviant status on deviants and on society, became the most fashionable explanation. Becker's "masterwork", Outsiders, became the text. He subscribed to a relativistic approach, describing deviance as "the failure to obey group rules". According to him, social groups "created deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance...Deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an offender" (Becker 1963:8-9, 17, 176). Becker called to the attention of those studying deviance that a group's ability to make rules and apply sanctions reflects "power differentials" in society, and that those studying deviant populations should avoid adopting the majority viewpoint.

Changes also began to surface in relation to the role taken by the state in regulating morality, the right to privacy, and arbitrary law enforcement practices. Special attention was given to the legal penalties suffered by homosexuals. The decriminalization of private consensual adult homosexual relations, the most basic of reforms, won the support of prominent jurists and attorneys across the country. In 1962, the American Law Institute, which at that time had about 1,500 members, finished its model penal code in which sodomy statutes were eliminated. The code gained the support of the International

Congress of Penal Law in 1964, and in the latter part of the decade lawyers and jurists began to shift focus away from acts of sodomy and to address issues concerning homosexuality and law (D'Emilo 1983:144-5). For example, one study dealing with the issue of public solicitation was done discreetly and in no way offended public decency. However, the study went on to show that a good number of arrests of homosexuals in Los Angeles County came from decoy enforcement of solicitation statutes but with no basis for arrest. Changes in the opinion of attorneys and jurists were not implemented. Only the states of Illinois in 1961, and Connecticut in 1969, adopted the model penal code by the American Law Institute; an attempt in the State of New York to remove its sodomy law was defeated.

McCarthy and Zald's model of movement formation has been criticized for not being able to explain the impact of macro structural changes in creating an environment which is conducive to forming social movements. In attempting to avoid such a theoretical gap, the new interpretation given to homosexuality in the context of events taking place in society at that time will be considered.

The general climate of American society in the 1960's was characterized by a great deal of social and political turmoil. Blacks had just started freedom rides and sit-ins protesting their secondary status. American military power was under attack by anti-war activists, and discontented students began to rebel in major university campuses around the country. Concurrently with these developments came the new interpretation of homosexuality. But note that the new outlook on homosexuality offered by the legal system and

academia, and the new exposure of gay issues in the media coincided with the general revolt of many in society. The concept of cultural drift, as described by Blumer, also applies to these developments. That is, society was experiencing a change in its value system. Blacks, anti-war activists, and students, while fighting for distinct causes, were all responding to somewhat similar discontent. For whatever reason, they all came to the realization that the values which supported discrimination against blacks, the war in Southeast Asia, and the consumerism and hypocrisy of student life, were no longer adequate to speak for a good number of people in this society. Notice further that the rhetoric chosen to fight society's outmoded valued system pointed to society as the entity in need of reform. The system became the blamed party. When reporters, academicians, lawyers and judges approached the question of homosexuality, a similar interpretation was offered. Some representatives of those institutions began to see the need for a change in the system and the way the system had been addressing the question of homosexuality and the position of homosexuals. Thus, large scale structural changes not only facilitated the redefinition of homosexuality but also shaped its direction. In addition, the homophile movement, by the means of these changes, began to establish allies among the heterosexual majority. Such support was not sufficient to enlist all the resources needed by the movement, but they were just enough to generate opposition within major institutions of the heterosexual majority.

Where was the movement when all these changes were taking place? The impact of the dissolution of Mattachine's national structure was still being felt by individual members. Curtis Dewees, a member of New York Mattachine who delivered a speech at One's midwinter institute in January, 1962, told his audience that "the time was not ripe for a mass organization," and proceeded to propose that the Homosexual Law Reform Society of Great Britain should be used as a model for the movement in the United States. The British group was composed of respected individuals who did not "press for legal reform". Dewees advocated a strategy which, by now, was outmoded: he maintained that gains for homosexuals in society could be made only if the movement was willing to attach itself to the "pillars of the community." Clearly, Dewees was not in tune with the current developments.

The approach which was about to be developed radically changed the direction of the movement. A militant wing was soon developed on the East Coast, and eventually it won the support of gays and lesbians all over the country. Activists, unlike their predecessors, were no longer willing to educate society about homosexuality. They instead rejected the medical establishment and began to confront the morality of those times. Such challenges came with a redirection of the movement's goals and priorities. Gay activists were concerned with eliminating homosexuals' inferior status in society. They believed that conditions would change if effective means were found to fight the discrimination and abuse that homosexuals experienced. They were also interested in affirming their subculture. It became

evident that expressing their sexuality extended beyond their choice of sexual partners. Such expression constituted an integral part of their existence and as such it could not be realized in a cultural vacuum or for that matter in an underground subculture. At the time, heterosexual culture and the institutions which comprise it were not supportive and did not allow for full expression of homosexual existence. Consequently, the legitimization of homosexual subculture became a priority. Militancy also brought to the movement a new set of tactics. Cooperation with respectable professionals would not do the job. Instead, direct action with protest and mass demonstrations became the way in which they would fight for their goals. All of these shifts began to take place in an optimum period. Society was marked by social unrest, and, more importantly, the call for militancy came after homophile leaders had laid the groundwork for activism, and after the costs for mobilization had been reduced and the chances for success maximized.

Franklin Kameny was the backbone of the new-born militant wing. Born in 1925 to a middle-class Jewish family in New York City, the precocious boy entered college at the age of 15 and got his Ph.D. in astronomy at Howard University in 1956. Kameny then took a lecturer position at Georgetown University and after a year decided to work for the U.S. Army. However, he soon lost his position because of accusations of lewd conduct. Kameny took his case to court, but, to his surprise, it failed. "At the very first," he wrote, "I did not look for another job because I rather naively felt that this affair would quickly be resolved in my favor." As the situation got worse,

Kameny started to look for a job only to find himself "in the peculiarly ironic position of being in excessively great demand and yet totally unable to get a job because of security problems." (Tobin and Wicker 1975:90-95). And his situation got even worse when it became clear that the federal government was not going to surrender. Discouraged by bureaucratic and legal ineffectiveness, he then decided to form a homosexual rights organization in Washington, D.C. in order to continue his fight by other means.

It was then that he encountered Jack Nichols, the son of an FBI agent who came out to himself and his family while in high school. The two men met in late 1960 but it was not until the summer of 1961 that they started recruiting members for the new organization. In November of the same year the Mattachine Society of Washington was formed with 12 members who then elected Kameny as president (Tobin and Wicker 1975:178-80).

Kameny not only had knowledge of how Washington bureaucracies worked, but he also had the ability to aggressively argue his points. His approach differed from that which had characterized the movement in the 1950's. He insisted that gay and lesbian activists take an aggressive, direct-action approach. As he correctly perceived, the movement had three basic options: social services, information and education, or civil rights direct action. According to him, the answer was the third option. That is, "no lasting good can be accomplished by administration of social services alone," he wrote. "One can supply virtually unlimited amounts of money, food, clothing, and shelter to the poor, but unless one gets to the roots

of poverty - the economic system which produces unemployment...one will accomplish little of lasting value." And using the experience of black America as an example, he pointed out that only where "a vigorous civil liberties, social action approach" was used did blacks start to change their lot effectively (D'Emilo 1983:153). Kameny rejected the old reliance on professionals. He was also critical of the movement's receptivity to the medical establishment and its posture on homosexuality:

I do not see the NAACP and CORE worrying about which chromosome and gene produced black skin or about the possibility of bleaching the Negro...we are interested in obtaining rights for our respective minorities. As Negroes, as Jews, and AS HOMOSEXUALS...why we are Negroes, Jews, or homosexuals is totally irrelevant, and whether we can change to whites, Christians, or heterosexuals is equally irrelevant (Kameny 1964).

Kameny's past involvement with the Civil Service Commission played a part in determining his tactics and priorities. His first priority was to tackle discrimination by the federal government and he was able to mold the Washington Mattachine Society to his concerns and outlooks. In August, 1962, letters were sent to Senators, Executive Department officials, Supreme Court Justices, and to the President and his staff, requesting a meeting with gay activists to discuss their grievances. But the response was minimal; only two liberal representatives, Fitts Ryan of Manhattan and Robert Nix of Philadelphia, arranged meetings. Many attempts were made to meet with John Macy, chairperson of the Civil Service Commission, who refused, saying the "there would be no useful purpose...since homosexuals are not suitable for appointment or retention" in federal

employment. Kameny was not satisfied with Macy's response and wrote a paper: "Discrimination Against the Employment of Homosexuals" and, using Macy's letter, filed a complaint with the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.¹²

Meanwhile, Mattachine Society of Washington was busy trying to gain the support of the American Civil Liberties Union and its newly formed chapter, National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union. This lobbying proved fruitful when in March, 1964, Hal Witt, chairperson of the discrimination committee for the ACLU, in protest, wrote to Macy urging him to change the Commission's regulation on the employment of homosexuals. In August of the same year, the ACLU passed a resolution condemning discrimination against homosexuals.¹³ The ACLU showed its commitment to the new resolution when it took the case of Bruce Scott, whose application for federal employment had been turned down because of allegations of homosexual conduct. On June 16, 1965, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that the charges were too vague and did not justify Mr. Scott's disqualification (Washington Post June 17, 1965:3).

Despite the collaboration of the District of Columbia branch of the ACLU with gay activists, the national board of directors of the

¹² John Macy to Bruce Schuyler, September 28, 1962, and "Discrimination Against the Employment of Homosexuals," February 28, 1963: both documents can be found at Washington's Mattachine file.

¹³ A copy of the resolution can be found at Washington's Mattachine. See: Resolution of National Capital Area Civil Liberties Union on Federal Employment of Homosexuals, Washington, D.C., August 7, 1964.

organization had yet to change the posture assumed in January, 1957. Accordingly, the national board adopted a statement which supported the constitutionality of sodomy statutes and the federal security regulations which denied employment to homosexuals. But pressure exercised on the national board from the Washington, New York, and Southern California branches of the ACLU led the national board to revise the 1957 stand. In 1964, the ACLU finally took the stand that no sexual behavior between consenting adults in private ought to be subject to criminal penalties (D'Emilo 1983).

Thus far, Kameny's aggressive approach had been effective; however, problems were just around the corner. In May, 1963, Representative John Dowdy, a conservative Democrat from Texas, introduced a bill revoking Mattachine's permission to raise funds. Knowing that he would be pressed, Kameny appeared well-prepared before the committee holding the hearings. However, the committee was not interested in questions pertaining to job discrimination, but inquired about homosexual orgies, bestiality and incest. Not surprisingly, an amended version of the bill passed the House in August, 1965.¹⁴ The issue, however, received positive coverage from the local press. Furthermore, Kameny was able to convince the ACLU to lobby Capitol Hill against the bill, which shortly after died

¹⁴ See U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Hearings Before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia, on H.R. 5990, August 1963, and January 1964, Washington, D.C., 1964: 2, 58-59, 70, 73, 85-88.

in the Senate. Such an achievement was beneficial to the movement's morale, proving that it was ready to survive attack.¹⁵

The Mattachine Society in Washington was not the only one making progress. In New York, Randy Wicker was trying to get things moving there, too. Wicker had along history of activism before joining the gay movement. As a student at the University of Texas at Austin, Wicker became active in the civil rights movement. It was then, when subjected to homophobia and discrimination, that he perceived the need for a militant wing in the gay movement. Wicker moved to New York City in 1961 and not long after he proposed to Curtis Dewees and Al de Dion, then president of Mattachine, a plan to attract media attention. But Wicker got no support since New York Mattachine leaders were still trying to win sympathetic professionals to the cause of the movement. This in turn propelled Wicker to start a one-man organization, the Homosexual League of New York, in 1962.

