James E. Metzger
One Closet Under All: Collective Individuality within the Gay Liberation Movement
A Historiographical Study
12 July 2013

The Stonewall riots of 1969 are "commonly considered the start of the gay rights struggle," responsible for inspiring the militancy "that resulted in the birth of the Gay Liberation Front" (Johnson 13, Carter 2). However, a foundation for homosexual liberation was established at least two decades earlier under the guidance of oft forgotten activist Harry Hay[1]. Within the 1950s rhetoric of the early liberation movement, "coming out had signified the private decision to accepts one's homosexual desires and to acknowledge one's sexual identity to other gay men and women" (D'Emilio 235). As the movement gained momentum, "[g]ay liberationists…recast coming out as a profoundly political act that could offer enormous personal benefits to an individual," a "fusion of the personal and the political that the radicalism of the late 1960s exalted" (235). No longer was the process one of internal acceptance, but also a significant declaration of personal identity against the majority enforcements of the United States. "Today's activists," ironically, "show a marked disinclination" for drawing a deeper connection to their historical past (Hay 6), as if the time before Stonewall is best (not) remembered as when the movement was in the closet.[2] Rather than seeing the individual as an essential part of a larger collective process supporting the expansion of homosexual consciousness, acceptance, and integration, "[t]he general attitude seems to be that the Lesbian/Gay movement began whenever one's own involvement with it began" (6). And while this perception conforms to the idea of political activation defining an individual's coming out, it minimizes the descriptive potential of understanding the gay rights movement within a larger framework of American history. While much of the progress before the Stonewall riots was meager and largely isolated across geographic regions, these early activations within the gay subculture were establishing an important framework from the upcoming liberationist ideologies of the 1970s. From 1950 to 1969, the foundational actions driving the Gay Rights struggle supported the "coming out" of the movement by redefining the collective as a legitimate oppressed minority within the cultural, political and social dynamics shaping the consciousness of life and sexuality during this time in the United States.

Life as an out homosexual within mainstream American society was practically a nonexistent reality following World War Two. Any person living outside the realm of the nuclear family was seen as perverse and deviant. In 1948, "homosexuality in America was illegal, homosexuals were dangerous

perverts, and every move a homosexual made was fraught with the danger of self-disclosure and subsequent persecution" (Hay 37). Hardly an environment in which an individual member of society with an alternative lifestyle felt safe to seek out other like-minded people. And while there were pockets of vibrant homosexual communities within urban centers like Washington DC (Johnson 13), the internal perception for most homosexuals was to not only feel isolated, but to believe one self to be unlike any other member of society. Through the 1950s, within "the Judeo-Christian tradition, homosexual behavior was excoriated as a heinous sin, the law branded it as serious crime, and the medical profession diagnosed homosexuals and lesbians as diseased" (D'Emilio 13). Everything about the particular lifestyle of a homosexual was not only less than normal, but worthy of total persecution. These cultural forces acted as "barriers against self-awareness [that] made it difficult for women and men to find entry into the homosexual subculture" (13). Without a significant external reality on which to relate, the opportunity for a more collective identification was highly improbable. Not only did society diminish the value of homosexuals externally, the self-perception within individual homosexuals frequently reinforced and perpetuated hatred, denial and isolation.

As early as 1948, political activist Harry Hay knew that "[b]efore there could be a social movement of homosexuals…someone had to think about homosexuals and homosexuality in a new way" (Hay 8). Challenging the tri-fold stigma of sin, criminality and sickness, Hay stressed that any "breakthrough was *and had to be* visionary in nature, not merely political" (8). In linking social and political realities, Hay hoped to redefine the way in which homosexuals were perceived, not only by others, but more importantly by themselves. In 1950, Hay, a homosexual with membership within the Communist party, was increasingly concerned by the "full realization that encroaching American Fascism…[sought] to bend unorganized and unpopular minorities into isolated fragments of social and emotional instability" (63). Already disengaged and full of self-hatred, the homosexual subculture would soon prove to be an easy target for political ostracism through the upcoming decade (Carter 13). In direct response, Hay founded the "first sustained gay organization in the United States in southern California in 1951 (13). With a mission to unify, educate and lead, the Mattachine Society believed

> it possible and desirable that a highly ethical homosexual culture emerge…paralleling the emerging cultures of our fellow-minorities…The Society believes homosexuals can lead well-adjusted, wholesome and socially productive lives once ignorance and prejudice

> against them is successfully combated, and once homosexuals themselves feel they have a dignified and useful role to play in society. The Society, to these ends, is in the process of developing a homosexual ethic-disciplined, moral and socially responsible (Hay 131).

