

THESIS

LGBTQ+ POWER, AND JUSTICE, AND KNOWLEDGE! OH, MY!

-OR-

LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE FACTIONS OF THE LGBTQ+ MOVEMENT: A STUDY OF
POWER, JUSTICE, AND KNOWLEDGE

Submitted by

Emery Edison Lockwood

Department of Political Science

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Fall 2022

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Courtenay W. Daum

David W. McIvor
Jeff Kasser

Copyright by Emery Edison Lockwood 2022

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

LGBTQ+ POWER, AND JUSTICE, AND KNOWLEDGE! OH, MY!

-OR-

LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE FACTIONS OF THE LGBTQ+ MOVEMENT: A STUDY OF
POWER, JUSTICE, AND KNOWLEDGE

Social movements are important to understand when studying the reification of democracy because they are a mode of political action that is frequently utilized for a wide variety of causes by diverse sets of people. This work explores the differences of power, justice, and knowledge in the progressive and liberal factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement and what that means for both the LGBTQ+ community and society. Using a historical analysis of the strategies and actions of the liberal and progressive factions of what has grown to be the LGBTQ+ Movement an examination with a lens of power provided by Lukes (2021), justice as fairness advocated for by Rawls (1958; 1971;2001), justice as recognition and redistribution put forth by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004), epistemic injustice theorized by Fricker (2007), and willful hermeneutical ignorance formulated by Pohlhaus (2012) will be conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of change the two factions are able to create.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Courtenay W. Daum for advising me as I wrote my thesis. I know it was hard and stressful and you will forever have my gratitude for taking every new development in stride. Secondly, I would like to thank my thesis committee members Dr. David W. McIvor and Dr. Jeff Kasser for their role in my journey in graduate school and making this project possible. Thirdly, I would like to thank Dr.s Bradley MacDonald, Madeline Schomburg, and Nathalie Morasch for unknowingly providing my lenses of analysis for this project as well as Dr. YuJung Lee for telling me about the sequential degree program at CSU. Fourthly, I would like to thank my husband, Ezra Azriphale Lizard Lockwood for putting up with my hectic, manic writing for the last year. It was a hard time for both of us and I am immensely thankful for all of your support. Lastly, I would like to thank my father, David J. Jenkins for his continued support through undergrad and graduate school. Thank you for challenging me during the writing process and helping me critically examine my claims and analysis in the following pages.

DEDICATION

Dedicated to all my queer, trans, and non-binary siblings. Especially those who have been the victims of violence: may you rest in power.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
Introduction.....	1
Social Movements.....	1
The LGBTQ+ Movement.....	2
Power, Justice, and Knowledge.....	4
Overview.....	5
Chapter One - Power, Justice, and Knowledge: An Overview.....	6
Power.....	6
Justice.....	10
Justice as Fairness.....	10
Justice as Recognition and Redistribution.....	12
Knowledge.....	14
Epistemic Injustice.....	14
Testimonial Injustice.....	14
Hermeneutic Injustice.....	15
Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance.....	18
Conclusion.....	19
Chapter Two - The Liberal LGBTQ+ Faction: An Overview.....	21
Homophile Era: 1950-1969.....	22
An Arc to Moderation: The Homophile.....	23
The Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis.....	23
Institutional Reliance in the Homophile Era.....	31
Exclusion in the Homophile Era.....	34
The Gay Liberation Era: 1969-1981.....	35
An Arc of Moderation: Gay Liberation, Gay Activists, and Radicalesbians.....	36
The Gay Liberation Front.....	37
The Gay Activists Alliance.....	40
The Radicalesbians.....	42
Institutional Reliance in the Gay Liberation Era.....	44
Exclusion in the Gay Liberation Era.....	44
AIDS Era: 1981-1996.....	47
AIDS.....	48
Institutional Reliance and AIDS.....	48
Exclusion in AIDS Activism.....	49
Institutional Reliance After AIDS.....	52
Exclusion After AIDS.....	54
The Contemporary Era: 1996-Present.....	55
Institutional Reliance in the Contemporary Era: Judicial Activism.....	55
The Role of the Supreme Court.....	56
Romer v. Evans.....	57

Lawrence v. Texas.....	57
U.S v. Windsor and Obergefell v. Hodges.....	57
Bostock v. Clayton County.....	59
Activists and the Supreme Court.....	60
Exclusion Part One: Judicial Activism.....	62
Institutional Reliance: Non-Judicial Activism.....	65
Exclusion Part Two: Non-Judicial Activism.....	67
Exclusion Part Three: Synthesis.....	70
Arc Toward Moderation.....	70
Conclusion.....	72
Chapter Three - The Progressive LGBTQ+ Faction: An Overview	74
The Homophile Era.....	76
One, Inc.....	76
The Erickson Educational Foundation.....	77
The Gay Liberation Era: 1969-1981.....	79
STAR: Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries.....	80
Lavender Menace.....	82
The Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization.....	83
The AIDS Era: 1981-1996.....	85
The Gay Men’s Health Crisis.....	86
The AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power.....	88
The Contemporary Era 1996-Present.....	97
Mutual Aid and Direct Action.....	97
The Sylvia Rivera Law Project.....	98
FORGE.....	100
Southerners on New Ground.....	101
Familia: Trans Queer Liberation Movement.....	102
Progressive Critiques of the Modern Era.....	102
Conclusion.....	105
Chapter Four - Power in the LGBTQ+ Movement.....	107
Power Revisited.....	107
Power in the Liberal Faction.....	108
Power Over Observable Action.....	109
Power Over Agenda Setting.....	112
Ideological Power.....	114
Power in the Progressive Faction.....	117
Power Over Observable Action.....	117
Power Over Agenda Setting.....	120
Power Over Ideology.....	122
Conclusion.....	126
Chapter Five - Justice in the LGBTQ+ Movement.....	128
Justice Revisited.....	128
Justice and the Liberal Faction.....	129
Justice as Fairness.....	130
Justice as Recognition and Redistribution.....	133
Justice and the Progressive Faction.....	135

Justice as Fairness.....	136
Justice as Recognition and Redistribution.....	138
Conclusion.....	142
Chapter Six - Knowledge in the LGBTQ+ Movement.....	144
Knowledge Revisited.....	144
Knowledge and the Liberal Faction.....	146
Epistemic Injustice.....	146
Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance.....	149
Knowledge and the Progressive Faction.....	152
Epistemic Injustice.....	153
Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance.....	156
Conclusion.....	161
Conclusion.....	163
References.....	168

Introduction

Modern democracies have several foci of power because they are, by their very nature, pluralist systems (Bealey 1999, 243). Power's main focus within pluralist systems is in the formal institution(s) that make up the government because they are the only institutions vested with executive, legislative, and judicial authority. Other foci of power in modern democracies are informal institutions known as pressure groups (ibid). These groups include political action committees, interest groups, lobbyists, and social movements because they all exert pressure on government institutions to act in a certain way (Bealey 1999, 267). While pressure groups do not have the ability to enact formal policy changes, they have the capability to influence those with the power to do so. Understanding pressure groups is fundamental to comprehending how modern democracies function because they hold a significant amount of influence in democratic States. The pressure group in the current line of inquiry is social movements and the kind(s) of power they have the capacity for, the justice they have the ability to provide, and the capability to proliferate knowledge on behalf of the community or entity they are mobilizing for.

Social Movements

Social movements, and their factions, fall broadly into four different types of political attitudes: reactionary, conservative, liberal, and progressive (Simpson, Willer, and Feinberg 2022).¹ Using the traditional liberal notion of a left to right political continuum, reactionary and conservative attitudes are on the right whereas liberal and progressive attitudes are on the left. Reactionary movements and factions occupy the extreme right end of the continuum as they attempt to take society back to a "better time" by re-establishing a previous regime (O'Neil 2020, 77). Oftentimes movements with a reactionary attitude will try to undo any and all progress

¹ Not all social movements have factions that fit all four attitudes.

society has made since the “better time” they are trying to revert to (ibid). Conservatives are center right on the continuum and do what their name says: conserve (ibid). They want to preserve the status quo and keep policy and society the way that it currently is (ibid). Liberals occupy the center left spot on the continuum and support change to the status quo, but through small incremental changes using the established social and political institutions and processes (ibid). Progressives occupy the far-left side of the continuum and want to change society and the systems that are currently in place because there are little or no redeemable qualities to the status quo (O’Neil 2020, 76). Movements and factions with a progressive attitude believe that there is nothing worth preserving in the status quo and everything from social to political institutions need to be reformed to accommodate the modern world (ibid). These attitudes help form different social movements and the factions within them. Different factions have different ideologies, goals, and strategies, which change the factions’ capacities of power, for justice, and ability to proliferate knowledge on behalf of the community they are mobilizing for.

The LGBTQ+ Movement

One of the longest standing social movements in the United States is the LGBTQ+ Movement that seeks to better the lives of members in the community. While there are different factions in the movement that fight with each other, they are still part of the same larger movement with roughly the same goal in mind. I split the LGBTQ+ Movement into four distinct eras with each era changing due to a significant event for the movement. The first era of the movement, the Homophile Era, started in 1950 with the creation of the Mattachine Society, which was the first organization in the United States that mobilized around homosexual issues (D’Emilio 1983, 58). In the aftermath of the Stonewall riots in 1969, the Gay Liberation Era was formed with more invigorated ideas and strategies for gay liberation than what had been seen in

the Homophile Era. The AIDS Era was formed in the early 1980s when the AIDS pandemic started and the movement focused much of its energy on AIDS advocacy, which eventually became its own movement as more accessible and effective treatment started to become more readily available in the early to mid-1990s. After AIDS advocacy began to wane in prominence due to access to better, widespread treatments, the Contemporary Era was formed as focus shifted from AIDS to eliminating systemic barriers that affected the LGBTQ+ community, such as Don't Ask, Don't Tell, sodomy laws, and legalization of same-sex marriage. These four eras compose the history, successes, and failures of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement as well as point to what it has left to do.

Similar to other social movements, the LGBTQ+ Movement has developed different factions, specifically, progressive, liberal, and conservative. While the conservative faction does engage in the significant endeavors of educating the Republican Party and conservatives on LGBTQ+ issues, supporting conservative pro-LGBTQ+ politicians, and advocating for LGBTQ+ inclusive policies, this inquiry will address only the liberal and progressive factions ("About Us", n.d.). The conservative faction is being omitted from this evaluation because any new analysis will only further the saturation already present in the literature. Since its creation in 1977, the conservative faction has effectively focused its activism in three areas: 1) organize to defeat the Briggs Initiative in California, 2) fight for same-sex marriage, and 3) sue over the perceived unconstitutionality of Don't Ask, Don't Tell (ibid). Until the conservative faction finds a new battleground, there is no new analysis to be conducted on it because, in my assessment, it would not contribute anything of substance to the literature that is not already there.

The liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement will be examined to understand the power that these factions have, their ability to bring justice to the community, and

their capability to proliferate LGBTQ+ knowledge. Capacities of power will be analyzed through the three dimensions of power defined by Lukes (2021) and will answer the question of the capacity of power that the liberal and progressive factions of the movement have. Justice as fairness, as advanced by Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001), and justice as redistribution and recognition, as advanced by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004), will be utilized to analyze capacities for justice in the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement. The notion of epistemic injustice developed by Fricker along with Pohlhaus' theory of willful hermeneutical ignorance will be used to evaluate the progressive and liberal faction's ability to proliferate LGBTQ+ knowledge.