In April, 1962, Wicker successfully convinced the director of public affairs for radio station WBAI to broadcast a discussion of homosexuality by homosexuals themselves since the station had held a discussion of the issue by psychiatrists not too long before Wicker's request. Press releases were sent out and the broadcast went on the air. Jack O'Brien, a conservative columnist for the New York Journal-American, made sure that the event did not go without protest. Such protest, however, was exactly what Wicker had hoped

¹⁵ For the original press coverage see the editorial in the Washington Post, August 8, 1963: 14.

for, and shortly after he paid a visit to different papers and magazines in town hoping that the same press mileage would be gained from the controversy. His tactic was successful, with Newsweek and The New York Times reviewing the event positively.¹⁶ Shortly after, and because of Wicker's effort, the Village Voice, Harper's and The New York Times all published a series of articles related to the homosexual movement and the homosexual world in New York. Such achievements had a snowball effect, each article increasing Wicker's ability to present himself as a spokesperson for the movement, even though the movement had never had one.

Wicker then decided to tap into politics a bit further. he managed to speak in front of several Democratic organizations, e.g., Americans for Democratic Action, village Independent Democrats, as a representative of the homosexual "voting block". He also spoke before the American Humanist Association, the New York Ethical Culture Society, Rutgers University, the City College of New York and Hudson Memorial Church. His popularity and activism also took him to a panel discussion on national television, and a tremendous response from gays and lesbians all over the country was generated.

Not everyone in the movement was happy with Wicker's and Kameny's activism. Note that Kameny's opposition to professionals was contrary to New York Mattachine's posture and Wicker's vocal militancy contradicted the Daughters of Bilitis's preoccupation with maintaining a respectable image. But despite disapproval of both

¹⁶ Coverage and response to the event can be found in the New York Times, July 16, 1962: 47-8; and Newsweek, July 30, 1962: 48.

organizations, Kameny and Wicker carried on their militancy, and because of the differences in points of view among different branches of the movement, Kameny proposed that homophile groups on the East Coast should congregate regularly. It was January, 1963, when ECHO - East Coast Homophile Organizations - was formed in Philadelphia. Its purpose was to "explore ways of closer intergroup cooperation" (D'Emilo 1983:161).

ECHO became the central organization of the movement, and it had a crucial place in developing the militant contingency. ECHO held monthly meetings which permitted members to loosely form networks, exchange information about events, debate tactics and elaborate new plans of attack. Also, organizations soon began to share memberships, bringing them closer together and attracting more participants.

The conservative wing of the New York Mattachine and Daughters of Bilitis found themselves isolated while the newly established militant wing was gaining strength and membership support. Such support, however, did not come without hard campaigning. In order to develop a program for action, activists first had to convince other members that the medical establishment had no authority to speak for homosexuals and that their theories and explanations were wrong. Jack Nichols approached the executive board of the New York Mattachine in October, 1963, asking them to reject the medical model, but no support was given for his request. However, things soon started to take a different course. In July, 1964, Kameny was selected to give the monthly lecture at the New York Mattachine, much

of which was devoted to attacking the medical establishment. He asked his audience to consider the proposition that "until and unless valid positive evidence shows otherwise, homosexuality per se is neither a sickness, a defect, a disturbance, a neurosis, a psychosis, nor a malfunction of any sort." (D'Emilo 1983:164). Kameny's call sent a burst of enthusiasm and militancy to his audience. Meanwhile, the Washington Mattachine was also preparing an antisickness resolution and by March, 1965, after a series of debates over the resolution, two-thirds of its membership voted for the following:

The Mattachine Society of Washington takes the position that in the absence of valid evidence to the contrary, homosexuality is not a sickness, disturbance, or other pathology in any sense, but is merely a preference, orientation, or propensity, on par with, and not different in kind from heterosexuality.¹⁷

The struggle between the conservative and militant wings of the New York Mattachine continued. The two were preparing for the May elections which were coming soon. As always, the conservative wing maintained that the Mattachine should keep on helping the distraught homosexual to adjust to society. The militant wing, on the other hand, was calling for collective action and societal change.

The campaigning of the militant wing was done largely by Julian Hodges, a former supporter of the conservative wing. In October, 1964, at an ECHO convention, he delivered a speech calling for gay activism and participation in the political structure of society. Hodges was able to gain the loyalty of some old timers, such as Dick

¹⁷ "Policy of the Mattachine of Washington." Adopted on March 4, 1965. Mattachine Society of Washington's file.

Leitsch, Dr. Hendrik Ruitenbeek and Kameny. The conservative wing, which did not agree with the civil rights orientation of the movement, was still trapped by their own fear and by the intimidation which took place during the McCarthy era. They were especially careful not to generate hostility; they had problems with the openness expressed by young militants and the acceptance of new strategies also called for them to admit that old strategies were ineffective.

The old wing was not about to give up. They developed a committee of respectable members in order to gain members' support for David Goldberger, a candidate for the presidency on their ticket. Curtis Dewees and Donald Webster Cory did a lot of lobbying. Cory's participation was very important as he was considered a pioneer and was admired and respected, especially in the Mattachine Society of New York where he was very active. But Cory, who started in the movement as someone who was considered to be a radical, slowly changed his perspective. His later writing indicates that he came to see homosexuals as disturbed individuals who should seek out treatment for their illness¹⁸ Cory also opposed the movement's rejection of the scientific community.

The militant wing responded to the conservative wing's campaign with a letter to the members asking for their support and pointing out the dangers of electing a platform which considered homosexuality

¹⁸ For changes in Cory's perspective, see Donald W. Cory, "A Preface to the Second Edition: One Decade Later" in the Homosexual in America, 2nd edition, New York, 1959.

a sickness. Meanwhile, and to reinforce their position, Leitsch put together a pamphlet quoting damaging statements Cory made about homosexuality, referring to homosexuals as "disturbed individuals" and "borderline psychotics" (D'Emilo 1983:168).

The election took place in May, and the militant wing was victorious. In no time at all the conservative wing disbanded. Curtis Dewees, after ten years in Mattachine, left the movement. A number of old timers became members of the West Side Discussion Group, and Cory also dropped out of the movement. After 1965, Cory changed his name to Edward Sagarin and, in 1966, submitted a doctoral dissertation - "Structure and Ideology in an Association of Deviants" - to the Department of Sociology at New York University. The dissertation is a comprehensive study of the New York Mattachine Society. Sagarin then continued his career as a sociologist of deviance, but seldom did he have kind words for the movement which he helped to start.¹⁹

Changes were also taking place in the Daughters of Bilitis. Barbara Gittings, founder of the New York chapter in 1958, and president for its first three years, took over editorship of The Ladder in December, 1962. Gittings developed a working relationship

¹⁹ Other Sagarin work includes: "Homosexuals: The Many Masks of Mattachine" in Odd Man In Societies of Deviants in America, Chicago, 1969; "Good Guys Bad Guys and Gay Guys: Survey Essay," Contemporary Sociology, (1973): 3-13; "Is 'Gay' as Good as 'Straight'?" Sexology, February 1977: 22. Sagarin's dissertation has been published in a 1975 Arno Press reprint edition. For a discussion of Cory/Sagarin from a gay liberationist perspective, see John Kyper and Steven Abbott, "The Betrayal of Donald Webster Cory," Fag Rag/Gay Sunshine: Stonewall 5th Anniversary Issue, Summer 1974: 23.

with Wicker and Kameny and forwarded their militant tactics to the Daughters of Bilitis chapter in New York. Furthermore, she used her position as editor of The Ladder to spread militancy and to that effect initiated the series "Living Propaganda", urging lesbians to come out.²⁰

At the 1964 convention of the Daughters of Bilitis, Gittings launched the debate about the organization's dependence on the medical establishment. Shortly after that her position as editor came under fire from conservative leaders of the organization, especially Florence Conrad, who defended the medical establishment in an article (Conrad 1964:20-4). Gittings was pressed to give up the editorship of The Ladder, which she refused to do. However, she was removed from the position the following summer.

The New York chapter of Daughters of Bilitis was facing a political storm. At the ECHO convention in May, 1965, participants agreed to picket government buildings during the spring and summer. However, this initiative was not supported by the old wing. Because of the organization's structure, San Francisco's headquarters had the power to veto any action by the New York chapter. The dispute over the picketing issue and the conservative versus the militant wing soon become a test of loyalty. Militant members had to choose between being loyal to an all-lesbian organization or allying themselves with gay men who subscribed to a civil rights-direct

²⁰ For a good sample of the series, see The Ladder, November 1963: 4-6; December 1963: 15-16; and January 1964: 18-19. Incidentally the word "lesbian" appears for the first time on the cover of the January 1964 issue, and photos in September of 1964.

action approach. Meredith Grey and Shirley Willer, both active members of the conservative wing of the New York chapter, tried to argue in the next ECHO meeting that the coalition could not picket, since such an act would violate the policy and welfare of Daughters of Bilitis. The motion did not pass, and disputes between the Daughters of Bilitis and ECHO continued until the following year, when the organization disassociated from the coalition permanently. The New York chapter remained loyal to its mother chapter in San Francisco but at the price of alienation from the movement.

The militancy of the East Coast increased action and visibility of the movement. Despite the downfall of the Daughters of Bilitis, other organizations profited from the new militant, direct-action approach. The New York Mattachine Society, for example, experienced an increase in membership, which went from 100 members in 1963, to 200 members in 1964, to 445 by the summer of 1965. No figures are available for the Mattachine Society in Washington or for the Janus Society in Philadelphia, but the increased activities of these two organizations indicates an increased membership.

The increased militancy on the East Coast was good for the movement. It allowed for more visibility, and movement organizations profited from a growth in membership as well. However, those organizations did not succeed in recruiting participants from the most basic institution in the gay world - gay bars. Therefore, a lot of supporters were simply left out for lack of a more encompassing tactic.

Militancy marked another important chapter in the history of the movement. Militants, responding to their experiences as homosexuals and to the events taking place in the larger society, found no relevance or validity in the existing movement program of those days. Unlike the original founders of the movement, however, militants did not have to start from scratch. Instead they had at their disposal an organizational structure and already existing networks in the homosexual community which facilitated establishing a new program for the movement. The institutions of the gay world, existing networks, and homophile organizations were concrete evidence that those who preceded them were successful in grouping the homosexual community. It appears that such infrastructure was the factor which maximized the militant's chances of victory.