In practice, the Society would sponsor discussion groups as a way to educate members and challenge "the pressures of daily conditioning in language and culture" that enforced heterosexism and limited the potential for self-discovery (84). By the following year, Mattachine claimed over 2000 active members in a society that "exerted a profound influence on how the participants viewed themselves in relation to society" (D'Emilio 68). This was an important beginning towards redefining the assumed reality of homosexuals in a healthy and vibrant way. By claiming itself as an oppressed cultural minority alongside other racial and ethnic movements, Hay and the Mattachine were establishing a new vocabulary to support the collective efforts of "a group of individuals that have been forced together by society" (83). In terms of "coming out" gay activists were beginning to enforce self-acceptance as a precursor of the movement's existence.

If reality for the homosexual were ever to be remedied from the darkness of post-War America, this internal shift of perception would prove to be a necessary component for the burgeoning subculture. However, other threads of empowerment were beginning to insert themselves into the national dialogue during this time as well. With the release of *Sexual Behavior in the Human Male* in 1948, mainstream society had to face the reality "that the actual behavior of Americans was greatly at odds with prevailing sexual mores… [Dr. Alfred] Kinsey found that 37 percent of those surveyed had engaged in at least one homosexual act to the point of orgasm" (Johnson 53). No longer, it seemed, could same-sex relations be relegated to the realm of abnormality. However, scientific experimentation was still received with skepticism through the 1950s and many politicians and psychiatrists "saw the Kinsey report as a sign of declining American morals," rather than as an indication of misappropriated cultural perceptions that should be challenged (54). The conservative political scene of the 1950s, in line with the "American Fascism" that Harry Hay feared at the turn of the decade, not only served to reinforce this attitude, but also utilized it to its own advantage.

Built upon the inspiration of Senator Joseph McCarthy to rid America's government of Communists, politicians and government employees began a full-scale campaign to clean Washington DC of all "individuals who were psychologically disturbed" and a threat to the nation's safety (35, 38). The

meaning behind "disturbed" during the Red Scare, however, was quickly expanded because "it seemed that Communists were not acting alone but had recruited homosexuals to help steal secrets" (20).[3] As David Johnson explains, "[t]he typical case involved a homosexual confronted with circumstantial evidence that he had associated with 'known homosexuals' or been arrested in a known gay cruising area" (3). And because of the closet and close-minded cultural realities, "[a]lmost all those accused quietly resigned rather than risk further publicity" within the Lavender Scare (3). Of course, underneath the surface, both Scares "were outgrowths of a broader campaign led by members of Congress to halt the expansion of the bureaucracy they had neither the expertise nor the power to control" (97). By focusing their efforts upon the homosexual factions within the government, conservative politicians found a scapegoat that had not yet discovered any political motivation to fight back. Moreover, "[b]y crystallizing the association between the federal bureaucracy and immorality" (98) the persecution of gays would not only continue, but the perception of homosexuals as a second-class citizen was publicly reinforced.

Because society used homosexuals as political pawns for the gain of a conservative agenda, it is not surprising that the environment of America in the 1950s did not support a large scale "coming out." Life as a homosexual was an exhaustive reality, even if a particular homosexual never experienced any direct consequences for their lifestyle. As John D'Emilio writes, "[t]he effort to conceal what one so laboriously sought to uncover often exacted a heavy emotional toll" (21). Discovering one's alternative sexuality within a hetero-centric context was challenging enough, but to then find it necessary to hide the same realization in order to survive was complicated and often self-defeating. Therefore, as the 1950s progressed, activists such as Harry Hay, Mattachine and other homophile organizations would need to continue challenging the social constructions that still defined homosexuality as sinful, criminal and sick.