Power, Justice, and Knowledge

The concepts of power, justice and knowledge were chosen because each plays an important role in a social movement's ability to make effective change in society. The power that social movements have allows them to influence change for their communities; however, their capacity for justice and their capability to proliferate knowledge can be used to evaluate the movement's ability to influence change that positively affects its community's needs. Thus, using the lens of power, justice, and knowledge allows for an analysis of effective change. A lens of power by itself would be an examination limited to change because power is a necessary requisite for change; a lens of justice by itself would be limited to analyzing only the "effective" aspect in "effective change" because in order for change to be effective, it needs to adequately address the problem it is trying to solve, which is done through just practices; including the lens of knowledge supports the lens of justice because of the existence of unjust effects on society's current stage of epistemic development. Using power, justice, and knowledge together creates a holistic mechanism to analyze the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement.

Overview

This thesis explores new ways of analyzing social movements through a lens of power, justice, and knowledge in an effort to elucidate a more nuanced understanding of social movements through critically examining the kind(s) of change they have the ability to create, how that change provides justice to their constituents, and what is left for them to do. The concepts of power, justice, and knowledge that create this novel framework are explored in chapter one. Chapters two and three provide a unique conceptualization and history of the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as LGBTQ+ Movement in the United States since the movement's inception in 1950; combined, these chapters provide the historical context for the analysis of power, justice and knowledge. Chapters four, five, and six examine, respectively, power, justice, and knowledge in the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement to demonstrate the different capacities of power, for justice, and degree of knowledge production and dissemination that are present in the two factions.

Chapter One- Power, Justice, and Knowledge: An Overview

Capacities of power will be analyzed through the three dimensions of power defined by Lukes (2021); justice as fairness, as advanced by Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001), and justice as redistribution and recognition, as advanced by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004), will analyze the factions' capacities for justice; epistemic injustice characterized by Fricker (2007) and willful hermeneutical ignorance described by Pohlhaus (2012) will be used to evaluate the liberal and progressive faction's ability to proliferate LGBTQ+ knowledge. These specific frameworks have been chosen because of the depth of analysis they are able to provide. Lukes' (2021) framework of power allows for a deep analysis of power in social movements because of the work that social movements take on. The conceptualizations of justice provided by Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001), Fraser (1997), and Honneth (2004) are very well situated to analyze the change provided by social movements because of the strategies they utilize. The frame of knowledge was created using epistemic injustice (Fricker 2006; Fricker 2007) and willful hermeneutical ignorance (Polhaus 2012) because those concepts allow for the creation of a mechanism of self reflection that can evaluate the outcomes of activism taken on by social movements. Additionally, combined these frameworks create a lens that is able to evaluate the effectiveness of change provided and strategies used by social movements.

Power

Power is a concept that people understand without fully knowing its definition. This phenomenon has led to scholars like Dahl (1958), Polsby (1963; 1968), Bachrach and Baratz (1970), Lukes (2005; 2021), etc. trying to explain what power is and how it is reified. Lukes' conception of power is comprehensive and critical of previous scholars' work and creates a

schematic that allows power and its reification to be easily understood (Lukes 2021). Lukes' framework, created through a critique and expansion of previous scholarship, reveals different dimensions of power to provide a holistic framework through which to view power (ibid).

The first dimension of power in Lukes' analysis comes from Dahl (1957) and is known as the pluralist view of power with a focus on observable behavior, "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B otherwise would not do" (Lukes 2021, 21). Not only is the pluralist explanation of power straightforward, it shows two different parts to power: potential and actual. In the first dimension of power it is the success of power's exercise that leads one to have power in decision making contexts where there is conflict because everyone has the potential to influence the action of others, but it is when that potential is realized that power is reified (Lukes 2021, 24). There is a built-in limitation to the first dimension of power, however, because it only analyzes the behavior of those in decision making positions when there is conflict, i.e., the first dimension of power only studies people's observable behavior in a setting with conflict (ibid).

While the pluralist definition does describe what many think of when the word power comes to mind, it is not without its critics. Bachrach and Baratz are prominent critics of the pluralist conception of power because it focuses on observable behavior at the expense of agenda setting and the power that comes from it, "to the extent that a person or group--consciously or unconsciously--creates or reinforces barriers to the public airing of policy conflicts, that person or group has power" (Bachrach and Baratz 1970, 7). This power is realized through the words of E.E Schattschneider, "All forms of political organization have a bias in favour of the exploitation of some kinds of conflict and the suppression of others...Some issues are organized into politics while others are organized out", i.e., power is not only one's ability to affect the behavior of

another, it is also present in those who decide what is on the agenda (Schattschneider 1960, 71). The ability to affect another person's actions and what makes it on (or what is purposefully left off of) agendas is the second dimension of power. An exploration of the second dimension of power is an examination of actions as well as what is allowed to be acted on. The augmentation of the definition of power provided by Bachrach and Baratz (1970) does provide a much-needed expansion on how people think about power, but it is still missing something because it is still focused too much on observable conflict and behavior.

Lukes (2021) provides the idea to fill the lacuna on the definition of power that transcends observable behavior and conflict. He critiques both Dahl (1957) and Bachrach and Baratz (1970) because both the first and second dimensions are inadequate for the holistic study for the reification of power (Lukes 2021, 30). As such, Lukes provides three critiques to the first two dimensions of power. The first critique is that the first and second dimensions are only, "the study of overt, 'actual behaviour'" (ibid). This is insufficient for the study of power because it focuses too much on the individual and too little on the, "circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past" (Lukes 2021, 31). Secondly, within the first and second dimensions, power can only be exercised within a conflict. This means that power to make people think certain things that is seen through consuming media and being socialized is ignored (Lukes 2021, 32). Lastly, the second dimension of power assumes that when there is no grievance to a proposal, there is consensus, which means it, "[rules] out the possibility of false or manipulated consensus by definitional fiat", i.e., the second dimension of power assumes inaction on certain policy areas happens because people do not want any changes, but it could mean action in that policy area is prevented from being considered via manipulation of ideology (Lukes 2021, 33).

The third dimension of power provided by Lukes is not focused on examining how people act within conflict, rather, it examines how ideology is formed (Lukes 2021, 34). There is power in the influence of people's ideology because it affects the way people engage with policy alternatives and how they view the world (Hershey 2017, 126). The third dimension of power examines how ideology is externally influenced by other actors and how that influence is reinforced; there is a holistic understanding of sociological, political, and historical contexts within the third dimension of power. The third dimension of power transcends influence over observable behavior and potential behavior, as it influences ideological development. The transcendental characteristic of the third dimension of power comes from the influence it has over how people perceive the world and how they act off of that perception.

Additionally, there are two different reifications of third dimensional power when it comes to social movements: positive and negative. A positive reification of third dimensional power occurs when ideology has been changed in a way that furthers the social movement's goals, e.g., changing society's perception of homosexuality so it is seen as a valid expression of sexuality and not a disease or a moral failing. A negative reification of third dimensional power occurs when ideology is changed, but it furthers oppression that is seen, e.g., creating an environment where homosexuality is okay, but it needs to be done in a hypermasculine way to be seen as valid. This is an addition to Lukes' (2021) framework provided by me in order to accurately analyze the power seen by social movements, but there will be more on that distinction later.

The concept of power is understood via this framework as it covers power over action, power over potential action (agendas), and power over ideology. All aspects of this framework are important when studying any kind of pressure group within any modern democracy because

of the different foci of power that exist in the framework in which modern democracies reside. Analyzing pressure groups' ability to work within the three dimensions of power allows for an examination of the extent it is able to influence the modern framework of democracy. It is important to look at not only the power that pressure groups have, but the different factions within them because then a deeper understanding of the power that specific pressure groups hold can be elucidated because very rarely do pressure groups have one track strategies.

Justice

In a similar vein, there are different ways of thinking about what justice is and what it means for it to be achieved or to be experienced. Theories of justice are normative in nature and seek to establish what just societies ought to look like. The two main definitions of justice within political science are known as justice as fairness and justice as recognition and redistribution. The former was developed by Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) in the mid-20th century and the latter was developed by Fraser (1997) in the late 1990s and further developed by Honneth (2004).

Justice as Fairness

Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) establishes justice as fairness through the idea that a democratic society would be just if political and social institutions operated fairly under just practices (Rawls 1958, 164-65). In order to create this fair schematic of institutional practices and set ups, the original position and the veil of ignorance are created (Rawls 2001, 14-15). The original position is a hypothetical scenario where people gather to discuss what social rules and institutions should look like in order to have the fairest possible practices; in order to prevent people from making a political and social system that advantages them and people like them while creating barriers for those who do not, the discussants are behind a veil of ignorance that prevent them from knowing the identities they will hold once they leave the original position to

ensure that no one ends up on the “wrong” side of what is created in the original position (Rawls 2001, 16). Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) theorizes that in these conditions people would create a just society due to that society being fair because decisions were made by impartial, rational actors (Rawls 2001, 14-15). Furthermore, the original position and the veil of ignorance work in tandem to create an objective set of criteria that can bring justice to everyone because it assumes that there are universal criteria by which justice is understood that benefits everyone regardless of identity.

To further ensure that a just political and social system is created there are two principles of justice that evaluate the proposals in the original position (Rawls 2001, 42-43). The First Principle states that everyone, “has the same inalienable claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties” (Rawls 2001, 42). This is an important evaluative mechanism because in order for society to be fair, people need to have access to the same rights and liberties as others. The Second Principle of Justice comes in two parts: a) if social and economic inequalities exist they have to be “attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity” and b) social and economic inequalities need, “to be to the greatest benefit of the least-advantaged members of society” (Rawls 2001, 42-43). The first part of the Second Principle postulates that in order for a democracy to be just, there need to be as few restrictions as possible on who can hold office and vote and the second part tries to form equity in the creation of a just society.

An important facet of justice as fairness is the idea that justice is systemic. Any localized instance of injustice is a direct result of unfair practices and set ups of political and social institutions (Rawls 1958, 164-65). Because justice as fairness sees injustice as being the results of flawed institutional setups and practices, this is inherently a top-down approach to justice, i.e.,

justice comes from the apex of democratic institutions down to individuals: the only way justice can be introduced is through changing the practices and set up of political and social institutions.

Justice as Recognition and Redistribution

Fraser (1997) and Honneth's (2004) conception of justice focuses less on the elimination of symptoms of inequality and more on the avoidance of things like humiliation and disrespect that are fundamental causes of inequality (Honneth 2004). For Fraser (1997), justice is not just about equality, it is about recognition and redistribution to help get at the root of what forms inequality and unjust societies. In the modern era, "Cultural domination supplants exploitation as the fundamental injustice" recognition of the domination as well as its consequences will help allow justice to be achieved (Fraser 1997, 11). Justice as redistribution is also important because it rectifies and helps stop further exploitation, economic marginalization, and deprivation that are present in modern society (Fraser 1997, 13).

Justice as recognition is important because, "nonrecognition or misrecognition... can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, reduced mode of being... Due recognition is not just a courtesy but a vital human need" (Fraser 1997, 14). Justice as recognition and justice as redistribution are intimately connected because oftentimes redistribution is preceded by a recognition of societal, institutional, or cultural failing that needs to be rectified (Fraser 1997, 15). This is not to say that justice as recognition and redistribution are top-down approaches like justice as fairness (Rawls 1958; 1971; 2001). Local instances of injustice can happen because individuals can refuse to recognize how their actions affect others or they can misrecognize another's wants or needs (Fraser 1997, 14-15).

Honneth elaborates on Fraser's conception of justice because to him, something is not quite right. Honneth has strong reservations about separating redistribution and recognition like

Fraser advocates for. To Honneth, a just society is one where everyone is afforded the dignity of being recognized as their own autonomous social agent because they are not on the receiving end of disrespect or humiliation (Honneth 2004, 352). The idea of recognition is central to Honneth's expansion of justice as recognition:

The justice or wellbeing of a society is measured according to the degree of its ability to secure conditions of mutual recognition in which personal identity formation, and hence individual self-realization, can proceed sufficiently well. (Honneth 2004, 354)

It is through this recognition that justice is created. Those who are recognized as autonomous social agents and all of the identities within them are no longer disrespected or humiliated because they are seen as autonomous social agents that are worthy of everything else that is afforded to other autonomous social agents (Honneth 2004). In other words, adequate and accurate recognition of a holistic person needs to be extended to everyone in order for any kind of redistribution of rights, benefits, and privileges to be just.