Resource Mobilization Theory stresses the importance of previous organizations and networks in the process of mobilizing unorganized groups. That is, the more abundant these preexisting structures, the more organized the group and the greater are the chances for a successful mobilization. If such structures could be transformed into a device whose purpose was to measure the likelihood of the movement's success, militancy would come out as an approach with good chances. It is interesting to note that militancy in the homophile movement was developed alongside conservatism. This should be no surprise considering that social movements are lively enterprises which evolve, adapt, and respond to changes. Some theorists, exploring the general direction of the evolution of social movements, have predicted greater conservatism with increased bureau-

cratization. Militancy brought to the homophile movement more coordination and more structure. However, like other recent social movements, the homophile movement came to be dominated by radicalism.

Militancy boosted the mobilization of the homosexual community by shifting the goals and tactics of the movement. It did so with the help of outside changes. As the data show, by the time militancy took over the homophile movement, society was in the midst of social and political turmoil. The social unrest of those days was an expression against the system. Most social phenomena, mass revolt and protest, receive a systemic treatment where society, and not the individual, becomes the entity in need of reform. As if these changes weren't enough, the general population was also experiencing a post-materialist change in values. The expression of the "self" became more important than social rules and morality. All these dislocations facilitated the appearance of a new approach to the question of homosexuality. Gay militants, just like any other outcast group in society, were no longer willing to adjust to the social order. Instead, they were concerned with achieving their liberation. Liberation implied a change in the tactics of the movement, which up to now had employed passive tactics.

Since adjustment to society had been the order of the day before militancy, educating society had been a respectable way of pursuing change. However, with the change in priority from adjustment to liberation, collective action and protest by homosexuals became the favored tactic. Notice that by shifting the movement's goals and tactics the focus of the movement changed also. The homophile

movement was now more concerned with institutional change as opposed to personal change. Zald and Ash (1966) state that a social movement whose priority is to change the social institutions of society will most likely develop a centralized structure with an inclusive membership. The data indicate that with the introduction of militancy a number of attempts were made to centralize the movement under organizations such as ECHO, NACHO, Gay Liberation Front, and later on the Gay Activist Alliance. These organizations had as their major task the coordination of movement actions for better utilization of the movement's resources. Furthermore, overlapping memberships were not uncommon in these organizations; participants often took part in several activities and belonged to networks of more than one organization. In short, as argued by Resource Mobilization Theory, changes in goals and tactics of the movement created a string of dislocations in the structure of the movement, which in turn led to greater mobilization. As may be recalled, the movement did go through changes in goals earlier. However, previous changes, despite their direction, had little chance of increasing mobilization because of the lack of preexisting organized, group structures and the prevailing outlook on the question of homosexuality.

Another significant change was the shift in the position of professionals taking part in the movement. Prior to militancy, professionals constituted both the outside support for the movement and the channel through which homosexuals would achieve a better position in society. They were the guardians of the movement since a

large number of homosexuals believed that the lack of respect from society prevented them from voicing their own cause. At that point in time the movement was still concerned with personal change. Consequently, no others in society had the necessary training and respect to look after the fate of troubled homosexuals except professionals. The shift to liberation changed all that. Professionals were displaced from their positions in the movement and became part of the pool of supporters who had no control over the direction and affairs of the movement. The data confirm this assertion. However, outsiders did provide a great deal of support and resources for the movement, supporting McCarthy and Zald's (1977) argument that recent social movements have been able to draw support from a "conscience constituency" which aids the movement in co-opting resources from society's institutions. They further maintain that movement organizations, at this point, experience a shift in form from "classical" to "professional" organizations. The data in the present study do not offer support for this latter assertion. Movement organizations do not appear to have taken a "professional form". It is possible that such a form was assumed by some organizations in the movement after the 1970's, but up to this point in the history of the movement, movement organizations remained indigenous in their leadership and membership. Most organization resources came from direct beneficiaries, and movement actions began to be based on mass participation. The data appear to be more congenial with the Morris (1980:1981) and McAdams (1982) assertion that external resources were reactive, not initiatory and not

consistently beneficial. There was, however, one specific change towards professionalization. For the first time, a number of spokespeople for the movement appear. Unlike previous homophile leaders, these "entrepreneurs" were not leaders per se, but seemed to have acted as agents whose jobs were to take the message of the movement to society and to the social institutions which they were trying to change.

Lastly, Resource Mobilization Theory points out that mobilization requires a program of action for the movement. The new approach to the question of homosexuality, coupled with the changes in goals and tactics, made it possible for gay activists to implement a program of action based on solidarity and commitment and offering collective incentives. The movement's ability to embrace large numbers of homosexuals and focus the movement on institutional change became the very incentive for liberation. Furthermore, choosing collective action as the most appropriate form of tactics allowed participants to recharge their networks and easily exchange roles with one another, thus reinforcing dependency and the feeling of struggling for a common, unified cause. Previously, the program of the movement was never able to reach participants very effectively since its emphasis was on individual change. But by shifting its emphasis to systemic change the program gained a greater appeal. This made it possible for the movement to initiate its process of "block recruitment"; that is, the movement started to enlist large numbers of participants and the organizations which many of them represented.

THE MOBILIZATION OF SAN FRANCISCO'S GAY COMMUNITY

On the West Coast, the route taken for mobilizing the gay community was the opposite of the one adopted in the East. Gay and lesbian bars became the centers where action and recruitment took place.

Russell Woden, a mayoral candidate in San Francisco in 1959, accused Mayor George Christopher of having turned San Francisco into "the national headquarters of the organized homosexuals in the United States." Christopher, who was trying to avoid more publicity at the time of the accusations, left gays and lesbians alone. But shortly after his reelection, he announced a "vigorous new campaign" against gay bars in San Francisco (D'Emilo 1983:182).

Not everything ran as smoothly as Christopher had hoped. In December of the same year the California Supreme Court issued a statement affirming the right of homosexuals to congregate, and, furthermore, stated that in order to revoke a liquor license of a homosexual bar or tavern the Alcoholic Beverage Control Department needed to provide evidence of illegal sexual activity taking place on the premises. Shortly after the ruling, the Alcoholic Beverage Control Department reissued the liquor license of the "Handlebar", a gay tavern on California Street. The owner, now aware of changes in the law, filed a complaint with the district attorney in February, 1960, for two years of police harassment and payoffs. Accusations against the Alcoholic Beverage Control and Police Departments hit the local papers. It also led to indictments of seven police officers

and an investigation of the Liquor Department. Out of the eight accused, two pleaded guilty and the rest went to trial, with the jury acquitting all of the defendants.

Increasing publicity and recent events propelled an internal campaign among law enforcement officers against the public display of homosexuality. Not surprisingly, The Ladder reported that felony charges against gay men went from zero in the first half of 1960 to 29 in December, 1960, to 76 in June, 1961. In August, 1961, San Francisco saw its biggest gay bar raid. The police arrested 89 gay men and 14 lesbians in one raid of the "Tay-Bush Inn". In October, 1961, the Alcoholic Beverage Control Department reported that the liquor licenses of 12 gay bars were revoked since the beginning of the campaign. Fifteen more gay establishments were under close investigation.²¹

The crackdown on the lesbian and gay community in San Francisco gave the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis a chance to recruit new members and to embark on activism. But nothing was done by those two organizations since they both were concerned with their public image and were still waiting for support from respectable professionals. These two organizations were also suffering the effects of structural changes which took place at the same time as these events. Mattachine national structure had been dissolved in 1961. Its San Francisco chapter suffered great impact; money raised

²¹ For a comprehensive report on the increase of felony charges, see The Ladder, October, 1961: 19; on the Tay-Bush raid, see the San Francisco Chronicle, August 14 and 16; September 8, 1961. On actions against gay bars see the Examiner, October 12, 1961.

from annual fund-raising dropped from \$2,500 to \$270. The Review survived on reprints and in 1964 stopped its monthly publication schedule altogether. In addition, Daughters of Bilitis was also going downhill due to its self-absorbed nature and its focus on reform of individual lesbians.

Response to the situation finally came. A unique gay establishment, the "Black Cat", was a place where bohemians, gay men and the police often congregated (not for the same reasons, of course). The establishment had a long history of liquor license revocation and trouble with the law because of its refusal to make regular payoffs to the police and to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Department. Jose Sarria, an employee, probably contributed to and accelerated police persecution. Sarria, who has been described as a master of gay camp humor, would dress in drag and perform at the "Black Cat". His improvisational theater turned into a regular satiric opera on Sunday afternoon. Sarria, in drag, would sing his version of the heroine of the opera Carmen in Union Square, a cruising area for homosexuals, scurrying through the brush to avoid capture by the vice squad. Sarria's shows were always well attended, attracting an average crowd of 200. At the end of each show he insisted that the audience hold one another and sing "God Save Us Nelly Queens". Sarria, in turn, was able to touch the consciousness of many by making gays and lesbians aware of their rights (Adair and Adair 1978:73-4).

In 1961, when the campaign against gay and lesbian bars was at its peak, the "Black Cat" became the subject of another action. Sarria decided that there was a need for someone in city hall to look after gay rights. he then announced his candidacy for city supervisor. His chances of winning were nonexistent, but that was not the purpose of his candidacy. Sarria managed to gather 6,000 votes and became well-known among the homosexual bar crowd in San Francisco. Perhaps more significant than his candidacy was the mobilization he initiated. The League for Civil Education, an organization which came into existence shortly after the dissolution of the Mattachine national structure, began to print the LCE News in order to publicize Sarria's campaign in San Francisco's gay bars. By spring, 1962, the total circulation of the LCE News reached 7,000 copies, with lengthy articles about police brutality and cover page headlines calling for prompt collective action (D'Emilo 1983:189).

Attacks on gay bars and prosecution of their patrons led to the formation of another organization. The Tavern Guild was formed, and Bill Plath, manager of the "D'Oak Room Bar," assumed the presidency. Unlike any other organization, the Tavern Guild was the first to set aside a bail fund for anyone arrested in or near a gay bar. It hired a lawyer and coordinated campaigns to fight the Alcoholic Beverage Control Department. Equally important were their fund-raising events and the voter registration drives which took place inside gay bars. The Guild also financed the publication and distribution of The Pocket Lawyer, a legal guide instructing individuals in case of arrest or harassment (Sweet 1968:123-4).

Despite the recent developments and the existence of a few homophile organizations, San Francisco still did not have a gay political organization which would carry the torch for militancy. This led Bill Plath, Jim Foster, William Beardenph, and Mark Forrester to plan an organization, and in September, 1964, the Society for Individual Rights was formed.