One of the most successful ways these groups reframed negative self-perception was through the establishment of discussions groups. These meetings kept their focus by asking members to reflect on a diversity of questions, such as "what causes swishing?" and "[s]hould homosexuals try to pattern their 'marriages' after the heterosexual ones" (Hay 133)? For example,

> one group rejected theories interpreting homosexuality as a pathological condition. Members argued that the psychological state of the gay individual was "socially conditioned," a product of the externally imposed pressure to hide for self-protection. To remove this pressure, the group concluded, homosexuals had to band together…As the founders of the Mattachine Society had intended, the discussions were transforming the

> consciousness of participants, who began to see themselves as members of a minority group with a need to act collectively (68).

This revolutionary shift in consciousness, from the individual to the collective, brought a new momentum to the movement into the mid-1950s. "With the growth of membership came an expansion of activities," including the launch of a homosexual magazine, with the realization that "homosexuals could not depend on the press or other media to publicize their grievances" in a language appropriately aligned with the liberated viewpoint of their expanding minority (72-3). However, there was a side effect as a result of this quick growth. The singularity of collective voice soon became fractured with the challenges of balancing the multiplicity of newfound dialogues. As a group of once-disparate voices finally joined forces, the variety of their views and interests established a divisive component within the movement that would create challenges that would only begin to find resolution for diversification a decade later.

Alongside the growth of this collective homosexual vision, the founding members of Mattachine realized their need to resign from the Society, if only for the movement's benefit, in 1953. Their "former Communist affiliation…became a serious liability… Not only was the society trying to mobilize social outcasts, but it apparently placed its trust in a leadership that stood beyond the boundaries of political legitimacy" (D'Emilio 75-6). A brave realization, since the political environment of the United States, and the encroaching Lavender Scare, was not going to accept a group of communistically influenced homosexuals. By distancing themselves from the movement, the goal seemed to help propel the collective potential in a more legitimate, non-subversive way. However, the founding members maintained a "hope that a unified movement would survive them" (Hay 139). These wishes would prove fruitless, for the fear of continued Communist influence swept its way through the new leadership of the Mattachine Society and framed the external perception of the media as it began to report on this new minority movement (D'Emilio 76-80).[4]

Ultimately, with the changes in leadership, the fear of Communist tendencies, and the geographical influences creating further division amongst the goals of the movement, infighting would be the next challenge for gay rights activists during the mid-1950s. Beginning in 1956, a subtle tinge of internalized homophobia, a condition of self-hatred most often associated with the psychological turmoil of life within the closet, would seem apparent within the evolving visions for liberation. The most

significant point of division centered upon the educational missions of the three dominant organizations at the time: the reformed Mattachine Society, the Daughters of Bilitis, a lesbian organization, and ONE, a journalistic offshoot of Mattachine Society. While ONE only cared to communicate with its gay constituency, the other two organizations shifted from their radical roots by "repeatedly impress[ing] upon their gay constituency the need to adjust to normative standards of proper behavior" with the hopes of "diffus[ing] social hostility as a prelude to changes in law and public policy" (109). In suggesting that homosexuals should be, or act, "proper," DOB and Mattachine simply "reflected back…some of society's most condemnatory attitudes" (125). And while homosexuals may effectively become integrated back into society with these re-visitations to the "closet," the posture of "fitting in" seems self-hating, and a way to promote invisibility rather than integration of a liberated homosexual reality. Most importantly, this particular belief was internally political across the spectrum of homosexual practitioners, since these statements actually isolated "the men and women with the strongest commitment to gay life" in America, those who frequented "bars and the gay subculture" as an expression of their everyday life (125). These "bar goers" lived without apologies and fully embraced their homosexual identification with less concern for the mainstream, when compared to their counterparts in the educational organizations. However, the rationale behind the potentially homophobic perspective was not completely misaligned from the larger goals of liberation and would eventually begin to bridge the first true connection between mainstream society and a "normalized" homosexual minority in Washington DC during the early 1960s.