Within the framework of justice as recognition and justice as redistribution it is important to note that justice is not something that is "one and done," it is a continuous process that needs to be constantly undertaken in order for justice to be achieved. While justice as recognition and justice as redistribution seem to strive for equality and/or equity that is not necessarily the case. There is an equality aspect to this framework because one of the goals is for people to be recognized as people and not seen as lesser than anyone else because of their culture, race, sexual orientation, etc., which has an air of equality to it; however, there is less of a potential for domination within this framework. Fraser and Honneth's framework does not assume universal criteria for justice, which de-centers existing power structures because it allows for people to exist in a world without domination and marginalization. Moreover, this framework does not

have a top-down approach. Justice as fairness posits that with institutions and institutionalized practices created behind a veil of ignorance justice will be achieved, which means it is a top-down approach to providing justice. Justice as recognition and justice as redistribution, however, are able to work on providing justice from the bottom up and from the top down because recognition that helps breed justice needs to come from both the individual and institutions (Fraser 1997).

Knowledge

Through the lens of knowledge two important concepts will be used to analyze the actions of the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement: epistemic injustice developed by Fricker (2007) and willful hermeneutical ignorance posited by Pohlhaus (2012). Both concepts explore the epistemic environment the LGBTQ+ Movement has formed and grown in.

Epistemic Injustice

Epistemic injustice comprises two separate phenomena: testimonial injustice and hermeneutic injustice (Fricker 2007, 1). Epistemic injustice prevents knowledge from being transmitted to others via testimonial injustice; it also prevents knowledge from being formed via hermeneutic injustice. These phenomena are prevalent in the LGBTQ+ Movement; however, before these impacts on the movement can be discussed, testimonial injustice and hermeneutic injustice need to be analyzed.

Testimonial Injustice

Testimonial injustice is when, “prejudice causes a hearer to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker’s word” (Fricker 2007, 1). Testimonial injustice relies on prejudice, either grounded in identity or actions of a specific social group or person, meaning it can be systemic or

localized. Systemic testimonial injustice is when people experience a deflated level of credibility due to systemic prejudices e.g., women's ideas being ignored in the workplace; localized testimonial injustice is when people experience a deflated level of credibility in one off circumstances e.g., a board of editors not giving credence to a paper because of the research method used (Fricker 2007, 27). The former is based on social biases and follows people as they interact with different institutions while the latter is rooted in a bias that one person or group has that remains isolated to that incident (ibid).

At the core of testimonial injustice, someone is, “wronged specifically in [their] power as a knower” because their testimony does not carry the weight that it should (Fricker 2007, 20). A misattribution of testimonial credibility is the cause of this injustice; it is because society, a group, or an individual see another person or group of people as less than they are that someone's testimony is given less weight than it should be (Fricker 2007, 17-22). Testimonial injustice prevents knowledge from being transmitted from one person to another because the hearer gives the speaker a credibility deficit due to a bias the hearer has against the speaker. As a result of testimonial injustice, the speaker is deemed unfit to know by the hearer and the former's capacity as a source of knowledge is diminished.

Hermeneutic Injustice

Hermeneutic injustice is a, “gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experiences” (Fricker 2007, 1). When someone tries to share their social interactions, lived experiences, or make sense of their identity but do not have the words to do so because they do not exist, that person experiences hermeneutic injustice. This is a type of injustice that only people with marginalized identities (women, people of color, people in the LGBTQ+ community, etc.) can experience,

“The powerless are more likely to find themselves having some kind of social experience through a glass darkly, with at best ill-fitting meanings to draw on in the effort to render them intelligible” (Fricker, 2007, p. 148). While society at large is also implicated in hermeneutic injustice, it is the marginalized that bear its brunt (ibid). Fricker uses the Women’s Movement as an example of hermeneutic injustice. These examples have two different purposes: 1) the example of sexual harassment in the workplace details the harm created by hermeneutic injustice and 2) the example of postpartum depression provides a way of combatting this injustice.

Fricker uses the rampant sexual harassment seen in offices during the mid to late 20th century to reify hermeneutic injustice through the experience of Mrs. Carmita Wood. Mrs. Wood worked at a nuclear physics laboratory for eight years before quitting due to constant sexual harassment; when she applied for unemployment insurance Mrs. Wood was asked why she quit her job and she could not answer (Fricker 2007, 149-51). While the phenomenon of sexual harassment existed, the words to describe it did not (Farley 1978, 12). That is the crux of hermeneutic injustice: there is a gap in the collective system of knowledge that prevents people from giving proper descriptions of their social experiences and/or their identities. Not only does hermeneutic injustice prevent some people’s experiences from being rendered intelligible, it also prevents them from being understood; the existence of hermeneutic injustice necessitates the existence of an epistemic black hole because neither society nor people experiencing hermeneutic injustice can fully understand their experiences and/or their identities.

Fricker’s use of postpartum depression describes how hermeneutic injustice can be overcome. In the mid-20th century women’s groups were being created and people in those groups talked about their experiences. Some of these groups focused on women sharing their experience with depression after pregnancy. These groups facilitated adversely affected

populations coming together and gave people a platform to share their experiences with others, which helped those with postpartum depression and society gain a better understanding of what was happening during pregnancy and after birth (Fricker 2007, 148-49). While the consequences of hermeneutic injustice are serious as will be explained later, there is a way of disassembling the epistemic black hole that is formed as a result of hermeneutic injustice.

The hermeneutic lacuna seen in people's inability to put words to experiences and identity is harmful. People cannot put words to some of their experiences or identities meaning the knowledge created by those experiences and identities can neither be created nor dispersed. This means that both the person and society are harmed by the injustice because neither can understand the experiences or identities of the former; however, the "cognitive disadvantage" is more often than not a significant disadvantage to society, in fact there may be an incentive to keep the injustice in place so as not to upset the status quo (Fricker 2007, 151).

The impact of this injustice is disadvantageous to those who experience it because their ability to understand themselves is limited:

The cognitive disablement prevents [them] from understanding a significant patch of [their] own experience: that is, a patch of experience which is strongly in [their] interests to understand, for without that understanding [they are] left deeply troubled, confused, and isolated, not to mention vulnerable to continued [mistreatment]. [Their] hermeneutical disadvantage renders her unable to make sense of her ongoing mistreatment, and this in turn prevents her from protesting it, let alone securing effective measures to stop it. (Fricker 2007, 151)

Hermeneutic injustice limits people's ability to understand themselves, how they fit into society, and how to explain their social interactions; this means that people who experience this injustice

are less likely to protest it and its consequences, e.g., sexual harassment, or be able to stop the injustice and its consequences: it creates an epistemic black hole. These consequences of hermeneutic injustice are severe because it facilitates a limited understanding of individuals and the effects of certain social phenomena, but as the postpartum depression example shows, there is a way to escape the aforementioned epistemic black hole.

Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance

Willful hermeneutical ignorance was developed by Pohlhaus (2013) to further develop Fricker's (2007) conception of epistemic injustice. This occurs when people dominantly situated in society cannot make sense of the lived experiences or social interactions of marginally situated people because they are utilizing an improper framework when listening to marginally situated people. Unlike testimonial injustice and hermeneutic injustice, willful hermeneutical ignorance is always systemic, "dominantly situated knowers... misunderstand and misinterpret the world" (Pohlhaus 2012, 716). Willful hermeneutical ignorance is best exemplified through people's disbelief of social phenomena like cisgender-heterosexual normativity or white privilege. These phenomena exist, but people who see the benefits of them ignore their existence and are unable to understand the world it creates for those who are harmed by the social phenomena. Willful hermeneutical ignorance is exercised mainly by dominantly situated individuals because people dominantly situated in society cannot make sense of the world they have created for marginalized groups, nor do they have the incentive to make or maintain epistemic resources for marginally situated knowers because the dominantly situated knowers' grasp on epistemic power weakens (Pohlhaus 2012, 719). The crux of willful hermeneutical ignorance is dominantly situated knowers using and maintaining a faulty hermeneutic and epistemic framework through which they view the experiences of others.

The example that Pohlhaus discusses is that of Tom Robinson in *To Kill a Mockingbird*. The all-white jury in *To Kill a Mockingbird* refused to believe the experiences of Tom Robinson, they could not understand why a Black man in the Deep South in 1934 would help a white woman because he pitied her and could not understand that Tom was, “being set up because a white woman made a sexual advance toward him, and her white father witnessed it” (Pohlhaus 2012, 725). The white jury lives in a world where they do not have to worry about the effects of the racial politics that were rampant in the Deep American South because no matter what, they always come out on top. People of color are not so lucky; they experience a vastly different world where they can be charged, convicted, and killed just because of the color of their skin, “running away, it seems, is something a black man in Maycomb County cannot do without incriminating himself” (Fricker 2007, 24). The jury’s use of an improper hermeneutic and epistemic framework leads them to ignore the effects of racism and prevent them from being fully able to understand Mr. Robinson’s social experiences and his testimony because of his status as a black man.

Conclusion

These theories of power, justice, and knowledge create the lens through which the progressive and liberal factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement will be analyzed. They provide the theoretical framework to understand the role that the factions have played in society.

Lukes’ conception of power and its three dimensions explores the different ways that power manifests itself in the world and allows for a critical analysis because power is dissected into a basic foundation of an otherwise complicated subject. Justice as fairness and justice as recognition and redistribution creates different criteria on which to base whether or not justice has been provided, which can help determine what needs to happen next to create effective

change for a specific community. Epistemic injustice and willful hermeneutical ignorance explore the importance of the proliferation of knowledge because a stagnation of knowledge presents itself with unique consequences, such as limited ability to understand social experiences and identity, for both marginalized populations and society at large. Again, each of these concepts are important for having a more nuanced understanding of social movements. Analyzing movements' capacity for power provides a holistic understanding of their ability to make change; utilizing justice to examine social movements provides a mechanism to evaluate the effectiveness of the change social movements are able to provide; using the lens of knowledge allows for an understanding of what movements have left to do because it provides a technique of self reflection.

Chapter Two- The Liberal LGBTQ+ Faction: An Overview

The classification of the LGBTQ+ Movement's liberal faction as *liberal* is an apt designation. The liberal ideology envisioned by Locke, Voltaire, Rousseau, Jefferson, and others was once a revolutionary force in the realm of political theory and government formation that was founded on representative institutions with the promise of freedom, liberty, and citizenship for everyone (Bronner 1999, 26-37). This once revolutionary political ideology and theory quickly turned less and less anti-status quo as it started to conform to the interests of the bourgeoisie instead of those who had been systematically denied a voice in government and society for centuries (ibid). The arc of liberalism in transforming from a political movement for everyone to the privileged few can also be seen in the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement through retreats to respectability, a tie to liberal institutions, and exclusion.

The liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement and its ties to liberal democratic theory do not stop at its transformational arc built from supporting the masses to privileging the already privileged few. Much like liberalism, the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement is inextricably tied to both institutions (D'Emilio 1983; Vaid 1995). This tie to institutions shapes the faction's strategies to focus on change within political institutions, for example, the Supreme Court, in an effort to grant the LGBTQ+ community access to social institutions like marriage (Daum 2020). Furthermore, the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ will fight to keep the status quo in place but fight for its most minute mutation in an effort to make life more tolerable for LGBTQ+ individuals who are white, cisgender, and able bodied, which means they combat the symptoms of the system that gave rise to their oppression and its maintenance instead of fighting the system itself. This fight for the maintenance of oppressive systems leads to the inevitable exclusion of

what Vaid calls, “Objectionable gay people” (Vaid 1995, 38). These objectionable individuals are people who further transgress social rules such as effeminate men, butch women, the transgender community, queer trans people of color, and poor LGBTQ+ individuals (ibid). The liberal faction’s reliance on political and social institutions, a willingness to exclude the most disadvantaged in favor of the most advantaged, and their arc from radical organizations to a, “retreat to respectability,” truly make them liberal organizations (Bronner 1999, 26-37; D’Emilio 1983, 75).

In order to better understand the focus and timeline of the LGBTQ+ Movement’s liberal faction, I have broken the movement up into four different eras: Homophile (1950-1969), Gay Liberation (1969-1981), AIDS (1981-1996), and the Contemporary (1996-present). The defining attributes of the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement will be examined through all four eras in order to get a comprehensive and chronological understanding of the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement and why it is classified as such.

Homophile Era: 1950-1969

The Homophile Era is marked by the emergence of the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis (DOB) (Marotta, 1981; D’Emilio, 1983; Adam, 1995). These two organizations were the first long lasting gay organizations in the United States. They developed, formed, and worked in an era characterized by hostility toward gay people; an era in which being gay was considered an indicator of mental illness, moral deficiency, and a just cause to face exclusion from social, political, or governmental institutions; it was an era awash with state sanctioned violence and oppression, pervasive in the lives of gay people through such acts as bar raids and crackdowns on cruising, resulting in extreme difficulty coming to terms with one’s identity because of the stigmatization and ignorance of homosexuality (Marotta, 1981; D’Emilio

1983; Adam 1995; Rubenstein 1995; Vaid 1995; Meeker 2001; Woods 2017). The social realities of the day informed the goals, strategies, and structure of the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis.

An Arc to Moderation: The Homophile Movement

In the United States, the homophile movement, which would eventually evolve to become the LGBTQ+ Movement, began in November of 1950 with Harry Hay's determination to get society and homosexuals to recognize the latter as an oppressed minority and his desire to obtain civil rights for that minority (D'Emilio 1983, 9; Meeker 2001, 79). What Hay started has persisted for over 70 years since that fateful November day. While the organization he started was one rooted in the desire and capacity for radical change, exclusion was a fundamental component of the Mattachine Society, and its liberal tendencies propagated by 1953 (D'Emilio 1983, 57-91). Mattachine's sister organization, the Daughters of Bilitis, were arguably never radical, but there will be more on that later.

The Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis

The radical beginnings of the liberal faction of the Gay Movement can be seen within the very formation of the Mattachine Society, the founders' first goal, and the direction the organization took after its May 1953 convention (D'Emilio 1983, 57-107). The founders of the Mattachine Society wanted to see the status of homosexuals as social, legal, and moral outcasts changed. They wanted society to view homosexuals as an oppressed minority, "[The founders'] analysis that gradually emerged of homosexuals as an oppressed cultural minority" (D'Emilio 1983, 65). The position and end goal of the founders was in diametric opposition to the prevailing beliefs of homosexuality that were held by the vast majority of Americans when the Society was founded in 1950. Up until the latter part of the 20th Century, homosexuality was

seen as a mental disorder or a psychopathy that could be “cured” (Rubenstein 1995, Abstract). Because of the conventional “wisdom” of the mid-20th century, states passed sexual psychopath laws that were aimed at targeting homosexual activity because they were seen as deviants who were unwilling to get the help that society thought they needed (Woods 2017, 146). Mattachine sought to radically revise the way that society viewed gay people as well as expand gay people’s ability to participate in society as openly gay individuals through an expansion of civil rights to the homosexual minority (D’Emilio 1983, 60; Meeker 2001, 79).

In the 1950s, homosexuals and lesbians were not seen as a minority that needed protection, they were seen as diseased, immoral, and unnatural beings that society needed to be protected from, not the other way around (D’Emilio 1983, 9). This is why the very formation of the Mattachine Society was radical. The founders of Mattachine sought to establish homosexuals and lesbians as a social group unto themselves and wanted to switch society’s perception of homosexuality and lesbianism from something that was morally bankrupt and diseased to something that was natural whose members were unjustly discriminated against (ibid). This ambition of the Mattachine Society, changing society’s perception of a group of people, can only be seen as radical.

The liberalness of the Mattachine Society can be elucidated through the transformational arc its main founder had envisioned; Hay wanted Mattachine to transform into a homosexual rights organization after they had achieved the primary goal of getting homosexuals recognized as a social group (Marotta 1981, 9; Meeker 2000, 79). The initial goals of the Society included getting homosexuals to realize that they were a class in themselves and for themselves; meaning that homosexuals and lesbians were a class of people and more importantly a class of people who had common interests (D’Emilio 1983, 67). The most common of these interests was

emancipation from the oppression seen in police raids, the fear of “meeting-up” with other homosexuals, and witch hunts that had the purpose of purging the homosexual from public life (D'Emilio 1983, 40-53). That is where the second goal of the Society came in. For Hay, it was not enough for homosexual people and society at large to realize that homosexuals are part of a subjugated group that had common interests, but homosexuals also needed protection against the discrimination that was ubiquitous and wont to take the form of barriers to employment, entrapment, raids, and service refusal in places of public accommodation (ibid).

The Mattachine Society was able to achieve these two goals to some degree. Through reading groups and creating the infrastructure to help homosexuals meet privately, Mattachine was able to help gays see themselves as part of a larger community that spans across San Francisco, the United States, and the world. Mattachine was also able to help combat some of the discrimination seen by gay men at the hands of law enforcement specifically through the trial of Dale Jennings (D'Emilio 1983, 67 and 70-71). After Jennings was the victim of entrapment, as many gay men were at the time, the Mattachine Society created the Citizens Committee to Outlaw Entrapment (D'Emilio 1983, 70-71). The committee distributed leaflets and pamphlets and secured donations to cover the trial's cost. Arguably, the activities of the Society and the Committee led to the charges against Jennings being dropped (ibid). Though the Mattachine Society was founded on promising goals of radical change for the entirety of the homosexual community, it had a built-in liberalizing arc and was dominated by gay men (D'Emilio 1983, 92). The work of Mattachine also became less radical after May of 1953 when the organization was tempered at its first annual conference (D'Emilio 1983, 75-91).

In May of 1953, the Mattachine Society held a convention to draft a constitution and by-laws; after the restructuring of the Mattachine, the founders no longer held leadership

positions, and some did not continue their affiliation with the organization (D'Emilio 1983, 86-87). In an attempt to distance itself from communism (which was a contentious issue as the founders were communists and the society was formed during the McCarthy Era), Mattachine's new leaders issued a statement that read, "Homosexuals... are not seeking to overthrow or destroy any of society's existing institutions, laws, or mores, but to be assimilated as constructive, valuable, and responsible citizens" (D'Emilio 1983, 84). The new leadership also distanced itself from direct action; instead of grassroots organizing and campaigning on behalf of those who had been victims of oppression, Mattachine started to work more with social institutions and professionals like lawyers and professors in an attempt for homosexuals to be seen as a less disruptive group mainly focused on finding ways to contribute to society despite some "deficiencies" in their character (D'Emilio 1983, 85; Adam 1995, 69; Meeker 2001, 79). The end goal for the homophile movement post-1953 was to assimilate into a homophobic and heterosexual centered society instead of making room for the homosexual in a more tolerating society (Meeker 2001, 79). These changes embody the transition from a progressive faction to a liberal one (Bronner 1999, 26-37). They also helped inform the strategies and actions of the liberal faction well into the Contemporary Era (Bernstein 1997; Seidman 1993).

It could be, and should be, argued that the restructuring of Mattachine after 1953 helped entrench and institutionalize the liberalism that was already in the organization via the seemingly singular focus on the plight of the most privileged of the homosexual community: those who were cisgender and male. The members of the Mattachine Society were mostly gay men; there were a few token lesbians in the Society, but not many (D'Emilio 1983, 92). The Dale Jennings trial, which put Mattachine on the proverbial map, held "Little immediate relevance for lesbians," (D'Emilio 1983, 92) because they did not participate in cruising like their male

counterparts. Lesbians also had little disposable income during the era of Mattachine because the work they were able to find did not pay enough to guarantee financial freedom or security, meaning that few lesbians could actually live as a lesbian due to the heavy financial reliance that women had on men in the mid-20th century, which was a major issue facing a substantial portion of the homosexual group that Mattachine ignored (Marotta 1981, 230; D'Emilio 1983, 93).

Mattachine was not interested in the plight of the female homosexual; in fact, they questioned the need for an organization for their female counterparts. One of the founders of the Daughters of Bilitis testified to this disconnect at an annual convention held by the Mattachine Society, "At every one of these conventions I attend... I find I must defend the [DOB] as a separate and distinct women's organization... [Mattachine has not] recognized the fact that Lesbians are women and that this 20th century is the era of emancipation of woman [sic]" (D'Emilio 1983, 105). The Mattachine Society was more focused on making sure that gay men would not be penalized for having sex, or going to gay bars, or cruising, but they also wanted to create a version of homonormativity that centered being gay around the experience of middle to upper class, cisgender, white men; the Mattachine Society fought for the most privileged among the oppressed and questioned the need to include others on the quest for being able to live as an out homosexual in society. The Mattachine Society already focused on the needs of white, gay, men when it was founded and that focus did not change after the overhaul in 1953, which led to an increase in the liberalism seen in the organization because of its reliance on existing institutions, embracing assimilation, as well as a scaling back on direct action like what was seen in response to the charges against Dale Jennings.

This is not to say that the Daughters of Bilitis were better or more inclusive than Mattachine; they too fought for the most privileged among the lesbians. The organization was

founded by a pair of lesbians who had disdain for the bar scene which mainly attracted blue collar lesbians (D'Emilio 1983, 106). Along with the class prejudice that came with the organization, there was also a prejudice against the butch lesbian. The Daughters of Bilitis were very outspoken about the need for gay women to present stereotypically feminine; many events held by the DOB required participants to dress in what would be considered socially acceptable and they would rejoice when a butch lesbian was “feminized” (D'Emilio 1983, 103). The Daughters of Bilitis was an organization that existed to serve the needs of the middle to upper class lesbians, educate them on what lesbianism was, and how to raise kids as a lesbian (ibid). While they focused on issues that pertained to a more subjugated portion of the homosexual minority, they still primarily served the most privileged of that subgroup of the minority and created their own version of homonormativity centered around stereotypically feminine housewives with children (D'Emilio 1983, 92-107).

The publications of the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis also show the temperance of these organizations as they moved into the mid-1950s. Both Mattachine and the DOB published periodicals for their respective audiences and heterosexual society (D'Emilio 1983, 103). Mattachine's *Mattachine Review* and the DOB's *Ladder*, “Spoke in neutral tones rather than assuming the stance of impassioned partisans” (D'Emilio 1983, 109). Instead of taking stances on issues, both publications tried to temper the flamboyance of their readers and what the leaders of Mattachine and DOB thought were homosexual behaviors that heterosexuals would find unacceptable. This fulfilled two different ends: 1) they helped create a type of homonormativity that encouraged assimilation and 2) they imparted to the psychologist, the lawyer, and the policy maker that homosexuals were a respectable people who were no different than the heterosexual. Both of these ends are assimilationist in nature. The former created a

homonormativity that mimicked heterosexuality and the latter projected the idea to a wider society that the “good homosexual” did not stray from social expectations in any other way than their sexual proclivities.