From the beginning the organization stood out from others. The militant leadership established a democratic structure for the organization. They understood that the organization had a chance to grow if its message reached homosexuals in their bars. Only then could a community feeling be developed. The leadership was attuned to the social needs of gay men. Previous organizations, e.g., Mattachine, had not permitted the congregation of homosexuals in their facilities due to fear. In contrast, the Society for Individual Rights opened its door to the community and approved every request for membership. The Society sponsored bridge clubs, bowling leagues, picnics, art classes, meditation groups, etc. It also opened a thrift store, which was staffed by volunteers, and in April, 1966, the organization started a gay community center, the first center of its kind in the country.

Their activities went beyond the gay community. In cooperation with the Health Department in San Francisco, the organization launched an education campaign on venereal disease. Shortly after its formation, the Society began to publish its own magazine, Vector, which could be purchased on newsstands throughout the city. Political activities of the Society were coordinated by an action

committee which surveyed California politicians on their positions on sex law reform and police practices. The committee also conducted voter registration drives and invited political office seekers to come and speak to the group. Endorsement of the candidate would follow if support on gay-related issues was promised. From the start, the organization was very successful in attracting members. After the first few months of its existence, its membership was 250; by the end of 1966, the figure jumped to 581. In a year the membership had reached almost 1,000 (D'Emilo 1983:189-92).

Another important development was the mobilizing of the clergy in San Francisco. Recall that, starting in the 1960's, churches of various denominations began to take stands on social concerns. Because of the visibility of gays and lesbians in San Francisco some of this concern was directed towards the position of gays in the community. Reverend A. Cecil Williams, a black minister familiar with the civil rights struggle, opened a young adult center in his Glide Memorial Methodist Church. Shortly after, Reverend Williams recruited Ted McIlvenna, a young minister from Kansas City, to take charge of the project (Sweet 1968).

McIlvenna soon realized that a number of young adults involved in the project were also homosexuals practicing prostitution and running away from family hostility. McIlvenna, who lacked knowledge of homosexuality, directed his questions to the Mattachine Society but got no cooperation from it since Mattachine did not want to get involved with a population under 21 years of age. He then contacted the Daughters of Bilitis, the Tavern Guild, and the Society for

Individual Rights and learned that all of these organizations had very real complaints against the church. McIlvenna became active in the homophile movement. In May, 1964, he organized a four-day meeting with gay activists and 16 ministers from a number of denominations. The clergy attending the meeting toured lesbian and gay bars in San Francisco. Del Martin, writing about the event, reported that "the rebirth of Christian fellowship" had taken place, and that "unexpected avenues of communication and cooperation between the two groups" was finally happening (Martin 1964:9-13).

The clergy listened to the grievances voiced by activists and acknowledged the oppression of the church against homosexuals and promised to initiate dialogue in their denominations on the position of the church and homosexuality. Subsequent meetings between homophile leaders and the clergy formed the Council of Religion and the Homosexual in December, 1964.

It did not take long for the clergy involved with the Council to get into trouble. In order to gather funds for the new organization, the ministers decided to sponsor a New Year's Eve dance for the gay community. Such an event, however, was reason enough for police confrontation, since officers used touching by homosexuals in a public place as sufficient evidence for arrest and for liquor license revocation. On the night of the dance the ministers witnessed the harassment and intimidation by the police officers. The ministers called a press conference on January 2 at Glide Memorial Methodist Church. At the press conference the clergy accused the police department of harassment, brutality and intimidation, and this time

the press had to either take the side of homosexuals or else challenge the account given by the ministers. Publicity on police brutality and constant scandals involving the gay community kept gay-related concerns in print for quite some time.

THE HOMOPHILE MOVEMENT ASSESSED

The homophile movement was definitely gaining momentum during the mid-1960's, but organizations on the East Coast remained unaware of the agenda and activities of organizations on the West Coast and vice-versa. However, in early 1966, leaders representing 15 organizations from all over the country met in Kansas City to discuss the possibility of a coalition. The old dispute between activists of San Francisco and New York City was still alive, but northeast activists were willing to conquer new territory and "create a tightly structured national body bound by a militant philosophy, that would let the movement speak with one voice and act on a unified agenda" (D'Emilo 1983:19). Certainly the Kansas City meeting did not lead to forming a well-defined national organization, but in August, 1966, the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (NACHO) was formed. NACHO was a loose federation which managed to orchestrate the work of homophile organizations. Such a central organization helped to reinforce solidarity among participants. It also gave other organizations strength to withstand the attacks of the opposition, and reminded them of the movement's mission. NACHO was able to establish a national legal fund, the first of its kind, which was to be used for court cases involving bar closures, banning of homo-

sexual immigrants, and supporting rights of gay military personnel. In addition, the organization sponsored studies dealing with aspects of the legal system, discrimination, and the homosexual community. Equally important, the organization became means to spread homophile organizations to untapped territory and gave the movement a uniform set of guidelines which called for protest techniques, insistence upon equality, and rejection of the medical establishment.

There were disagreements with NACHO's radical posture, but activists were able to convince the majority that direct action was the only tactics which would win victories. A struggle for equality, and not understanding, soon became the goal of the movement. Picketing and protest slowly started to spread among homosexual communities of various cities, and at the 1968 NACHO conference, held in Chicago, the theme "Gay is Good" was endorsed, paving the way for further activism.

NACHO's organizational impulse was a vital driving force in the spread of gay political activity. The Phoenix Society, for example, came into existence because Drew Schafer, a One subscriber, read about the national meeting taking place in Kansas City. he and friends, with the guidance of NACHO delegates, soon formed the Phoenix Society for Individual Freedom, an independent organization which, after only a few months of existence, staffed an office, developed a library, issued a newsletter, sponsored dances, and initiated a campaign against venereal disease in Kansas City. Other places formed similar organizations. A NACHO conference in Seattle, in December, 1967, helped the Dorian Society get off the ground.

A distinguishing aspect of these newly-formed organizations was their concern with abuses from law enforcement officers directed toward lesbians and gays, and they soon began to actively fight such attacks. When the Houston police, for example, took several lesbians into custody in August, 1968, Ray Hill, president of the Promethean Society, got a promise from Houston's mayor to end such harassment. Likewise, legal aid was provided for gay men arrested in bath house roundups in Chicago. The Central Ohio Mattachine Society in Columbus protested the acquittal of a self-confessed killer of a gay man.

These organizations did win isolated legal victories, but they also carried the message that it was possible to resist oppression. Furthermore, they helped to bring homosexuality into the open, making city officials aware that a new interest group, fighting for justice, had been formed.

Meanwhile, San Francisco and New York continued to house the largest homophile organizations, which gained further visibility and victories. In San Francisco, for example, the amount of publicity which San Francisco's gay activists were generating forced the police department into considering appointing liaisons with the gay community. After much dispute, police officers halted their persecution of gay bars. Arrests of homosexuals cruising other public places was still a practice, but it became much safer for gays and lesbians to patronize their bars. The increasing numbers of those establishments testified to those changes. In 1963, San Francisco had about 20 gay establishments. The number jumped to 57 by 1968, making San Francisco the city with the largest number of gay bars in the nation.

San Francisco's homophile organizations failed, however. They were unable to transform the community's grievances against police brutality into large-scale grassroots activism. The two major organizations (Daughters of Bilitis and Society for Individual Rights) never managed to attract and keep a large number of followers. The very purpose of Daughters of Bilitis rested outside political mobilization; above all, the organization was there to function as a resource center providing "self-help" and as a means for socializing for lesbians. Furthermore, those militant members who might have made a difference had they stayed left the organization and concentrated their efforts in women's organizations.

The Society for Individual Rights did manage to attract a large number of gay men, but their participation was more in social and not in political activities. Furthermore, the close relationship between the Society and the Tavern Guild soon died since their goals had been achieved. This in turn left no room for injecting new goals in their agenda. These developments led to the loss of steam by San Francisco's dynamic organizations.

As the data indicate, the trend toward centralizing the movement's activities spread beyond the East Coast into the West Coast. San Francisco's Society for Individual Rights took upon itself part of the responsibility for coordinating the affairs of the movement. The organization was very successful in mobilizing the bar scene. Tilly (1978) argued that groups with "distinctive identities" and dense "interpersonal networks" are highly organized and ready for mobilization. The bars provided just that. Their family-like

structure fortified the interactions among customer's and helped sustain their identities as homosexuals.

However, the bars did not have all the necessary elements for mobilization. More specifically those responsible for developing a program of action for the bar goers of San Francisco did not enlist commitment to the movement's cause. It appears that the goals of the movement became displaced by the interests of those establishments. Being able to have those establishments patronized by gay men and lesbians became more important than enlisting their support for their liberation. As the data point out, goal displacement was possible because a good number of those heading major social movement organizations were bar owners and their employees. Under the distraction of getting gay men and lesbians to fight for their right to congregate, bar owners were actually gaining protection for their businesses. Recall also that mobilizing San Francisco's gay bars followed an increase in police crackdowns and liquor license revocations. As soon as bars and taverns achieved a more stable position, the incentive to proceed with the process of mobilization ceased to exist, and thus the decline of movement activities in those establishments. By concentrating its efforts around bars, the movement in San Francisco was never able to make the leap into the institutional aspect of the movement. Short-term goals kept the movement focused on personal institutions.

At the same time, the movement in San Francisco was very effective in getting into the political structure, especially at the local level. Its brand of militancy allowed activists to initiate

voter registration drives and campaign for selected candidates. Tilly (1978) has addressed the question of political participation. A movement's ability to enter the polity is closely related to its likelihood of success. This proposition accounts for some of the gains made by movement organizations in San Francisco since these organizations did penetrate into the political structure of the city. But such an explanation still leaves out the process of enlisting support from polity members. Jenkins (1983) explains that political access depends on shifts in public opinion and on mobilizing electoral coalitions. The gains made in San Francisco by movement organizations were not the result of the movement's being able to tap into the political structure only, but also because, in the process of mobilizing electoral coalitions, polity members became aware that they could not afford to ignore gay voters any longer. The best way to assure their support was to exchange votes for political favors. In this process, movement organizations came into contact with the political industry.

While the torch of activism was dim in San Francisco, New York's organizations were as active as ever. Things began to change when John Lindsay, liberal Republican, was elected mayor. Upon election, Lindsay gave permission to law enforcement agents to start a general clean up of "undesirables" in Times Square and later on in Greenwich Village. To their surprise, the police department met strong opposition. The New York Civil Liberties Union, taking sides with Mattachine, accused the police department of violating the rights of homosexuals to congregate in public. A community meeting took place

at Judson Memorial Church, bringing together the chief inspector of the police department and activists and gay residents of the Village. The meeting strategy worked. In May, 1966, Police Commissioner Howard Leary addressed the officers, requiring a civilian witness for every gay arrest they made. Police abuse and entrapment decreased sharply, although bar raids and license revocations continued (D'Emilo 1983:205-07).

Employment practices changed during the Lindsay administration. A lawsuit against the city by a gay man who had applied for a position with the Department of Social Services made headlines when the case was found in favor of the plaintiff. In addition, the Civil Service Commission, in 1966, slowly began to change its posture towards hiring lesbians and gays.