Beginning in the 1930s, the increase of government jobs brought "[t]housands of young men and women came to the nation's capital in search of both work and social acceptance… This process of urbanization created the kind of social and economic base that is crucial to the development of gay and lesbian subcultures." (Johnson 42). Ironically, through the 1950s, many of these gays and lesbians were not politically minded, and even in groups such as the Mattachine Society of Washington DC (MSW) of the 1960s, "members were more interested in 'personal affairs and romantic hopes' than in ideological debate" (42, 193). In searching for a life free from the constraints repressive sexual assumptions, the act of leaving home and settling into a homosexual subculture seemed politically activating enough. However, as the Lavender Scare continued to reach further into the private lives of government

employees, the intersection of homosexual rights and civil rights became inevitable, and the use of "proper behavior" became the most empowered act available in 1965 to create larger dialogue.

Harvard PhD Frank Kameny had trained his entire life to be an astronomer. In the late 1950s, he was hired to support his country in the space race with the Soviet Union. However, in 1957 the Army Map Service "dismissed him with the trumped-up charge of falsifying a federal application form" (180). The truth behind the charges was an arrest for homosexual behavior. Kameny would never find another job in government; homosexuals did not receive security clearances. His childhood dream vanished and nothing to lose, Kameny hired representation and followed his case to the U.S. Supreme Court. When his attorney abandoned the case, Kameny persisted and unearthed a new potential for reinventing the homosexual cause as one falling in the jurisdiction of civil rights. In his brief to the Court, Kameny

> charged that he and fifteen million other Americans were being treated as second-class citizens. He argued that he was not being persecuted for illegal conduct but for his sexual identity… He did not challenge the facts of his case, nor the procedures involved, but asked the court to decide on the constitutionality of the government's blanket policy of excusing homosexuals from government employment… He would reframe the homosexuals-in-government issue as a matter not of morality, criminality, or national security but of civil rights. (182)

Though the Supreme Court denied his petition in 1961, a political and social activist was born. Working in a leadership role with the MSW, Kameny would continue to challenge government dismissal policies through a variety of avenues in the 1960s, but more increasingly as an issue of civil concern.

The most compelling political activation of his career began in April 1965 when Kameny and a small group of homosexuals, empowered by the "combination of affirmative action towards racial minorities, liberalization of policies concerning heterosexual conduct, and a continuing hard-line towards homosexuals" picketed the White House (199). Their message drew ironic parallels between the reported persecution of homosexuals in Communist Cuba and the treatment of lesbians and gays within the United States. Since "[p]icketing implicitly involved an open avowal of one's homosexuality," one protester realized he "gained a little piece of his soul" while outing himself on CBS-TV (D'Emilio 165, Johnson 200). However, to reduce the potential backlash from being perceived as "sick" individuals, the MSW "drew up strict regulations" for the picketers concerning dress, personality, conformity and behavior, believing that a "dignified approach would ensure the best response" for acceptance by the mainstream (201). And while perhaps internally homophobic, because of the media attention of this event, "even

small public actions could make known to many homosexuals and lesbians the existence of a gay rights movement" worthy of respect (D'Emilio 165). In terms of a collective minority, gay liberation was becoming publicly aware of its own sexuality. In working to normalize homosexual behaviors, such actions helped to dismantle the fears of "coming out," both individually and as a larger group movement.

While such shifts in the political perspective of the movement were in conflict with activists like Harry Hay, they would still prove to be increasingly valuable touchstones as society began the journey towards mainstreaming same-sex sexuality. In 1961, Hay reinforced his views about the responsibility of the gay movement to define their own vocabulary of liberation, writing that "the rooting out of the mechanical and wholly fallacious habit of comparing and/or evaluating our minority patterns of behavior in terms of heterophile values and/or conventions" was essential for "redeeming [homosexuality] as a social identity," because such choices would not simply "minimiz[e] homosexuality as a minor variation" from the mainstream through normalization (Hay 157, 150, 150).[5] However, mainstream society was already beginning to take notice of alternative sexualities at the beginning of 1960s, and the issues surrounding the homosexuality and its darker relationship as a sub-culture were becoming more integrated in the national dialogue, whether activists were ready or not.