The creation of homonormativity can be seen in a frequent theme that permeated many of *Ladder*’s editorials. Lesbians who wore shorts, or had short hair, or presented in other masculine ways were admonished by the DOB, who thought it was time to, “Do ‘a little ‘policing’,” of their own (D’Emilio 1983, 113). This sense of normativity created by the DOB and perpetuated through *Ladder* did not stop at presentation, it extended to the activities that were becoming of acceptable lesbians. Officers of the Daughters of Bilitis and writers of editorials shared the belief that, “Gay women ‘aren’t bar hoppers,’ ..., ‘but people with steady jobs, most of them good positions” (D’Emilio 1983, 113). This belief from DOB suggests that the only acceptable lesbians are the ones that act in accordance with how the dominant culture believes a woman should act with the exception of being attracted to and/or having sex with other women.

These standards of what it means to be a homosexual were not only pushed on the homosexual community, but they were also accepted by people outside of the community (D’Emilio 1983, 114). The attempt at creating a homonormativity did not stop at presentation and admonishment of bar hopping, the latter being a classist gatekeeping mechanism (D’Emilio 1983, 106). The creation of homonormativity by the DOB was also seen by the target audience of the *Ladder*, which was lesbians who had children; the one organization that had a vested interest in making sure lesbians had a voice in the homophile movement eventually started to only recognize lesbians as lesbians if they conformed to the singular image of the female homosexual that was a housewife, a mother, and presented stereotypically feminine (D’Emilio 1983, 110).

The origin of the LGBTQ+ Movement was radical but became dramatically less so in a very short period of time. The very idea that started the homophile movement, recognizing homosexuals as an oppressed social group, was radical as its aim was to drastically change society's perception of homosexuals and their rights; however, the movement became less and less anti-status quo. The seminal organization of the movement, the Mattachine Society, stopped offering help to gay men like they did to Dale Jennings in its nascent stages. After 1953 the leaders argued that the homosexual minority needed to make friends with people like psychologists, lawyers, and professors, the leadership of the organizations issued a statement that said the goals of Mattachine and DOB were no longer to pursue social change for the homosexual minority while concomitantly excluding communists from the movement. Additionally, the leaders strove to create a homonormativity in an effort to proliferate the number of acceptable homosexuals in an effort to make the homosexual community more palatable to heterosexual society (Marotta 1981, 12; D'Emilio 1983, 81; Kissack 1995, 107). The Daughters of Bilitis were not expressly disinterested in helping working class lesbians, but DOB despised the aesthetics and practices of blue-collar lesbians who were less likely to have kids, which was the main audience DOB focused on (D'Emilio 1983, 93). Instead, DOB was more interested in helping middle to upper class femme lesbians come to terms with being lesbian and help them raise their child(ren). The Homophile Movement was advertised for everyone, but in less than three years, the scope shrunk to only encapsulate those who aligned with gender norms.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Mattachine Society suffered a major schism. The affiliates of Mattachine on the East Coast saw a return to radical strategies, which created insurmountable tensions between those who had been ushered into power after the 1953 conference and the gays who had come of age when society's perception of homosexuality took

on a “don’t ask, don’t tell” relaxed approach as opposed to active attempts to expose the homosexual (Marotta 1981, 22-47; D’Emilio 1983, 165). Because forced outings had decreased in the 1960s, a new generation of homosexuals who started to get involved with Mattachine wanted to pursue active efforts in grassroots organizing (Marotta 1981, 22-48; D’Emilio 1983, 150). The east coast affiliates of Mattachine were organizing and engaging in direct action, namely by finding an ally in the American Civil Liberties Union in the pursuit to get the U.S Armed Forces to lift the ban on employing homosexuals (D’Emilio 1983, 154). The activities of the east coast Mattachine affiliates differed greatly from the activities of the Society post-1953. After the founders had been forced out of Mattachine, the organization mainly printed articles arguing that the homosexual is no different than anyone else and balked at the idea of grassroots organizing or even taking a firm stance on any issue even if it was trivial (ibid). As the 1960s continued, the differences became too much for Mattachine to bear and the national structure of the organization, which was already nearly non-existent, dissolved as the East Coast affiliates dropped their Mattachine affiliation.

Institutional Reliance in the Homophile Era

The arc of the Mattachine Society from radical to less anti-status quo is not the only reason the Society belongs to the liberal faction of the movement. There is an inherent liberalness that can be seen in the Mattachine Society through Hay’s second goal for the organization: obtaining civil rights for the newly realized homosexual minority (D’Emilio 1983, 9; Meeker 2001, 79). The objectives of this goal were to have employment security, stop the practice of police entrapment, and even enlarge the scope of the family to include homosexual identities (D’Emilio 1983, 40-53). The way to go about achieving these goals was through state action. By getting society to recognize the homosexual as a persecuted minority, Mattachine

hoped to work on an expansion of civil rights benefiting homosexuals (D'Emilio 1983, 9; Meeker 2001, 79). This is a liberal strategy because, as Bronner (1999) wrote, liberalism is heavily dependent on the use of institutions to make change (Bronner 1999, 26); Vaid expands on this being uniquely liberal because Mattachine's successes are inextricably linked to political institutions as those are the method of redress for stopping entrapment, unequal access to work, and expanding the institution of the family to include homosexuals (Vaid 1995, 106). The second main goal of Mattachine, obtaining civil rights for the newly realized homosexual minority, was liberal in nature because of the mechanisms that would be used to bring about its realization.

After the 1953 Mattachine convention, the new leaders of Mattachine relied heavily on social institutions changing their perceptions of the homosexual community. Mattachine post-1953 employed three different strategies: host talking groups as the organization had done since 1950, publish a periodical, and lobby professional organizations like the American Psychological Association, State Bar Associations, and Universities in an effort to get those institutions to change the way they viewed homosexuality with the end goal of those social institutions being able to change society's perception of homosexuality on behalf of the homosexual community so they could assimilate into a heterosexual world (D'Emilio 1983, 81-84; Adam 1995, 69). While the second goal envisioned by Hay in 1950 would most likely have relied on state institutions to grant homosexuals access to society, Mattachine post-1953 increased the reliance on institutions to achieve their goals through the desire for social institutions to work and eliminate bias and prejudice on behalf of the homosexual (D'Emilio 1983, 81-84). Through shifting focus away from direct action to working with the American Psychological Association, Bar Associations, and Universities as well as political institutions, Mattachine's status in the liberal faction was solidified. As Mattachine became more liberal, so

did the Daughters of Bilitis. Due to the nature of the statuses of homosexuals, women, and of homosexual women in the mid-20th century, DOB and Mattachine worked closely together and used similar strategies to help advance the rights and social standing of their respective groups (D'Emilio 1983, 101).

In 1961 Franklin Kameny joined the Mattachine Society in Washington D.C and helped facilitate a return to political action Mattachine was known for pre-1953 (D'Emilio 1983, 149). Because of Kameny, Mattachine started protesting and lobbying politicians again instead of trying to get professors, lawyers, and doctors to represent homosexuals to politicians. He was also convinced that Mattachine should focus more on civil rights and started Mattachine's relationship with the American Civil Liberties Union (D'Emilio 1983, 153-155). In 1965 after four years of protests at key government buildings, testifying before congress and the Civil Service Commission, and meeting with Members of Congress, Kameny's faction in Mattachine won leadership positions and took Mattachine to a time of reliance on political institutions to obtain civil rights for the homosexual in America.

A reliance on social institutions also comes with making minute changes to the status quo to make life livable and ending there. Social and political institutions can rarely change the social realities that create oppressive structures because they benefit from that structure. Unfortunately, making minute changes via institutions was prevalent in the New York Chapter of Mattachine (MSNY). As the 1960s came to a close New York's Mayor John Lindsay, came out in support of the Black community after the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr.; when MSNY requested Lindsay support gay rights legislation, he refused to respond (Faderman 2015, 217-18). The president of Mattachine Dick Leitsch continued to defend Lindsay after he refused to respond by saying, "It was Lindsay who had made the city 'livable' for gay people by ending police

entrapment” (ibid). This statement shows MSNY, or at the very least its leader, supporting systems of oppression, but making the most minute changes to the status quo so that New York was “livable” for the most privileged homosexuals as Lindsay’s refusal meant an almost sure continuance of discrimination in employment, housing, and places of public accommodation.

Dick Leitsch was also an avid opponent of protests and marches and an avid proponent of using political institutions to make change (Faderman 2015, 193-94). He did not want to jeopardize the liberal alliances he had made at City Hall obsolete (ibid). To be fair with Leitsch at the proverbial helm, Mattachine was able to end police entrapment in the city, got gays the right to drink in bars legally, and was able to get the New York Civil Service Commission to end its policy on banning homosexuals from employment (Faderman 2015, 194). All of these were important accomplishments; however, the reliance on these political institutions had, in a sense, tied Leitsch and Mattachine to those institutions, which made it unlikely Mattachine would do anything to put their ties to City Hall in danger. As long as New York City policy only hurt the most vulnerable in society like women, the poor, the homeless, people of color, trans people, those sitting at intersections of marginalized identities, etc. Mattachine would look the other way.

Exclusion in the Homophile Era

The last hallmark of liberalism seen in Mattachine, and DOB is the exclusion of certain members of the homosexual community in order to advance the needs and wants of the most privileged. Mattachine arguably started off with a penchant for exclusion as they focused exclusively on the needs of gay men and questioned the need for an organization that paid attention to the needs of lesbians (D’Emilio 1983, 92-93). The Daughters of Bilitis, while giving a voice to female homosexuals in the fledgling homophile movement, left a great many lesbians out of their purview (D’Emilio 1983, 96-101). DOB did not want blue collar or butch lesbians to

be associated with the movement for fear that lesbians who further transgressed social norms would hurt the movement (ibid). The question of why is easily answered: respectability.

The unfortunate reality was that attitudes towards homosexuality in the United States during the 1950s made it difficult for homosexuals to do much of anything without being seen as illegal, immoral, and social outcasts (Marotta 1981; D’Emilio 1983; Adam 1995). Because the people who founded and led the homophile movement were people whose only subaltern identities were their sexuality and in some cases their gender, the willingness to exclude objectionable gay people was high (D’Emilio 1983, 92-93 and 96-101; Vaid 1995, 38). This willingness was justified by the potential of being able to bring some reprieve for the homosexual community and arguably helped Mattachine and DOB push their versions of homonormativity because if the “respectable” homosexuals were the ones who were able to “transcend” oppression, then more homosexuals may have conformed to the homonormativity pushed by the two organizations. More importantly, however, is that this privileging of “respectable” homosexuals at the expense of the least privileged homosexuals and Mattachine’s and DOB’s push for homonormativity helped solidify Mattachine and DOB as liberal Gay Movements by embodying a core part of liberal ideology, exclusion of the least privileged for the benefit of the most advantaged, in the two most prominent homophile organizations of the 1950s and 1960s.

The Gay Liberation Era: 1969-1981

The Gay Liberation Era started after the New York Police Department’s raid of the Stonewall Inn on June 29th, 1969 and lasted until the AIDS epidemic started circa 1981 (Adam, 1995; Vaid, 1995). This era saw a new openness to homosexuality by gay individuals than what had previously been seen. Almost 20 years after the founding of Mattachine and the start of the

homophile movement, members of the gay community actively and publicly labeled themselves as gay and actively sought better ways of achieving the goals of the previous era (Marotta, 1981; Adam, 1995). The Gay Liberation Era of the movement arguably is the truest embodiment of the liberal arc the Gay Movement has yet to see because of its radical beginnings, the exclusion of “objectionable” homosexuals, and the high reliance on both political and social institutions that a new generation of gay organizations exhibited in the 1970s (Marotta 1981; Adams 1995).