Other activities also contributed to mobilizing the gay community in New York. For example, the Mattachine Society distributed gay and lesbian literature and legal pamphlets to residents of the Village, West Manhattan, and public places where gay men cruised. When a Brooklyn Heights newspaper tried to launch a campaign against homosexuals, members of the Mattachine picketed its offices and put together an effective advertising boycott. Mattachine members also increased their speakers bureau, sending representatives to local television and radio shows and to 425 non-gay organizations around the city (Brown 1976:9-13).

The appearance of other organizations contributed to the spread of the gay cause and its presence in New York. In spring, 1967, Columbia University sponsored a Student Homophile League, which

brought about a great deal of publicity. Shortly after, similar groups were formed at Cornell, New York University, and Stanford (D'Emilo 1983:210). The visibility of gay groups in New York City, especially Mattachine, was important. It not only attracted new adherents to the movement, but also opened doors between the movement and the community at large.

THE GAY AND LESBIAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

American daily life was far from monotonous during the 1960's. Demonstrations, unrest, police brutality were all part of the picture. Young black militants were suddenly invading the streets and changing the nature of the Civil Rights Movement from a passive reform movement to an angry dispute with the American socio-political structure. The constant, brutal attacks on Southern blacks, the betrayal by Northern liberals and the inability of Democratic politicians to represent and fight for the movement contributed to an outburst of anger among ghetto residents. Their message was clear. They had had enough of the white establishment, and called for black power. Advocates of this distinct form of politics and culture put aside the principles of assimilation and instead protested against structural racism and the systemic oppressiveness of white supremacy. The revised goal of the movement became liberation and self-determination. They also intended to organize the black community with an independent power base away from white society.

Black became beautiful.

Concurrently, there were changes taking place in the white student movement, which started out as a struggle to build a democratic society. However, events taking place during Fall, 1965, in Berkeley showed that students had more in mind than organizing the poor and supporting southern civil rights struggles. It became apparent that they were expressing discontent with the quality of their lives, with the education they were getting, and with adult social roles. In addition, the war in Southeast Asia and the draft intensified their discontent. All these factors led to the articulation of a brand of idealism characterized by a rejection of social institutions and to New Left militants advocating resistance and revolution instead of reform.²³

Among the students involved in these movements, some turned to cultural radicalism. Furthermore, the hippie counterculture was complemented by the New Left, despite the fact that the two ideologies had different purposes. Those subscribing to counterculture were rebelling against what they perceived to be the alienation and hypocrisy of modern American life. Counterculture was also concerned with affirming subjectivity, calling for a revolution in

²² On the formation and evolution of the black power movement, see Benjamin Muse, The American Negro Revolution From Non-Violence to Black Power, 1963-1967, Bloomington, Indiana, 1967; Barton J. Bernstein and Allen J. Matusow, eds., Twentieth Century America: Recent Interpretations, New York, New York, 1969.

²³ On the student movement, the New Left, and the antiwar movement, see Priscilla Long, ed., The New Left: A Collection of Essays, Boston, Mass., 1969; Paul Jacobs and Saul Landau, The New Radicals, New York, New York, 1966.

"consciousness", or a change in the self, personality, ethics, and living styles, all of which was consistent with the political and social stand taken by the New Left. Young counterculturalists did away with expectations and values imposed by the white middle class. In its place they embraced cohabitation, new dressing styles, mind expanding drugs, and a sexual morality free from taboos and constraints.

Women in the New Left also started to apply radicalism to their position in society. There was the realization that their place in the movement was secondary to men and that their personal identities were also dependent upon the men with whom they were intimate. It was then that a new branch of feminism was added to the women's movement. Radical Feminism started out by questioning the very foundation of exactly what denotes socially defined categories of male and female. Radical feminists generated a whole new way of looking at gender, placing it alongside race and class, and maintained that gender, too, was a product of inequality, systematically forced onto the individual. In this light, intimate relationships between men and women, as well as the treatment of women outside of that realm, were considered by radical feminists as the battlefield where women lost to male supremacy. The outcome of the radical analysis was the elaboration of a sexual-political program where

personal life was also an aspect of political affirmation.

This wave of activism reached those involved with the homophile movement as well. A new outlook towards homosexuality was finally flourishing, and with it came a commitment to the homosexual cause based on militancy, group solidarity and moral purpose. However, the civil rights agenda again encountered resistance and this created internal dislocations in a number of organizations; but the next agenda eventually won the support of most gays and lesbians in the movement.

The Daughters of Bilitis, for example, had a number of internal disputes over the question of feminism and what it meant to the organization. The new radical approach to feminism gave the organization some theoretical insights with which to delineate their disparities with gay men. However, the institutional autonomy of the organization was not based on the fact that lesbians needed their own space, but it was defended on political grounds. Shirley Willer, addressing the 1966 NACHO convention, stated that "the lesbian is discriminated against not only because she is a lesbian, but because she is a woman...lesbian interest is more closely linked with the women's civil rights movement than with the homosexual civil liberties movement." (Willer 1966:8-9). Del Martin, who in 1967 joined the National Organization for Women, also questioned the

24 On radical feminism and sexual politics, see Sara Evans, Personal Politics, New York, New York, 1979; Robin Morgan, ed., Sisterhood is Powerful, New York, New York, 1970; Kate Millet, Sexual Politics, Garden city, New York, 1970; Jo Freeman, The Politics of Women's Liberation, New York, New York, 1975; Shulamith Firestone, The Dialectic of Sex, New York, New York, 1970.

organization's alliance with the homosexual cause. In an article in The Ladder she pointed out that "the lesbian is first of all a woman...The 'battle of the sexes' which predominates in American society prevails in the homosexual community as well, and the lesbian finds herself relegated to an even more inferior status." (Martin 1967:24-6). Such rhetoric left members of the organization with a difficult choice to make - heterosexual women or gay men. However, not everyone in the Daughters of Bilitis felt comfortable with the idea of joining forces with the women's rights movement and putting aside their loyalty to the homophile cause. Even Willer was not convinced that heterosexual women were ready to give up their pedestals and felt that despite the chauvinism encountered in gay men they constituted the more workable alliance. Others in the organization shared her view.

Daughters of Bilitis experienced a radical shift in late 1968 when new members entered and changed the focus of the debate from women's rights to women's liberation. Rita Laporte became the new president of the Daughters of Bilitis and with her came a wave of radical feminists. Also, Barbara Grier became editor of The Ladder, and she soon changed the orientation of the magazine, making it more feminist. Laporte soon pressed for the withdrawal of the Daughters of Bilitis from NACHO. In an article she wrote that "it needs to be said over and over again that the real gap within humanity is that between men and women and not that between homosexual and heterosexual". Furthermore, she urged lesbians as a group not "to 'marriage'...to the male homophile community" (Laporte 1969:18-19).

The organization and its magazine continued to carry its feminist message and were able to gain new members for the organization. But disagreement over whether the organization should ally itself with the women's movement or the homophile movement eventually destroyed both the organization and its magazine in 1970.

Another organization which suffered from the call for militancy was the Society for Individual Rights. Leo Laurence assumed the editorship of Vector, the organization's magazine, early in 1969. Being a recent adherent of the New left, Laurence began to encourage homosexuals to revolt and demand freedom, equality, and personal liberty. However, his ideas were too radical for the organization, which after internal disputes, forced Laurence out of the editorship of Vector in May, 1969. The magazine resumed its civil rights stand.

Despite resistance to militancy, the gay and lesbian liberation movement was alive and well. It reached its peak June 27, 1969, when, at a little past midnight, two detectives and a handful of police officers from Manhattan's Sixth Precinct took off to raid the "Stonewall Inn", which was located on Christopher Street in the heart of Greenwich Village. The "Stonewall Inn" was a good candidate for police crackdowns. It was operating without a liquor license, its patrons were mostly nonwhite and young, and a good percentage of them were drag queens; the establishment also had a reputation for being involved with organized crime. The police proceeded with business as usual but the patrons of the bar responded in an unusual way. As the police began to release them from inside the bar, a crowd formed on the street and disorder soon erupted when the police took off with

the bartender, the bouncer, and three drag queens:

...the scene became explosive. Limp wrists were forgotten. Beer cans and bottles were heaved at the windows and a rain of coins descended on the cops...Almost by signal the crowd erupted into cobblestone and bottle heaving...From nowhere came an uprooted parking meter - used as a battering ram on the Stonewall door. I heard several cries of "let's get some gas", but the blaze of flame which soon appeared in the window of the Stonewall was still a shock (D'Emilo 1983:232).

Within no time, reinforcements came to rescue the officers trapped inside the bar. But the disorder was not getting under control. Crowds spread through the intersection of Greenwich and Christopher Street. Fires continued to blaze, stones flew and a chorus of voices demanding "Gay Power" was heard. The following night was also marked by more demonstrations. "On nearby Waverly Place, a concrete block landed on the hood of another police car that was quickly surrounded by dozens of men, pounding on its doors and dancing on its hood." Over four hundred officers were sent to contain a crowd which exceeded 2,000 individuals. On the third night of the first gay riot in history, intense discussion about the events began to take place and before the end of July a group of gays and lesbians formed the Gay Liberation Front, an organization which from its beginning took a New Left revolutionary posture. The events of June and July made news all over the country, and in about a year gay liberation groups were formed in a number of cities and universities across the nation.

The Stonewall revolt was the catalyst which produced a nationwide, grassroots liberation movement among gays and lesbians. Liberationists followed the recruiting strategies and tactics of the New Left. They also confronted the public by espousing their

sexuality without shame. Gay Liberationists clearly established alliances with other radical groups and together took advantage of daily events and demonstrations. The New York Gay Liberation Front, for example, organized a contingency for the antiwar protest of October 15, 1969. Gay radicals in Berkeley engaged in guerilla theater on campus and organized workshops at the 1969 annual convention of the National Student Association. In a very short period of time, and by their participation in a host of events, gay liberationists were able to spread their message quickly and effectively, reaching out for new participants in the movement.

Gay liberationists were able to gain the support of other young radicals who did not share sexual identity but political philosophy. They spoke the "New Left lingo" which helped to define the reality of both groups and above all sustain their similarities in outlook, goals, and strategies. Gay liberation was one among the many radical groups during the 1960's, and in so being took over other issues in their struggle to mobilize American youth regardless of sexual identification. The Gay Liberation Front of Berkeley, for example, passed a resolution on the Vietnam War and the draft, which called for the return of troops. The Los Angeles Gay Liberation Front offered their alliance to all minorities fighting for their liberation. Such high participation and exposure also helped to win the support of those gays and lesbians who were closeted, yet radical in their politics.

Gay liberationists were also trying to win over basic social institutions, but they differed from homophile leaders in their

priorities and in their choice of confrontational tactics. Police crackdowns and arrests of gay men in New York City during August 1970, led to a march where rioting broke out again. Articles opposing gay liberationists' latest action appeared in the Village Voice and Harper's, causing the occupation of these periodicals' publisher's offices by liberationists. A demonstration in San Francisco against the Examiner ended in a bloody confrontation with the police. Other examples of these new tactics included invading the convention of the American Medical Association in Chicago in 1970 and disrupting the American Psychiatric Association annual meeting in San Francisco in the same year (D'Emilo 1983).