With the release of Jack Kerouac's *On the Road* in 1957, the Beat Movement imbedded itself as the counter-cultural movement in the United States. "The unique visibility of the burgeoning beat subculture in North Beach had a more than incidental impact upon gay male consciousness in San Francisco. Homosexuality weaved its way" through the journalistic descriptions of the movement which were designed largely to shock a national audience (D'Emilio 179-80). The discussion of homosexuality "within the context of a major social phenomenon guaranteed a receptive, and attentive, ear among gays," and "[t]hrough the beat's example, gays could perceive themselves as nonconformists rather than deviates, as rebels against stultifying norms rather than immature, unstable personalities" (181). Homosexuality was becoming more established as a viable cultural dynamic that existed both within its own personal movement and outside of itself, towards a broader audience across the country. While the media coverage was still largely negative, the mention of homosexuals was proof to closeted homosexuals that they were not alone. And "with beats and homosexuals coexisting easily on the streets"

together, a larger reality of integration was beginning to show potential (182). The trappings of the closet were being reformed alongside the expanding view of radicalism against the status quo of the 1960s.

Even with Kinsey's scientific legitimization in the 1950s and the "any press in good press" mindset of the 1960s, homosexuals were still lacking vocal, external allies. Most of the work changing perceptions was still being instigated with within the homosexual community. This changed in the spring of 1964 when Ted McIlvenna, a young social worker from the Glide Memorial Methodist Church of San Francisco, "took a crash course on society's treatment of gay men and women" (D'Emilio 192). Across the nation, churches were inspired into activism, focusing newfound energies onto social concerns brought forth by the civil rights movement. In the San Francisco tenderloin, issues of homosexuality, poverty, teenage runaways and homelessness went hand in hand. That May, McIlvenna and the Glide Urban Center held a four-day conference for gay activists and sixteen Protestant ministers. After touring bars and drag shows, participating in homophile meetings, and talking one-on-one with "real homosexuals", the ministers came to acknowledge "the role that religion had played in the persecution of homosexuals and promised to initiate dialogue in their denominations…toward same-gender sexuality"(193), thereby serving as a pivotal first step in challenging the religious viewpoint of homosexuality in sinful ways.

By the end of that year, the Council on Religion and the Homosexual demonstrated good faith and threw a New Year's Eve dance for the gay community. Hoping to assuage the potential for police interference during the event, the CRH spoke with officers at the local precinct many times for their support, but on the night of the dance, the *Mattachine Review* reported that the ministers "were 'treated to the most lavish display of police harassment known in recent times:'" stalking the event with paddy wagons, taking pictures of all 600 guests and arresting three lawyers supporting the event (194). CRH ministers quickly admonished the local police officers for their demonstration of bad faith and the American Civil Liberties Union came forth to represent the three detained lawyers. During the trial in February, "the judge directed the jury to return a not-guilty verdict before the defense had even presented the case," citing it was a waste of everybody's time (194). A strong statement, and one perceived as the "turning point" for the movement in San Francisco. Being the first time that external organizations publicly supported the cause of the homosexual, addressing both religious concerns and issues of the law,

the historical notions of sin and criminality were beginning to detangle on the hold of repression that was limiting the movement. The assumption of oppression and fear of ostracism were being replaced with opportunities that would better support the social expansion of a gay subculture within the mainstream.