An Arc of Moderation: Gay Liberation, Gay Activists, and Radicalesbians

Throughout the late 1950s and 1960s, police forces all over the United States would raid gay bars; the raids were such a common occurrence they have been described as, “An American institution- a police rite to ‘manage’ the powerless and disrespected” (Adam 1995, 81). It was a common occurrence that many people in the early Gay Movement were fearful of and wanted stopped, especially as city wide raids would proliferate around election seasons; however, one raid stands out amongst them all: Stonewall. On June 27th, 1969, officers from the First Division of the Public Morals section of the New York City Police Department raided the Stonewall Inn and changed the face of the Gay Movement as society knew it (Marotta 1981, 71; D’Emilio 1983, 206-7). As the police rounded up patrons of Stonewall, the crowd got restless and fought back against police and state sanctioned oppression (Samar 2001, 147).

As the East Coast homophile organizations saw a return to grassroots strategies and direct action in the early to mid-1960s, the events at Stonewall helped bring about a new era in the Gay Movement by igniting a new passion for gay liberation, the Gay Movement saw a return to the founding of organizations rooted in radical ideas that relied on radical strategies to achieve radical goals like gender equality, a proliferation of anti-racist ideology, and much more (Marotta 1981, 24-25; D’Emilio 1983, 149-175). This new era of the movement started out with an

ambivalent outlook on civil rights that bordered on the pessimistic because, “Why petition to be let into a social system so deeply rooted by racism, sexism, militarism, and heterosexism?” (Adams 1995, 82). This passé outlook on civil rights also saw a rebuke of institutions, both social and political, as a mechanism for change. It appeared as though the Gay Movement had seen an advance to the avant-garde. Unfortunately, much as the homophile movement had done nearly twenty years prior, the radical origin would soon be tempered and see an introduction to exclusion as well as a reliance on political and social institutions to achieve the goals of the organizations that propagated during this time.

The Gay Liberation Front

One of the first organizations that was created in light of the Stonewall riots was the Gay Liberation Front (GLF), which was created on June 29th, 1969, just two days after the Stonewall riots and was the first organization to have the word “gay” in its name (Adam 1995, 82). The name “Gay Liberation Front” helps show the radical origins of this organization: gay was a moniker used within the community to identify themselves, liberation had the rhetorical impact of being free from the Rousseauian chains placed on the gay community by a homophobic society, and front was used as a way to show both the gay community and society at large that the movement was going to see a return to militaristic (what I call radical) strategies (Marotta 1981, 91; Kissack 1995, 113). The revolutionary foundation of the GLF is not only seen in its name, but also in the structure, or lack thereof, of the organization. GLF had no officers, the chair of meetings would be rotated, ad hoc project groups took the place of committees, decisions were made via consensus instead of majority rule, and everyone who wanted to participate could (Marotta 1981, 92). Third, GLF participated in other liberation movements like the Anti-War Movement, the Women’s Movement, and supported the Black Panthers (Kissack

1995, 108). Lastly, the Gay Liberation front described itself as part of a larger counterculture movement against a system that, “denies [gay people] our basic humanity in much the same way as it is denied to blacks, women, and other oppressed minorities; the grounds are just as irrational. Therefore, our liberation is tied to the liberation of all people” (Kissack 1995, 108). The GLF was, inarguably, an organization that was founded on radical ideas with a structure that made it an organization for everyone, and the organization acted on one of the most important factors of radical movements: creating alternative queer institutions (ibid). The Gay Liberation Front was founded as an organization for everyone; however, that soon changed.

Rhetoric used by members of the Gay Liberation Front near the beginning of organization was very masculine in nature that alienated and “doubly marginalized” women (Kissack 1995, 110-12). This alienation helps show, just as Mattachine had done nineteen years prior, the GLF’s formative exclusion of women and the organization benefiting the already privileged members of the gay community (ibid). While the GLF was open to everyone who wanted to come, less than a year after the formation of the Gay Liberation Front there was an exodus of women who had felt the organization was focusing too much on the needs and wants of gay men (Kissack 1995, 119). This focus came in the form of task groups aimed at countering police entrapment, sodomy law reform, or organizing dances that turned out to be heavily catered to men (D’Emilio 1983, 92; Adams 1995, 99; Kissack 195, 119). There was also a dress code that the Gay Liberation Front enforced at weekly meetings, which created a different kind of homonormativism than the one created by the Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis and, “GLF had a stern sense of who belonged and who did not” (Faderman 2015, 199).

The Gay Liberation Front, much like the Gay Activist Alliance, which will be discussed later, excluded people based on gender, race, and socioeconomic status (Gan 2013, 296;

Duberman 1994, 233-34). People like Sylvia Rivera who was a Cuban American transgender activist, found that she, and others like her, were not welcome members of the Gay Liberation Front based on their gender identity, racial and ethnic identity, and status as a “street person” (Gan 2013, 296). Despite wanting liberation for all gay people and its close connection with racial liberation groups like the Black Panther Party, the Gay Liberation Front was not exactly welcoming people on society’s margins with the proverbial open arms its founders had wanted to (Kissack 1995, 116; Gan 2013, 296). The failure to accept women, people of color, transgender individuals, and “street people” paint a picture of exclusivity in the Gay Liberation Front (Gan 2013, 296). Unfortunately, the GLF took exclusion one step further when it came to trans women of color. Sylvia Rivera help found the Gay Liberation Front and the Gay Activists Alliance but, “dropped out of these organizations after members worked to ‘really silence us’” (Daum 2020, 5).

Along with the exclusion of “objectionable” gay people, the men of the Gay Liberation Front helped keep their Rousseauian chains intact. One of various feminist critiques of male homosexuality is the focus on hypermasculinity in the gay community (Kissack 1995, 120). Unfortunately, hypermasculinity dominated the GLF through foundational rhetoric and the way that gay men defended themselves in society. Jim Fouratt, a founding member of the GLF said at a formation meeting, “Sweet? Bullshit! There’s the stereotype homo again, man! . . . Bullshit! That’s the role society has been forcing these queens to play, and they just sit and accept it” (Teal 1971, 28). He, and many other gay men in GLF were not going to sit and accept the conception of gayness being equated to being feminine that was pushed on them by society (Kissack 1995, 111). While it is good that men had fought back on the idea of gayness being equated with femininity and emasculation, they compensated through hypermasculinity which only served to

morph male homosexuality into a place of simultaneous liberation and oppression (Kissack 1995, 120-21). Due to the focus on hypermasculinity among gay men, the GLF created a space where men showing their gayness was okay and acceptable but having other “feminine” attributes was not.² The gay men in the GLF fought for a minute mutation to society, but helped maintain their system of oppression through creating, “a catch-22 situation in which gay male sexuality became a site of liberation and oppression” (Kissack 1995, 121).

Through a transformational arc from the Gay Liberation Front being an organization for respectable and “objectionable” gay people alike to an organization that focused almost exclusively on the needs of the most privileged members of the community, rejecting the participation of “objectionable” gay people, and creating an environment that was simultaneously a place of liberation and oppression, the Gay Liberation Front showed itself to be a part of the liberal faction. The only move GLF did not make that is a hallmark of a liberal organization was to get involved in political and professional institutions. Though there was an effort within the first six months of the GLF to get chapters of the to become a political force in local politics across the country, this ultimately failed (Kissack 1995, 116). Even without the reliance on political and professional institutions to make change, the Gay Liberation Front started to resemble its predecessors more than it did any radical or progressive organization.

The Gay Activists Alliance

The Gay Liberation Front was not the only gay organization that’s nascency occurred after the Stonewall riots. The Gay Activists Alliance was formed in December of 1969 when disaffected members left the GLF after they had approved donations to the Black Panther legal defense fund (Kissack 1995, 117; Bronski 2011, 212). The Gay Activists Alliance had a short time where they were a radical movement. Even though the organization split from the GLF

² Here, the first “feminine” attribute is being attracted to and having sex with men.

because of the former's support of those fighting racial injustice and focused solely on gay issues, they were welcoming of most people including transgender activists. In fact, Sylvia Rivera and Marsha P. Johnson, two trans women of color, helped form the organization (Bronski 2011, 212). However, the acceptance of others quickly faded.

The Gay Activists Alliance adopted a constitution that codified contempt for political and social ideologies while also prohibiting the alliance of the GAA with any other organization (Carter 2004, 235; Bronski 2011, 211). However, the GAA was radical through their confrontations with anti-gay individuals and institutions in what have come to be known as "zaps" (Bronski 2011, 211). These zaps took the form of sit-ins, disruptive actions, and street confrontations; they have been described as guerilla tactics used by activists (Campbell 2007). In 1970, New York's Mayor, John Lindsay, was forced to address gay issues in the media as a result of these guerillaesque zaps (Adam 1995, 88). Arguably, the most effective and successful zaps were a series of them aimed at medical and psychiatric associations due to the classification of homosexuality as a mental illness. These zaps resulted in the removal of homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) in 1971 when the annual conference hosted by the American Psychological Association was the target of a zap that was years in the making (Faderman 2015, 282-83).

The GAA was also concerned about the status of lesbians in society and why they were not being given the consideration they deserve by the public, the media, and politicians (Marotta 1983, 286). In 1972, the GAA organized a zap in a bar. The members who attended danced with members of the same sex; men and women came and participated in the zap, but only the male couples were asked to leave by the manager, which gave the impression that the manager did not see lesbian activism as anything of substance (ibid). Furthermore, when Jack Paar invited

members of the Gay Activists Alliance on to his show to discuss the usage of slurs in the media, he objected to the inclusion of a lesbian in the “delegation,” but the GAA did not back down (ibid). The Gay Activists Alliance cared about the issues that lesbians faced and wanted their voices to be heard just like gay men’s voices were.

But eventually, the most radical thing about the Gay Activists Alliance were the identities of the women who helped form it: Sylvia Rivera and Marsha P. Johnson, both transwomen of color. Throughout the 11 years the GAA was active, these two founders were around for less than four before being forced out because of their trans and non-white identities, “If someone was not shunning her darker skin or sniggering at [Sylvia’s] passionate, fractured English they were... denouncing her sashaying ways as offensive to womanhood” (Gan 2013, 269). As the GAA was forming, they gladly welcomed all types of gay people as exemplified by the organization pushing stories about gays who defied stereotypes to the press, but when the organization became established, the objectionable gays were dropped (Eisenbach 2006, 107). On the institutional front, some members of the Gay Activists Alliance wanted to seek political office and the organization's ties to political institutions were formed in an effort to provide gay alternatives at the ballot box (Bronski 2011, 211). In the end, the Gay Activists Alliance suffered from the same liberalization that weakened the effectiveness of the Mattachine Society.

The Radicalesbians

When it became clear that the Gay Liberation Front was only going to focus on men in the movement, women left the GLF to form their own organization that, just like the Daughters of Bilitis, focused on women because gay men, which were a majority of the GLF, “don’t give a damn about the needs of women” (Faderman 2015, 232). Rita Mae Brown was the catalyst for the creation of Radicalesbians. She knew that gay men did not care about the issues effecting

lesbians and her time in the National Organization for Women (NOW) showed her that the Women's Movement had the same outlook on lesbians as the GLF (Faderman 2015, 233; Marotta 1981, 130-31). Brown had wanted to change the Women's Movement's outlook on lesbians, so she recruited the few lesbians left in the Gay Liberation Front to do so (ibid).

Before the Radicalesbians took on that name, they identified themselves as the Lavender Menace (LM) because the leader of NOW, Betty Friedan, had referred to the inclusion of lesbians in the Women's Movement as the Lavender Menace (Marotta 1981, 244; Faderman 2015, 233). The Lavender Menace had two goals: 1) get the Women's Movement to accept lesbians and not see them as a threat to the movement and 2) get the Women's Movement to focus on issues affecting lesbians (Faderman 2015, 235). They were successful on both fronts. The National Organization for Women was the mainstream organization in the Women's Movement that was against the inclusion of lesbians, so Lavender Menace organized a zap to occur at the second congress to unite women (Marotta 1981, 244; Faderman 2015, 236). Lavender Menace hijacked the conference, distributed their manifesto detailing what they wanted, and shared stories about what it was like to be a lesbian in liberation movements that helped keep power structures in place that oppressed the most vulnerable members of the population they were fighting for (Faderman 2015, 236).