The aggressive behavior of many liberationists and their confrontational tactics brought the movement to the public eye. It is possible that it alienated some gays and lesbians, but it changed the very meaning of what it meant to be homosexual. That is, the process of "coming out", which before was perceived by individual gays and lesbians as a private decision, became the tool for political action which could provide personal benefits. It was the starting point for the demise of self-hatred and the improvement of one's life and self-image. To come out meant to combine a personal and political statement. The process was also essential if a movement was to be built; it fostered the articulation of resentment and anger towards the "old scheme of living" which in turn led the individual to participate in political action. It also meant that, once out of the closet, individuals had invested themselves in the movement automatically and could not easily go back to the closet.

Gay liberation played an important part in the formation of a radical lesbian contingency. As previously stated, lesbians were a numerical minority within the movement; but the emergence of radical sexual politics soon recruited a sizeable number to their separate organizations, e.g., Radical Lesbians in New York, the Furies Collective in Washington, D.C., and Gay Women's Liberation in San Francisco. These organizations were also designed after the New Left, but, by being organizations for women only, they were able to create an environment free from the hostility of heterosexual liberationist women and the chauvinism of gay men.

The first anniversary of the Stonewall riot, in June, 1970, was commemorated by a march in New York City which attracted between 5,000 and 10,000 gay men and lesbians. By 1975, a number of cities throughout the country had designated gay freedom day marches with total participation reaching more than a half-million people. Gay organizations also increased in number from 50 organizations nationwide in 1969 to 800 in 1973 to more than 1,000 by the late 1970's. This increase in numbers shows that in a short period of time gay liberation achieved the goals set by early homophile leaders: an active involvement of large numbers of gays and lesbians in a struggle for their own emancipation and the development of their own culture. Furthermore, one of the most important achievements came in 1973 when the American Psychiatric Association changed its position on homosexuality - a position held for over a century. Homosexuality was no longer considered a mental disorder. In addition, lesbian and gay activists saw more than half of the states

remove sodomy laws. The Civil Service Commission eliminated its ban on employment of lesbians and gays in the 1970's, and a dozen municipalities passed antidiscrimination referendums. On the national level, a good number of politicians in Washington came out favoring gay rights, and in 1980 the Democratic Party included a gay rights plank. Gays and lesbians came out in their own professions, forming caucuses, institutes and research centers. They also built their own churches, counseling services, hundreds of social centers, sports leagues, publishing houses, travel agencies, resorts, theater groups, collectives, clinics, businesses - in short, a full culture which allowed for the development and expression of a public identity and a self-concept free from shame.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

What follows summarizes the formation and evolution of the gay movement. By following the movement's developmental stages and correlating them with the theoretical frames of reference chosen for this study it will be possible to understand why gay liberation appeared during the late 1960's and the factors which made it possible.

Mass movements aiming at social change do not come into existence fully developed. Their formation is a slow, gradual process that tries to alter old institutional patterns and cultural beliefs. Establishing a new scheme of living is not easily implemented either, but, most certainly, the process requires intensive labor, careful planning and abundant quantities of material resources. The career of most social movements is likely to experience a disorderly commotion of events. However, the disorderly fashion in which these movements unfold themselves does not make a social movement merely the result of spontaneous social protest by a specific segment of the population. A closer inspection of the career of social movements shows that they are rational attempts to bring about, or resist, social change. The identification of developmental stages in the career of social movements is a difficult task. The homophile movement is no exception. Blumer's description of general and specific social movement characteristics has, however, made the task a bit easier. By following the progression of the homophile movement I was able to identify trends

that are specific to distinguishable stages and show the movement's link with the larger social structure.

The data collected in this research show that the Second World War made it possible to integrate elements which constitute gay and lesbian subculture. Furthermore, the war also created a climate that was conducive to the spread, and further development, of homosexual subculture. Prior to this time homosexuals had means to socialize with one another, but their networks were fragmented and rather anonymous. The homosexual world resembled distinct aggregates of people whose dealings with one another did not form social relationships but rather episodic encounters. Homosexuals themselves did not think of themselves as being part of a group. They lacked support from cultural institutions and interactional roles had to be constantly redefined. With the war, many gay men and lesbians came to discover for the first time in their lives other who shared their preference for homoeroticism. Gays and lesbians were able to solidify their networks within an institutional structure in urban America. Their meeting places (parks, restrooms and bars) became the physical environment where guidelines for their interactions as well as interactional patterns came together in a process of habitualization and institutionalization.

With the end of the war, homosexuals had no reason to go back to their old living arrangements. They had no reason to destroy their networks or to stop socializing in their bars. On the contrary, the war facilitated the breakdown of isolation and, since then, conditions for homosexuals have never been the same. More importantly, the war made it possible for homosexuals to create an alternative cultural

setting, with its own institutions, and gave the group an environment sensitive to their position in society and to their needs. Homosexuals persisted in maintaining these institutions. Their tenacity was a way of acknowledging the fact that conditions of life had changed and that they were deserving of a place of their own in society. The 1940's marked the crystalization of the homosexual subculture. It gave homosexuals new dispositions. They became sensitized to different directions and developed new interest. However, homosexuals had not had enough experience being part of a cohesive group. Consequently, these new trends did not turn into a full-fledged social movement. But as Blumer explained, they were instrumental in keeping alive the dissatisfaction with the existing institutional system, giving homosexuals an incentive to continue with their struggle. Furthermore, the crystalization of the gay subculture helped to minimize the costs of mobilization by increasing solidarity and control over the assets in the institutions and organizations of the gay community.

The newly formed gay subculture began to take on larger proportions. Such proliferation soon led to attacks on homosexuals, which furthered social stigma and accentuated their label of sexual perverts. In the eyes of society, homosexuals were not worthy of government employment, and to the extent that it was possible they should be subject to surveillance. Police brutality and systemic discrimination now dominated the scenario of gay life. But changes occurring during the early 1950's did not stop the trends that were initiated during the 1940's. However, individual homosexuals did not develop a new self-image right away. The fact that gay men and lesbians made an effort to keep their newly established subculture

alive does not indicate that they had acquired a new vision of themselves. Such an image was a long way from being developed.

Discontent with the old scheme of living continued and was especially felt by those who formed Mattachine Society. At this point in the history of the movement the trends which gave rise to change in perception of their position began to materialize. That is, discontent was slowly being transformed into action. Action led to the formation of movement organizations that were intended to change the position of homosexuals in society. The data show that the movement at this point took on a vague, uncoordinated direction, thus marking its general phase. Mattachine was only in formation. As a result the organization lacked a well-developed program for action, and more importantly, the organization did not have an established membership. However, homophile leaders slowly began to identify the direction which the movement was to take. Two goals were stressed: liberation and affirmation of a homosexual subculture. These goals were to be accomplished by collective action.

However, the process of mobilizing lesbians and gay men lagged because of lack of an infrastructure in the lesbian and gay community. In addition, most homosexuals feared the penalties to which they would be subject if disclosure of their sexual preferences was to take place. Consequently, many chose to "pass" as heterosexuals. Any involvement with a gay organization was far beyond the risks which most could afford to take. But as long as homosexuals concealed their sexual preference the movement did not progress. For a movement to exist, there must be a group of people who acknowledge to themselves and to one another that they are members of the same group and share common

interests. The disclosure of their sexual preference was further disrupted by the very nature of the process of discovering one's sexuality. The discovery and initial exploration of sexuality is a private matter for most individuals in this society. It was not any different for homosexuals, who for the most part discovered their sexuality not only secretly but also in isolation from other homosexuals. The advances made by espousing one's homosexual identity was not sufficient to overcome these barriers and to develop a sense of group identification among homosexuals themselves.

The original founders of Mattachine understood the need to generate a feeling of a distinct group among homosexuals. They tried to solve these problems by implementing a tactic which is characteristic of the general phase of a social movement. That is, homophile leaders began to sponsor discussion groups. These groups were vital in maximizing interaction among participants. They allowed members to get to know one another, develop common sympathy, and to explore each others experiences. The end result of the discussion groups was a boost in group solidarity. However, homophile leaders had higher hopes. They intended to implant in participants a unified movement ideology through the discussion groups and the informal interactions which those groups developed. It soon became clear to the leadership that the group was too diverse and that different individuals had different ways of explaining their existence as homosexuals. Consequently, a unified ideological consensus became hard to achieve. But these developments showed the leadership the importance of an ideology and its role in inducing a call for collective action and in delineating the movement's priorities.

Support for the ideology established by the fifth order was never gained. Instead, the original leaders of Mattachine were soon overthrown and a new leadership was established. The popularity of the new leadership and the acceptance of its ideas changed the direction of the organization and consequently of the movement. They implemented a program that promoted education about homosexuality to society and to troubled homosexuals. In addition, they maintained that only respectable professionals had the credentials to take on questions about the subject, and that homosexuals should learn from them how to become responsible citizens. Unlike the previous leadership, they were successful in acquiring the endorsement of movement's participants to their apolitical philosophy. Blumer (1939) describes the importance of an ideology for the survival of a movement and for subsequent developments in its career. A movement ideology is analogous to the spinal column in the human body. As an organ the spinal column assembles the vertebrae, supports the body's upright position and plays an indispensable part in the coordination of bodily movements. Group ideology makes it possible for the movement to line up the actions of its participants under a specific purpose. It also gives the movement support and justification for its existence, and it coordinates the practical operations and the tactics which the movement is to take. The new leadership did not establish an ideology for the movement. But their eclectic ideas were able to give coordination, purpose, and direction to the movement.

The new leaders abandoned the previous emphasis on collective action, militancy and the affirmation of a cohesive gay community. In its place, the movement guided its participants towards adjustment to

the existing order. Homophile leaders were convinced that the heterosexual majority would not tolerate the demands and rebellion of gay activists. Consequently, the new leadership advised homosexuals to leave the status quo unchanged and let professionals coordinate the agenda of the movement. These internal dislocations caused the movement to shift from an ideological-based movement to an apolitical set of guidelines that coordinated the affairs of the movement. Concurrently, there were shifts in the structure of the movement from a centralized form to a decentralized one. The data have also indicated that, with the rise of militancy the movement regained its ideological base and its centralized structure.

Zald and Ash's (1966) assertions have been confirmed. Changes in goals and tactics are the leading factors in altering the structure of social movement organizations. Furthermore, as predicted by these theorists, social movements whose emphasis is on personal change will most likely develop a decentralized structure with an exclusive membership. Recall that upon the ascent of the adjustment model and the use of professionals as the appropriate tactic to accomplish change, movement organizations responded with a change in their structure. Despite Mattachine's new structure as an above-ground organization the data show that the movement remained uncoordinated and that the emphasis on personal change became a selective requirement for recruitment of movement participants since only troubled homosexuals would be served by the movement. The situation was later reversed, however. Liberation ideology made it possible for activists to adopt an inclusive membership requirement and develop coalitions between organizations, resulting in a centralized structure with coordinating

organizations overseeing the steps taken by the movement as a whole.