Another unlikely ally for the gay rights movement of the late 1960s was organized crime. Supportive for no reason other than reaping huge profit, "the son of an important Mafioso… decided to open a gay bar in Greenwich Village" (Carter 5). Because of the "mafia's refusal to invest in basic amenities," the Stonewall Inn was disgusting (80). Lacking proper plumbing, no fire-exists and terribly diluted drinks, the Inn was still tremendously important for homosexuals living in New York City. Firstly, it challenged the geography of mainstream society, breaking "new ground by being a large gay club in a rather open area and on a main thoroughfare" (68). Secondly, because of the lower profiles still defining gay organizations at that time, young men arriving in the city saw the Stonewall almost as a community center in which to first experience personal freedom. For example, Danny Garvin admitted to having "no positive role models. Who'd know what the Mattachine Society was at seventeen? …So, yeah, the Stonewall's the first place where I started to accept myself being gay" (87). Lastly, the Stonewall Inn offered two dance floors for its customers. Wholly unheard of before this time – "Men don't dance with other men!" - the importance of dance became socially therapeutic and "had more of a communal character" (71, 83). In spite of its many shortcomings, the Stonewall Inn became a space for many of its patrons to explore honest self-expression for the first time. And while there were many ways beyond the bar culture in which a person might "come out," the opportunity to become a part of a larger community was essential to the coming out process. Connecting isolated individuals into larger association through positive social networks and sharing experiences of liberation, be it through dancing or discussion, were revolutionary in scope and began strengthening the collective reality of many once isolated homosexuals.

Therefore, when the police entered the Stonewall Inn, a club that "had been in existence for years, which contributed to the sense of identification…felt by a significant number of its patrons," for a "routine raid" on Friday June 27, 1969, it was not surprising for the patrons to finally rise into activation (257, D'Emilio 231). Lasting for six days, the violence was "memorialize[d] as the first gay riot in history" (232). However, in reflecting on this newly empowered minority, it is interesting to explore who served as the most propellant force behind the riots. Historian David Carter believes "[a]ll available

evidence leads us to conclude that the Stonewall Riots were instigated and led by the most despised and marginal elements of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered community" (262). A collection of street rats, drag-queens and one unknown butch-dyke lesbian are singled out as the most persistent forces of activation the first night of the riots. An interesting realization, to acknowledge that when the "*most* despised" faction of an already despised minority became willing to fight for their rights against the injustices delivered by the agents of the normalized mainstream, the movement finally seemed primed to seek true liberation. The day the darkest secrets of the collective homosexual identity were empowered to assert their identity was the day that Stonewall catalyzed the movement from the closet.

One of the compelling aspects of the collective homosexual minority is its universality. Regardless of the particular circumstances connecting these individuals into the larger social milieu of gay men and lesbians, there is a consistent notion that these men and women "represented a complete cross-section of American society" (Johnson 59). "Since gay men and women reflected the diversity of the American population," "all types of individuals may be found within the group" (D'Emilio 75, Hay 83). Even the Stonewall Inn "was popular with all segments of the community, so that when it was attacked, the entire community felt under attack" (Carter 257). With this capacity for cross-sectional representation, it would not be difficult to explore powerful links between the movement for homosexual rights and many of the radical social movements of the 1960s.[6] This minority voice was far more a part of society than the collective majority ever allowed itself to believe.

However, with the powerful level of diversification existing within the subculture of homosexuality, to have currents of infighting peppered through the dialogue of the political and social homophile groups before the outing of gay liberation of 1969 is understandable. Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, while some gay activists were working to establish their own vocabulary separate from mainstream assumptions, others worked hard to simply normalize homosexuality to the heterosexual community. Some groups were distinctly political, while others sought for a freedom of social expression. These ideas-for-being existed in distinction from each other, and in this separation, the movement often missed the initial opportunity for collective power. One of the first organizations to cross the boundaries exacted by the gay community onto itself was the Society of Individual Rights in San Francisco. Founded in 1964, SIR "opened its doors to anything that members had the energy to organize," and "[b]y not

forcing patrons to make a choice between the movement or the bars, [it managed] to increase the strength of the movement in San Francisco and to stimulate a deepening of political consciousness" (190, 191-2). Being a homosexual was no longer an act separate from a larger reality. This integrative approach of SIR was prophetic and helped introduce the framework for community building that would give "expression to a distinctive cultural experience" for homosexuals beginning in the 1970s (239).

However, perhaps the "unique diversities" of the homosexual community (Hay 166), its multiplicity of voices and the potential to navigate and eventually integrate divisive perspectives is the essential characteristic behind the tremendous success, and misunderstood importance of the homosexual movement. The evolution has been swift because homosexuality is hardly as foreign as contemporary Judeo-Christian hetero-normative structures would have society believe. In 1969, Harry Hay summarized:

> The Homosexual Nature, as the psychic architecture of an existential Minority from the dawn of history through the present and into the future, needs neither to be explained nor defended. It requires only to be acknowledged and its particular potential-for the expansion of human consciousness-re-evaluated (Hay 141).