After the zap at the second congress to unite women, the Radicalesbians formed as a group to help advocate for lesbians and women within social and liberation movements. However, their definition of "woman" was limited to those who were born women. Radicalesbians had so much disdain for Sylvia Rivera, Marsha P. Johnson, and their organization Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries because they believed that transgender women were, "mocking women by mimicking what demeaned them" (Faderman 2015, 231). The

Radicalesbians opposition to including transgender women as well as the articles and books they wrote on the matter helped create a group of feminists who balked at the idea of trans women; this group would eventually grow into what are known today as trans-exclusive radical feminists (TERFS) (Nownes 2019, 26). While Radicalesbians was born from a need to fill a gap in the issues taken on by the movement and the Women's Movement, they refused to fill that gap for transgender women or even acknowledge them as women. Just as NOW believed that lesbian inclusion posed a threat to the Women's Movement, the Radicalesbians believed that the inclusion of trans women posed a similar threat.

Institutional Reliance in the Gay Liberation Era

The political and institutional relationships that were cultivated during the Gay Liberation Era by the two most prominent organizations in the Gay Movement are mainly reflected in the activities of the Gay Activists Alliance as the Gay Liberation Front was more anarchistic than anything else and did not seek to participate in the institution based political action that the GAA was eager to start. The institutional involvement of the Gay Activists Alliance can be seen in two different ways: 1) a focus on civil rights and 2) the political aspirations seen in some members of the GAA.

As mentioned previously, zaps were a guerillaesque tactic that organizations in the Gay Movement utilized in the 1970s. The most impactful one during this era of the Gay Movement was, arguably, the series of zaps that lead to the American Psychological Association removing homosexuality as a mental disorder from the DSM in 1974 (Adam 1995, 88). Bronski writes, “[The GAA] focus only on achieving civil rights for gay people” (Bronski 2011, 211). Adams (1995) succinctly sums up how the zaps concerning the American Psychological Association helped achieve this goal of civil rights, “A century of psychiatric talk in the United States had

provided the underpinnings for a range of anti-homosexual practices. After all, what rights could a psychopathology have?” (Adams 1995, 87). Removing homosexuality as a mental disorder from the DSM, while good for the progressive faction of the movement as the “experts” were no longer considering gayness as a mental deficiency, it also helped gain “underpinnings” in support of gay civil rights because of homosexuality’s newfound status. This new designation of homosexuality helped destigmatize it and gave legislators cover to decriminalize sodomy in the United States at a faster rate than had happened before the APA removed homosexuality from the DSM (Woods 2017, 696). While it is unclear why the Gay Activists Alliance made the American Psychological Association a prime zapping target, it did not hurt the GAA as its leaders dabbled in lobbying later on.

The Gay Activists Alliance was focused on statutory change and working within existing social institutions and wanted to establish gayness as an identity that needed to be legally protected from discrimination (Engel 2019, 131). It was mildly successful in this effort. In New York the GAA was able to convince Representatives Bella Abzug and Ed Koch to introduce the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to protect gay identities in employment and denounce police practices of raids and entrapment, it was also successful in getting a ban on employment discrimination within NYC’s cities agencies; they were also able to secure employment protections in Ann Arbor, East Lansing, San Francisco, Washington D.C, Pennsylvania, and California (ibid). However, the GAA was not able to universally find success. Outside of New York and California, defeats were more common to come across than successes (ibid). The GAA was not only focused on state and local statutes it also had a concerted effort on lobbying the McGovern Presidential Campaign in 1972, and pressuring politicians, mainly Representatives Abzug and Koch from New York, into supporting gay rights legislation (Faderman 2015, 250).

Bruce Voeller, the chair of the GAA's State and Federal Government Committee wanted to get the message out to politicians that there is a gay vote, and they could benefit from endorsements of organizations in the Gay Movement; Voeller also used his position to organize a meeting of Gay Movement leaders to create a non-discrimination plank for the official Democratic Party's platform, which was not adopted at the Convention in 1972 (Faderman 2105, 253).

The second connection to institutions comes in the political arena. Members of the GAA had political aspirations and used the organization as a launch pad for their ambitions (Eisenbach 2006, 267). After the members of the GAA lost their elections, they were still involved in electoral politics and political institutions through lobbying on behalf of gay rights legislation (ibid). The lobbying helped increase the political legitimacy of the GAA and helped it become a legitimized part of the political process. Some members of the Gay Activists Alliance split from the organization to form the Gay Political Union as a lobbying group (ibid). The Gay Activists Alliance, while it did serve as a way for a few to launch political campaigns, was at first more of a steppingstone for the type of political involvement that is a hallmark of liberal organizations.

Just two years after its formation, the GAA got acutely involved in political practices and institutions at almost all levels of government. This involvement came in the form of helping some GAA members launch election campaigns; it also manifested through petitions to support civil rights for gay people and helping create a plank for gay civil rights for a national political party. This involvement is liberal in nature because activists were primarily working within the confines of the system that created and maintains their oppression.

Exclusion in the Gay Liberation Era

Just like the homophile movement before them, the Gay Liberation Front, the Gay Activists Alliance, and Radicalesbians all excluded people in the community from their spaces.

The Gay Liberation Front's formative rhetoric and actions were centered around the gay male experience that less than 18 months after the GLF formed, there was a mass exodus of women because the issues facing lesbians were not being addressed by the organization and they no longer felt like they belonged (Kissack 1995, 119). Furthermore, the environments created by the Gay Liberation Front, the Gay Activists Alliance, and the Radicalesbians were ones that were hostile and unwelcoming to trans people, people of color, effeminate men, other "objectionable" gay people, and anyone sitting an intersection of two or more of those identities (Kissack 1995; Eisenbach 2006; Bronski 2011; Gan 2013). The Gay Liberation Front focused only on the needs of gay men; the Gay Activists Alliance was fundamentally exclusionary; GAA left the GLF because of its support for the Black Panthers and its push for legislation excluded protections for transgender people; the Radicalesbians excluded trans women and created the theoretical foundations of Trans-Exclusionary Radical Feminism (Bronski 2011, 212; Faderman 2015, 231; Nownes 2019, 26).

AIDS Era: 1981-1996

The AIDS Era started with the AIDS crisis around the beginning of the 1980s and lasted until 1996 with the Supreme Court's decision in *Romer v. Evans* (517 US 620 [1996]). The Supreme Court declaring state sanctioned discrimination statutes, like Colorado's Amendment 2, unconstitutional ushered in a sense of acceptance of same-sex couples to social, governmental, and political institutions that laid the foundation for the next era's strategies for social change. The end of this era saw a decrease in AIDS activism in the Gay Movement as AIDS activism became a social movement unto itself and the liberal faction of the Gay Movement refocused its attention to expanding civil rights. The arc towards moderation is missing during this era; however, that only means the organizations in this era did not shift from progressive to liberal.

AIDS

Unbeknownst to anyone at the time, on June 5th, 1981, the Gay Movement would change forever with Michael Gottlieb's report to the Center for Disease Control of five men with pneumocystis carinii pneumonia, which served as the beginning of the realization of the AIDS pandemic (Faderman 2015, 415). Despite the "discovery" of AIDS in 1981, it was not until the mid-80s that the disease started to be addressed in domestic policy after it had spread to people with no history of homosexuality or intravenous drug use; AIDS being visible coupled with those it mainly infected led to an increase in anti-gay rhetoric (Adam 1995, 155-57). Most of the activity surrounding AIDS belongs to the progressive faction as most of the organizing during this time went to grassroots campaigns or direct action (ibid). The lobbying that occurred surrounding AIDS was almost all centered around making sure that government bodies like the FDA and legislatures were taking the epidemic seriously (Vaid 1995, 69-105; Bronski 2011, 232).

Institutional Reliance and AIDS

There was a lot of institutional reliance among national gay and lesbian organizations surrounding AIDS. The Lambda Legal Education and Defense Fund grew stronger as a result of AIDS litigation (Vaid 1995, 74). In 1983 Lambda won the first ever AIDS discrimination lawsuit that stopped the eviction of a doctor because he was treating people with AIDS ("Lambda Legal History", n.d.). Lambda continued to litigate AIDS issues throughout the course of the 1980s and '90s that gave people access to treatment that was AIDS related (ibid). Other organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union, the Human Rights Campaign, National Organizations Responding to AIDS, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, and others also had a strong reliance on political institutions (Vaid 1995, 74). These organizations lobbied governments of all

jurisdictions to provide protections for people with AIDS, legislate away hateful and harmful policies, and fund research into AIDS to figure out how to treat the virus (Vaid 1995, 69-106; “Stonewall at 50. ACLU at 100. A Legacy of Fighting for Justice and Equality.”, n.d.; “How HIV Impacts LGBTQ People”, n.d.).

Unlike organizations such as NGLTF, ACLU, HRC, and NORA, the Treatment Action Group (TAG) was formed as a direct response to the AIDS crisis by disaffected members of the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power’s Treatment and Data Committee due to infighting making the mission of research and patient advocacy nearly impossible (“History – Treatment Action Group”, n.d.). The Treatment Action Group focused on partnering with government agencies like the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes for Health as well as drug companies to research and develop new HIV therapies (ibid). TAG was only interested in working with government agencies and their corporate partners to further the advancement of AIDS research and treatment (ibid).

Exclusion in AIDS Activism

The rhetoric and framing of AIDS that came from the NGLTF and other organizations actively focused on non-gay identities in the national conversation surrounding the disease and the advocacy that those groups engaged in. Oddly enough, the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce along with others categorically excluded gays and lesbians from the mainstream discussion and framing of the AIDS crisis (Vaid 1995, 75-76). National gay and lesbian groups like the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce (NGLTF) de-gayd AIDS, as they, “[removed] the stigma of homosexuality from the stigma of AIDS” (Vaid 1995, 75). This was a strategic move to win access to institutions that otherwise would not have done anything about the epidemic because of the people the disease affected the most.

Furthermore, by de-gaying AIDS, organizations like the NGLTF centered the effects that AIDS had on heterosexual individuals, which gave credibility to the idea that gay, lesbian, and trans lives are less important than straight cisgender ones (Vaid 1995, 75). Instead of centering the struggles of gay, lesbian, and trans people with AIDS, framing and rhetoric provided by the NGLTF surrounded the impact that AIDS had on heterosexuals by putting the sadness and grief caused by a loved one's AIDS diagnosis or death above the discrimination and suffering of the queer individual (Vaid 1995, 75; Trout 2020).

The National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce's campaign of, "AIDS is not a gay problem; it's a human problem" implied that gayness and humanity are mutually exclusive and actively removed queerness from a queer issue (Vaid 1995, 75). The liberal faction's framing, rhetoric, and strategy surrounding AIDS activism helped reinforce the status quo of exclusion, instead of pushing for transformation because it lent credibility to the idea that, "AIDS would not be as important if only gay or bisexual people were susceptible" (ibid). The rhetoric and framing of the liberal faction prioritized heterosexual feelings and susceptibility over the humanity and suffering of gay, lesbian, and trans people.

The actions of organizations like the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce also de-centered queerness in the AIDS crisis. National gay and lesbian organizations that fought to improve the standing of homosexuality in society had heterosexual people speak on behalf of gays and lesbians, which put them at the mercy of a homophobic and ignorant society (Vaid 1995, 75). The liberalness seen in the response to AIDS from the NGLTF and others that accepted their rhetoric and framing came in the form of self-exclusion from the national, mainstream conversation about AIDS and the effect that it was having in the population most likely to get the virus. Gay people were all but removed from the liberal faction's response to

AIDS through rhetoric, framing, strategies, and actions that focused on AIDS' effect on heterosexuals.