Whether or not a centralized structure for movement organizations is more efficient than a decentralized one, it appears that decentralization was congenial with this period in the career of the movement since it provided the best environment for personal change. As stated by Gerlach and Hine (1970), decentralization can play a part in providing strong interpersonal bonds for movement participants and also reinforce commitment to the movement and to its ideology. Furthermore, decentralization did maximize grass root participation, as predicted by Zald and Ash (1966), but it appeared to be an inefficient structure for promoting change.

The gay movement continued to evolve. However, contrary to the prediction of some classical theorists, the direction taken by the movement was not towards greater conservatism. As documented above, the general climate of American society was one of social turmoil and protest. Blacks began to voice demands for equality, much of the general population protested the war in Vietnam, and students started to manifest a change in their value system as well. All these structural dislocations were a cry for social reform. Society became the entity in need of change. Soon, gay militants began to demand a systemic approach to the question of homosexuals and the homosexual's position in society. Structural changes, for the second time in the career of the gay movement, played a decisive part in the minimization of the costs of mobilization of the gay and lesbian community.

Gay activists, inspired by the general turmoil of society, came to reject the medical model as an explanation for the position of homosexuals. They also began to challenge the morality of those times,

and, more importantly, made discrimination against homosexuals and the affirmation of the homosexual subculture the two most important goals of the movement. In order to accomplish these changes activists abandoned prior movement tactics which relied heavily on support from respectable professionals. Instead they maintained that homosexuals themselves were the only people in society who could speak with authority on the question of homosexuality. In addition, they urged fellow homosexuals to take charge of the movement through direct action and protest. The rise of militancy gave the movement a new focus. The shift to liberation caused the movement to re-orient itself as an institutional change movement. Zald and Ash (1966) have maintained that institutional change movements are likely to develop a centralized structure with inclusive membership. The data support this assertion. That is, militancy came about when activists began to see society and its institutions as the movement target. This institutional focus propelled the formation of social movement organizations whose tasks were to coordinate the movement's actions in order to secure the best use of resources and yield the best possible results. Movement organizations such as ECHO, NACHO and the Gay Liberation Front also facilitated the development of coalitions and the exchange of movement participants reinforced inclusiveness and block recruitment. Gamson (1975) has observed that centralization increases combat readiness and reduces internal conflict. The data showed that while there were a number of internal disputes, centralization did promote solidarity and equipped the movement with better tools to fight the opposition. Lastly, centralization appears to be more effective than decentralization when it comes to the delivery of social change. The

two kinds of structures, however reflect different phases in the movement's career, and the development of one over another is relative to the movement's goals at different times.

Besides having an impact on the structure of movement organizations, and on the movement in general, goals and tactics also affect the mobilization process of movement participants. To repeat the findings, initial shifts in the goals of the movement led to the personal adjustment approach for homosexuals. Following that there was a decrease in group participation, recruitment and organizational activities. Later on, with the shift to institutional change and direct participation, the movement experienced an increase in membership and activities. The data have supported the idea that mobilization responds to changes in goals and tactics of the movement, and to the overall structure of the movement as well.

This research has also shown that the movement was able to develop a middle-class constituency that would not necessarily benefit from the gains made by the movement. There is the question of whether direct beneficiaries or outside supporters are the ones who initiate and carry out the struggles of the movement. The data support McCarthy and Zald's (1979) assertion that recent social movements have been successful in enlisting support from outsiders. However the data also indicate that, with the exception of the clergy, direct beneficiaries were those who initiated the actions of the movement and who generated the bulk of the resources needed for mobilization. There was an increase in outside participation and cooption of institutional structures of society with the movement's shift to institutional change. But this increase can be accounted for by the structural

changes reported above to which the general population was subject. In all, the data support Morris (1980;1981) and McAdam (1982) best: outside participation and contribution to the movement was reactive, not initiatory, and not always beneficial. Zald and McCarthy (1977) have also stated that establishing a middle-class constituency should change the form of movement organizations. Accordingly, movement organizations shift from a "classical form" to a more "professional form". The data do not support this assertion; movement organizations retained their classical-indigenous form. It is possible that in later phases of the movement new organizational forms were developed. There was, however, one very specific change towards professionalization: the appearance of spokespeople for the movement.

This study has tried to account for the factors which made it possible for the movement to develop and execute a program for liberation which was based on group solidarity and commitment to moral purpose. In addition, the role played by pre-existing group structure in forming and mobilizing the movement was investigated, especially in its later phase. It is no accident that these concerns were left to be treated concurrently. The composition of a program for action is not a small task, but its execution is by far a more demanding job. Execution marks the point in the career of the movement when all factors come together in an attempt to solve the collective puzzle. This collection of factors include the crystalization of the homosexual subculture, the redefinition of homosexuality, the shift to the goal of institutional change, structural dislocations occurring in the society, and pre-existing group structure.

The data have shown that, by the time the program for liberation

took over, gay liberationists as a group had begun to experience an unprecedented change in their value system. They shared with previous activists aspirations for a better position in society, but they differed on their new self-image and self-worth. That is, liberationists had no questions or doubts about the validity of and the satisfactions which their sexual preference allowed them to experience. Their sexuality became a valid channel for the expression of their existence, which included not only their choice of eroticism, but also their emotions, values, and subculture. All of this was free of guilt and shame. Once gay liberationists achieved a new outlook about themselves and about their lives, they were able to change the goal of the movement to liberation. Gay men and lesbians took as their model a civil rights agenda, and chose direct action as the means for mobilizing their community. Dislocations occurring in the general society encouraged them to reject outmoded explanations about their experiences as homosexuals and about their position in society. Homosexuals came to the realization that only the homosexual group and not the respectable professional was in a position to define their priorities. Furthermore, public disclosure of their sexual identity became translated into commitment to the movement, and confrontation with the establishment affirmed their group solidarity.

Note, however, that liberation also became possible because liberationists now had a fully developed homosexual society - something that homophile activists did not have. References to homosexuality and homosexuals was now a public as well as a private experience. Society at large, as well as individual homosexuals, could now identify and relate to concrete aspects of homosexuals' lives and of their

subculture. Their realities became objectified by the institutions of their world. Homosexuals finally achieved a collective history which gave continuity to their existence and common points of reference to one another. It was no longer necessary to redefine the meaning of what it meant to be a homosexual. Their world went public. As postulated by Resource Mobilization Theory, and confirmed by the data collected for this study, pre-existing group structure played a vital role in mobilizing the homosexual community. This group structure also secured the movement's ability to redirect and achieve its goals. The necessary resources for the ascent of the militant wing of the movement were carved out of the existing networks and previous organizations established by homophile leaders. Unlike previous activists, the militant's greatest task was to win the commitment of those who already belonged to the movement but whose support had been cast to the conservative group. Once this was accomplished the take over of other existing resources followed. It is important to point out, however, that despite those facilities, liberationists did engage in an arduous struggle. Internal movement shifts and structural changes helped the process of coopting resources. But such changes would not have automatically created the movement nor accomplished its goals.

The importance of the homophile movement in leading homosexuals toward liberation cannot be overlooked. It is true that the early phase of the movement won fewer victories. However, this early struggle was perhaps the hardest. Homophile activists broke the silence about homosexuality and planted the seeds of liberation in the minds of thousands of gay men and lesbians. Gay liberation was the crystalization of the goal set by the original founders of the

movement. The movement was an agent for social change. It introduced the notion that homosexuals were not sick individuals but a minority which no longer could, or would, accept confinement in dark ghettos. Gay liberationists, in turn, made it possible for thousands of homosexuals to experience and act upon their minority status. However, it took two decades of work by homophile leaders to give gay subculture substance, validation, direction and means for diffusion. When liberation finally invaded the streets of America, gay men and lesbians crossed a path which would never be crossed again. The battle was not over, however. New challenges have confronted homosexuals since the Stonewall riot. It remains to be investigated if gay men and lesbians have continued with their struggle or if they decided to take a break.

This study left me with a number of new questions to be researched at a future time. First, what was the overall course taken by the movement after the 1970's? Did the movement maintain its latest structure? Did it continue to pursue institutional reform or did its focus revert to personal adjustment again? Is there indication that the movement fell into a dormant stage? Secondly, Resource Mobilization Theory asserts that social movements will tend to mirror large structural developments. The past decade has been marked by a return to conservatism. To what extent has this general trend been reflected in the gay movement? How has the return to conservatism affected social movement organizations? Thirdly, what impact has the movement had on young gays and lesbians? How do they respond to the movement? Do they see the movement as part of their history as gays and lesbians? How is the history of the movement being transmitted to young homosexuals? Has the position of homosexuals in society changed

so radically that young gays can afford to take for granted the lessons learned by the initial struggles of the movement? And lastly, did movement organizations evolve into a "professional form" as a result of the movement's ability to tap even further into outside resources? Did movement organizations experience further specialization? Did they become more bureaucratized?

REFERENCES

- Adair, Nancy and Casey Adair
 1978 The Word is Out. New York, NY: New Glide Publications.
- Archer, Eugene
 1961 "Code amended to allow films to deal with homosexuality." New York Times, October 4:4.
- Bailis, L.
 1974 Bread or Justice. Lexington, MA: Health.
- Banner, Lois
 1974. Women in Modern America. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.
- Becker, Howard S.
 1963 Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. London, U.K.: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Bernstein, Barton J. and Allen J. Matusow (eds.)
 1969 Twentieth Century America: Recent Interpretations. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Berry, J. M.
 1977 Lobbying for People. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bishop, Bob
 1958 "Discard the mask". Mattachine Review, April 15.
- Blumer, Herbert
 1939 "Social movements." In Robert E. Park (ed.) An Outline of the Principles of Sociology. New York, NY: Barnes and Noble, Inc. pp. 255-78.
- Bolton Charles D.
 1972 "Alienation and Action." American Journal of Sociology 78: 537-61.
- Brill, H.
 1971 Why Organizers Fail. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Brown, Howard
 1976 Familiar Faces Hidden Lives: The Story of Homosexual Men in America Today. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich.

Bunzel, Peter

- 1962 "Shocking candor on the screen, a dilemma for the family." *Life*, February 23: 88-102.

Burns, Ken

- 1954 "Opening speech." Proceedings of the first annual convention of Mattachine Society. Los Angeles, CA: unpublished document, National Gay Archives.
- 1956 "The homosexual faces a challenge." *Mattachine Review*, June 27.

Call, Hal

- 1966 "Why perpetuate this barbarism?" *Mattachine Review*, August: 11-9.

Carden, M. L.

- 1974 *The New Feminist Movement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Chafe, William H.

- 1972 *The American Woman*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Conrad, Florence

- 1964 "How much research and why?" *The Ladder*, September: 20-4.