While homosexuals fail to propagate children unto the world genetically, their historical significance for culture empowered them to support "the social, economic, and educational needs of their communities" (114). In spite of hundreds of years of living in hiding (112), and the enforcement of the closet in post-War America, one must wonder if society's "moral decline" was exacerbated by the turpitude of homosexual inverts, or by the turpitude of the close-minded will asserted by conservative officials seeking political gain. A broad simplification, to wit, but like the nuanced reality of what defines homosexuality genetically, social movements and ideologies also "involve a *complex* or *constellation* of traits rather than a single factor in a linear model of causation" (143). Coming out as a political act for the individual is but one thread in the larger "coming out" tapestry of the collective gay rights movement. To overlay the idea of coming out onto the phenomenon of the community's history prior to Stonewall, as a confluence of many environmental traits - across social, political, cultural, racial, sexual, ethnic diversities – in creation of a whole, the idea of the individual's role is actually reinforced. In discovering a claim for personal freedom, the collective was empowered to re-discover and redefine a world that was perhaps sorely in need of its reintegration. The movement as an individual collective effectively shaped its own vibrant reality, and as a result expanded the consciousness of the United States into a universal history.

Works Cited

Carter, David. Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution. New York: St. Martin's, 2004. Print.

D'Emilio, John. Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940-1970. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983. Print.

Hay, Harry. Radically Gay: Gay Liberation in the Words of Its Founder. Ed. Will Roscoe. Boston: Beacon, 1996. Print.

Johnson, David K. The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2004. Print.

---

[1]The most interesting anecdote supporting the oversight of Harry Hay's importance to the gay rights movement is found within John D'Emilio's pivotal work of scholarship *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities.* Through the text he refers to activist as Henry Hay. Nowhere in *Radically Gay* is the name Henry used.

[2] There is a certain complexity inherent to minority politics within postmodern scholarship. While I will refrain from utilizing these (clever) sentence structures in this paper, they can be potentially useful as a way to acknowledge, address, manipulate and redefine language that subtly re-enforces the dominant view (Judeo-Christian hetero-normative) while still trying to convey the voice of minority populations in history and social theory. It is the belief of this student that queer history in its current form is still grappling to find footing outside sociological analysis because the primary outcome of the movement is still activated in revolutionary reality and not yet fully defined.

[3] It is important to note that while "[t]he highest profile cases may have involved suspicion of communism, [ ] the majority of those separated [from the Department of State] were alleged homosexuals" (76).

[4] There are so many potent examples within the literature used for this report. I have done my best to select ideas that helped refine a historiographical study along the lines of my particular argument. However, so much of the information I encountered could have been used in one way or another to help enforce the idea of collective integration via diversification of experience. For example, the geographical considerations shaping the Gay Rights Movement, West Coast vs. East Coast, and then specifically amongst various urban centers (SF v. LA and NY v. DC) are compelling and significant, yet far too detailed for discussion in this study. The Mattachine Society specifically evolved through many incarnations and divisions that will be noted briefly in this analysis. D'Emilio and Johnson texts go into further detail.

[5] *The Homophile Bill of Particulars* is titled, as such, along Hay's radical belief that the issue of civil rights for homosexuals should not even be an issue. A truly evolved self-perspective concerning homosexuality would not seek rights because equality is obviously wholly guaranteed. "Particulars," as such, are more suited to the needs of a particularly well-determined group. "Hay demonstrates a level of political analysis and strategy far in advance of the accomodationsists who then held the leadership roles in the homophile movement," by seeing homosexuality as a social identity and not something similar to prostitution and adultery, the other "victimless crimes" cataloged along with homosexuality in the 1950s and 1960s (Hay 149-50).

[6] This research found many descriptions paralleling gay rights with African American movements, the New Left and feminist movements. In most instances, gay groups participated as members of these minority groups and would have included banners that suggested a gay participation within the cause, universally, as well.