Cory, Donald Webster (pseud.)

- 1951 *The Homosexual in America*. New York, NY: Greenberg.
- 1964 *The Lesbian in America*. New York, NY: Citadel.

Damon, Gene

- 1959 "Radclyffe Hall." *The Ladder*, December: 8-9.

D'Emilo, John

- 1983 *Sexual Politics, Sexual Community*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Doty, Robert

- 1963 "Growth of overt homosexuality in city provokes wide concern." *New York Times*, December 17:1.

Evans, Sara

- 1979 *Personal Politics*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Firestone, Shulamith

- 1970 *The Dialectic of Sex*. New York, NY: Morrow.

Freeman, Jo

- 1973 "The origins of the women's liberation movement." American Journal of Sociology 78:792-811.

1975 The Politics of Women's Liberation. New York, NY: McKay.

- 1979 "Resource mobilization and strategy: a model for analyzing social movement organization actions." in Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy (eds.) The Dynamics of Social Movements. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop. pp. 167-89.

Gamson, W.

- 1975 The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

- 1980 "Understanding the career of challenging groups." Journal of Sociology 85:1043-60.

Gerlach, L. and V. Hine

- 1970 People, Power, Change. New York, NY: Bobbs-Merrill.

Goldstone, J. A.

- 1980 "The weakness of organization." American Journal of Sociology 85:1017-42.

Gould, Jack

- 1962 "Live and let live on WBAI presents homosexuals discussing problems." New York Times, July 16: 47-8.

Grier, Barbara

- 1960 "Lesbian literature in 1959." The Ladder, February:14-5.

- 1967 "Lesbian literature, 1966." The Ladder, April:8-13.

Gusfield, J.

- 1968 "The study of social movements." in Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences: Vol. 14:445-52.

Helmer, William J.

- 1963 "New York's middle-class homosexuals." Harper's, March:85-92.

Hertz, S. H.

- 1981 The Welfare Mothers Movement. Washington, D. C.: University Press of America.

Hopper, R. D.

- 1950 "The revolutionary process." Social Forces
28:270-9.

Hoover, J. Edgar

- 1954 "The role of the FBI in the Federal Employee
Security Program." Northwestern University
Law Review 491:333-47.

Ingelhart, R.

- 1977 The Silent Revolution. Princeton, NJ: Princeton
University Press.

Jacobs, Paul and Saul Landaw

- 1966 The New Radicals. New York, NY: Random House

Jenkins, J. Craig

- 1982a "The transformation of a constituency into a
movement." in Jo Freeman (ed.) The Social Move-
ments of the 1960s and 1970s. New York, NY:
Longman.

- 1982b "Resource Mobilization Theory and the movements
of the 1960s." Paper presented at 77th Annual
Meeting American Sociological Association,
San Francisco.

- 1983 "Resource Mobilization Theory and the study of
social movements." Annual Review of Sociology
9:527-53.

Jennings, Dale

- 1953 "To be accused is to be guilty." One,
January:10-3.

Kameny, Frank

- 1963 "Discrimination against the employment of
homosexuals." Washington, D.C.: unpublished
paper, Mattachine Society of Washington.

- 1964 "Speech to the New York Mattachine Society,
July." Los Angeles: unpublished document,
National Gay Archives.

Katz, Jonathan

- 1976 Gay American History. New York, NY: Crowell.

1983 Gay/Lesbian Almanac. New York, NY: Harper and
Row.

Kerlinger, Fred N.

- 1979 Behavioral Research: A Conceptual Approach.
New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

- Kinsey, Alfred C., Wardell B. Pomery and Clyde E. Martin
 1948 Sexual Behavior in the Human Male.
 Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders, Co.
- 1953 Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.
 Philadelphia, PA: W. B. Saunders, Co.
- Korpi, W.
 1974 "Conflict, power, and relative deprivation."
 American Political Science Review 68:971-84.
- Koski, Fran and Maida Tilochon
 1978 "Some pulp Sappho." in Karla Jay and Allen Young
 (eds.) Lavender Culture. New York, NY: Jove/HBJ.
 pp. 262-74.
- Kyper, John and Steven Abott
 1974 "The betrayal of Donald Webster Cory."
 Fag Rag/Gay Sunshine, Summer:23.
- Ladd, E. C. and D. C. Hadley
 1978 Transformation of the American Party System.
 New York, NY: Norton.
- Lambert, William
 1955 "How One Began." One, February, 8-15.
- Lang, K. and G. Lang
 1961 Collective Dynamics. New York, NY: Crowell.
- Laporte, Rita
 1969 "Of what use NACHO?" The Ladder,
 August-September:18-19.
- Licata, S.
 1981 "The homosexual rights movement in the U.S."
 Journal of Homosexuality, 6:161-89.
- Long Priscilla (ed.)
 1969 The New Left: A Collection of Essays. Boston,
 MA: P. Sargent.
- Martin, Del
 1956 "Editorial: the positive approach." The Ladder,
 November:9.
- 1959 "Editorial: the gay bar, whose problem is it?"
 The Ladder, December:4-13.
- 1964 "The church and the homosexual: a new rapport."
 The Ladder, September:9-13.

- 1967 "The lesbian's majority status." The Ladder,
June:24-6.
- McAdam, Doug
1982 Political Process and the Development of Black
Insurgency, 1930-1970." Chicago, IL: University
of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald
1977 "Resource Mobilization and social movements."
American Journal of Sociology 82:1212-41.
- Marx, Karl
1973 The Poverty of Philosophy. New York, NY:
International Publishers.
- Menninger, M. D. and William C.
1948 Psychiatry in a Troubled World. New York, NY:
Macmillan Co.
- Merril, Francis
1948 Social Problems on the Home Front. New York, NY:
Harper.
- Millet, Kate
1970 Sexual Politics. Garden City, NY: Random House.
- Morgan, Robin (ed.)
1970 Sisterhood is Powerful. New York, NY: Random
House.
- Morris, Aldon
1980 The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement. State
University of New York at Stony Brook:
unpublished dissertation.
- 1981 "Black southern student sit-in movement."
American Sociological Review 46:744-67.
- Muse, Benjamin
1967 The American Negro Revolution: From Non-Violence
to Black Power. Bloomington, IN: Indiana
University Press.
- N. A.
1950 "Pervert inquiry ordered." New York Times,
June 15:6.
- 1951 "Mattachine Society: Missions and Purposes."
Los Angeles: unpublished document, National
Gay Archives.

- 1952 "By-laws of Mattachine Foundation, Inc."
Los Angeles: unpublished document, National
Gay Archives.
- 1953 "Minutes: Mattachine Society convention for the
adoption of by-laws, November 14-15." Los
Angeles: unpublished document, National Gay
Archives.
- 1955 "Executive Order 10450." Bulletin of the Atomic
Scientist 4:156-58.
- 1956 "Purposes of the Daughters of Bilitis."
The Ladder, November:back cover.
- 1961 "British movie on homosexuality denied seal of
approval here." New York Times, November 16:45.
- 1963 "Unpopular causes." Washington Post, August 8:
A14.
- 1964 "Homosexuality in America." Life, June 26:66-74.
- 1965 "Sex change alone held no bar to federal work."
Washington Post, June 17:B4.
- 1965 "Policy of Mattachine of Washington." Washington
D.C.: unpublished document, Mattachine Society of
Washington.
- 1966 "The homosexual in America." Time Magazine,
January 21:40-1.
- Newton, Esther
- 1972 Mother Camp: The Female Impersonator in America.
Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oberschall, Anthony
- 1978a "Theories of social conflict." Annual Review of
Sociology 4:291-315.
- 1978b "The decline of the 1960s social movements."
Research in Social Movements, Conflict, Change
1:257-89.
- Olson, M.
- 1968 The Logic of Collective Action. New York, NY:
Shocken.
- Ovesey, Lionel
- 1954 "The homosexual conflict: an adaptational
analysis." Psychiatry 17:243-50.

- Piven, Frances F. and Richard A. Cloward
1977 Poor People's Movements. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Polak, C.
1965 "The story behind physique photography."
Drum, October:8-15.
- Polemberg, Richard
1972 War and Society. Philadelphia, PA:
Lippincott.
- Rodgers, Bruce
1972 The Queen's Vernacular. San Francisco, CA:
Straight Arrow Books.
- Rogers, M.
1974 "Instrumental and infra-resources."
American Journal of Sociology, 79:1418-33.
- Rowland, Charles
1953 "Opening speech." One, April:5-13.
- Ruitenbeek, Hendrick M. (ed.)
1963 The Problem of Homosexuality in Modern Society.
New York, NY: Dutton.
- Russell, David and Dalvan McIntire
1954 "In path untrodden: a study of Walt Whitman."
One, July:4-16.
- Sagarin, Edward
1969 Odd Man in Societies of Deviants in America.
Chicago, IL: Quadrangle Books.
- 1973 "Good guys, bad guys and gay guys: survey essay."
Contemporary Sociology 2:3-13.
- Sontag, Susan
1966 Against Interpretations. New York, NY: Dell.
- Star, Jack
1967 "The sad gay life." Look, January 10:30-3.
- Sweet Roxanne B.
1968 Political and Social Action in Homophile
Organizations. University of California,
Berkeley: unpublished dissertation.
- Tilly, Charles
1978 From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading, MA:
Addison Wesley.

- 1979 "Social movements and national politics."
Paper #197 Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research
in Social Organization, University of Michigan.
- Tobin, Kay and Randy Wicker
1975 The Gay Crusaders. New York, NY: Arno Press.
- Trash, Ralph
1960 "Factionalism is not the answer." Boston
Mattachine Newsletter, February.
Los Angeles, CA: unpublished document,
National Gay Archives.
- Treadwell, Marttie E.
1954 The Women's Army Corps. Washington, D.C.:
Office of the Chief of Military History
Department, Department of the Army.
- U. S. Senate
1950 Employment of Homosexuals and Other Pdrverts in
Government. Washington, D.C.: 81st Congress,
2d Session, Committee on Expenditures and
Executive Departments.
- Vining, Donald
1979 A Gay Diary, 1933-1946. New York, NY: The Pepsy
Press.
- Watson, Peter
1973 Psychology and Race. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- White, William S.
1950 "Never condoned disloyalty." New York Times,
March:1.
- Willer, Shirley
1966 "The lesbian, the homosexual and the homophile
movement." Vector, October:8-9.
- Williams, Colin J. and Martin S. Weinberg
1971 Homosexuals and the Military. New York, NY:
Harper and Row.
- Wilson, J. Q.
1973 Political Organizations. New York, NY: Basic
Books.
- Winters, Jeff
1954 "Can homosexuals organize?" One, January:4-8.

Wood, P.

- 182 "The environmental movement." in J. Wood and
M. Jackson (eds.) Social Movements. Belmont, CA:
Wadsworth. pp. 201-20.

Zald, Meyer N. and Roberta Ash

- 1966 "Social movement organizations." Social Forces
44:327-41.