Media made by AIDS activists also showed exclusion and the effect of excluding gay voices from the mainstream AIDS discussion and advocacy. Playwright Larry Kramer wrote *The Normal Heart* about the AIDS crisis (Campbell and Gindt 2018, 388). It, “was written in a time when gay, white men were dying in large numbers and were victimised and were excluded from power and it tells that story and it tells it very accurately” (ibid). Mainstream media created by one of the most prominent AIDS activists four years into the epidemic, focused on the effects that the disease had only on white gay men (ibid). The experiences of lesbians and people of color were all but absent from the work. Furthermore, *Angels in America* by Tony Kushner, created a false narrative that was influenced by the framing and rhetoric of organizations de-gayng AIDS. *Angels in America* told a story of heterosexual people being the saviors of the AIDS crisis, which ignored the reality of what was happening (Campbell and Gindt 2018, 389). When the play was written, people with AIDS were being abandoned by straight society and could only rely on each other for help (ibid). Media created during this era surrounding the biggest call to action the movement had seen up until that point excluded the very real experiences of people with AIDS as a whole as well the experiences of lesbians, people of color, etc. and those sitting any intersection of those identities.

By design, The Treatment Action Group was not the most inclusive of organizations. In the aftermath of its formation it was invitation only (Schulman 2019, 45). As a result of this policy, there were no people of color in TAG for the first few months of its existence; when a person of color was invited to join, the meeting took place in a 5th Avenue apartment and it was, “unfriendly. No one felt comfortable there” (ibid). The formation and recruiting policies of TAG

purposefully excluded people of color and when people of color did join the group, they experienced an unfriendly and uncomfortable environment.

Institutional Reliance After AIDS

As the 1980s wound to a close, the emphasis on AIDS that had enthralled the movement for years had started to wane. A renewed focus on civil rights for the gay community took the place that the AIDS crisis once occupied. The liberal faction of the Gay Movement set its sights on removing hurdles for civil rights for gays in the United States, which helped create the strategy of the movement for the next era.

In 1992, Colorado decided to see how far states could go in allowing discrimination against gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. In November of 1992 Colorado voters approved Amendment 2, which rescinded state and local laws that prohibited discrimination on sexual orientation and prevented any entity from enacting anti-discrimination laws based on sexual orientation (Zamansky 1993, 221). After Amendment 2 was passed, gay people and several municipalities with the help of the American Civil Liberties union sued to stop the amendment from taking effect and they were successful at the state level because it could not pass the strict scrutiny test (Law 2019). On the federal level, Amendment 2 was struck down in *Romer v. Evans* (517 US 620 [1996]) because it violated the equal protection clause due to the pro-discrimination policy not being rationally related to a legitimate state interest (Law 2019).

The victory in *Romer* was extremely significant as it was the first pro-gay decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court since 1958 (Law 2019). Until the decision in 1996, the movement believed that fighting change through the courts was a lost cause as the Court continually handed down homophobic opinions in cases that concerned something as simple as having sex with a member of the same sex (ibid). However, *Romer* changed that perception.

Members of the gay community mobilized around defeating Colorado's Amendment 2 in the court system and with the help of the ACLU that is exactly what happened (Engel 2019, 200). Outside of AIDS, the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce, the Human Rights Campaign, the ACLU, Lambda, and others were not having that much success (Vaid 1995, 159-174). *Romer* turned the proverbial tide and set up the strategy for political action in the liberal faction, but there will be more on that later.

Activism surrounding AIDS and Amendment 2 were not the only ties this era had to institutions. At the tail end of the Post-Gay Liberation Era, the LGBTQ+ Victory Fund was founded to support LGBTQ candidates for all levels of political office to advance equality for the community ("Our History – LGBTQ Victory Fund", n.d.). The Victory Fund was created by veterans in the liberal faction like David Mixner who had been active in the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force and member of the Clinton transition team (ibid; Vaid 1995, 165-66). The Victory Fund is inextricably tied to political institutions because the goal of the organization is to help as many LGBT people gain access to those institutions. It was successful. During the five years of its existence in the Post-Gay Liberation Era it raised substantial amounts of money to support LGBT candidates with several winning their elections ("Our History – LGBTQ Victory Fund", n.d.). The Victory Fund also pushed for Roberta Achtenberg to be nominated Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who would be confirmed by the Senate as the first openly gay presidential appointee to a senate confirmed position (ibid).

Contrary to other organizations that comprise the liberal faction, the LGBTQ Victory Fund was not exclusionary and did not focus exclusively on white cis gay men. The first person the Victory Fund endorsed and helped fund was Black lesbian running for a seat on the Seattle City Council, which is a demographic the Fund continues to support ("Our History – LGBTQ

Victory Fund”, n.d.). The Fund helped people, regardless of party, get elected at any level or branch of government (ibid). Even though the LGBTQ Victory Fund did not have a liberalizing arc, they still sit firmly in the liberal faction because of their focus on making change through political institutions.

With an increase of allyship and attempts to access political and government institutions, the Post-Gay Liberation Era saw a growth in dependency on institutions that would proliferate further in the coming decades. Organizations like the NGLTF, HRC, NORA, Lambda Legal, and TAG that mobilized around AIDS worked within political and government institutions to either end the formal discriminatory practices against those with AIDS or to research the disease within the homophobic paradigm that was ubiquitous in the government’s response to AIDS. The existence of the LGBTQ Victory Fund also tied the liberal faction more to political and government institutions because it developed a strategy of advocacy that could only be realized through working with and in institutions. The ACLU’s success in *Romer* also set the stage for organizations in the liberal faction, like Lambda Legal and the GLBT Legal Advocates and Defenders (GLAD), to make more of a concerted effort to utilize the court system in their activism.

Exclusion After AIDS

The exclusion that was seen after AIDS stems from *Romer*, which foreshadows exclusion in the Contemporary Era. *Romer* set the groundwork for creating dichotomies of sexual identity (Marcus 2020, 333). The language in the decision, which was actively celebrated by liberal organizations like Lambda Legal, excluded bisexuality (Engel 2019, 200). *Romer* goes much further than exclusion, it wades into the territory of invalidating identity via a sociolegal construction of sexuality with the only categories being heterosexual and homosexual.

Invalidating the existence of sexualities that are not heterosexual and homosexual creates a false dichotomy of sexual orientation and excludes people who do not fit in the box of homosexuality from legal protections granted through the success of litigation strategies created and celebrated by liberal organizations like Lambda Legal, the ACLU, and GLAD (Engel 2019, 200-01; Marcus 2020). The ramifications of the sociolegal framework created by *Romer* will be explored more in the next section.

The Contemporary Era: 1996-Present

The Contemporary Era is marked with a notable proliferation of civil rights for gays, lesbians, and transgender individuals through instances like the Court finding anti-sodomy laws unconstitutional in *Lawrence v. Texas* (539 US 558 [2003]), expanding the institution of marriage to same-sex couples in *U.S. v. Windsor* (570 US 744 [2013]) and *Obergefell v. Hodges* (576 US __ [2015]), and interpreting Title VII to protect sexual orientation and gender identity in the workplace in *Bostock v. Clayton County* (590 US __ [2020]). This era of movement has also seen somewhat of a course correction through the mainstream incorporation of gender issues that were previously missing and actively excluded from the movement (Colbert 2014). This era also saw liberal organizations like the Human Rights Campaign lobbying states and the federal government to legalize same-sex marriage and end employment discrimination for gays and lesbians. Freedom to Marry was also created during this era for the sole purpose of expanding the institution of marriage to same-sex couples via state legislatures and referenda (Wolfson n.d.a).

Institutional Reliance in the Contemporary Era: Judicial Activism

Liberal gay rights organizations like the Human Rights Campaign, the National LGBTQ+ Task Force, Freedom to Marry, Lambda Legal, and GLBTQ Legal Advocates and Defenders

(GLAD) along with the American Civil Liberties Union have been extremely active in the Contemporary Era of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement. A substantial amount of the liberal faction's activity since 1996 has utilized an institution that had been previously avoided: the court system. Historically, the court system had been unfriendly toward the LGBTQ+ community, but the decision in *Romer v. Evans* signaled to activists that the court system could be an ally in the fight for gay rights with the first gay friendly decision since 1958 (*ONE, Inc. v. Olesen* 355 US 371 [1958]; Engel 2019, 200; Law 2019). After 1996 in response to the *Romer* decision, Lambda, GLAD, and the ACLU started to utilize the court system more in their strategies, which has led to a long string of federal successes that have given same-sex couples the right to have sex, diversified the institution of marriage to include same-sex couples, and has given employment protections to gays, lesbians, and transgender individuals (ibid).

The Role of the Supreme Court

Except for the demise of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, the court system was the main venue for federal civil rights battles during this era ("LGBTQ Rights Timeline in American History » Teaching LGBTQ History", n.d.). The inclusion of the Supreme Court in the movement started in 1958 when the Court ruled that *ONE* did not violate obscenity laws (*ONE, Inc. v. Olesen* 355 US 371 [1958]). With the 1958 decision being the first and last gay friendly opinion, during the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s, and most of the 1990s, the movement did not view the court system as friendly to the plight of gay people. However, 1996 saw a change in the relationship with the Supreme Court because *Romer* was a gay friendly opinion that had spurred the movement to incorporate the Court more heavily in its rights-based strategies (*Romer v. Evans* 517 US 620 [1996]; Engel 2019, 200). Instead of organizations like the National LGBTQ Task Force (formerly the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force), the Human Rights Campaign, and the

ACLU focusing exclusively on the legislature and the executive, they expanded the venue to include the court room (Engel 2019, 200). This strategy has, for the most part, been successful because it has expanded the civil rights available to the LGBTQ+ community.

Romer v. Evans. As explained in the previous section, the 1996 Supreme Court case *Romer v. Evans* shifted the movement's view of the Supreme Court because instead of handing down a homophobic opinion that excluded homosexuals from the institution of marriage (291 Minn. 310, 191 N.W.2d 185 [1971]) or said that same-sex sex could be made illegal by the states, the Court issued a gay friendly opinion (Law 2019). This signaled to the movement that the Court was willing prevent civil rights infringements on the sole basis of sexual orientation (Daum 2020, 34). The decision in *Romer* also informed the litigation strategies used by Lambda, the ACLU, and GLAD, but there will be more on that later (Daum 2020, 34-36)

Lawrence v. Texas. In the 2003 case *Lawrence v. Texas* that was brought to the Supreme Court by the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, the Court struck down sodomy laws in the United States (539 US 558 [2003]). This decision was a reversal of the 1986 case *Bowers v. Hardwick* (478 US 186 [1986]) that upheld state laws banning sodomy between consenting adults (ibid). *Lawrence v. Texas* was in the same vein as *Romer* in the sense that it showed the courts to be more favorable to both gay people and gay conduct. The ruling also went a step further and showed a willingness to reverse homophobic precedent because, as Justice Kennedy wrote in the Court's opinion, "*Bowers* was not correct when it was decided, and it is not correct today. It ought not remain binding precedent" (*Lawrence v. Texas* 539 US 558 [2003], 578). The reversal of *Bowers* allowed organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union, Lambda Legal, and GLBT Legal Advocates and Defenders to seriously consider attempting to overturn *Baker v. Nelson* that had upheld bans on same-sex marriage because the court had signaled their

willingness to advance civil rights for gays and lesbians. Furthermore, the fact that the Supreme Court had issued two gay friendly decisions within a decade convinced liberal organizations like the Human Rights Campaign and the National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce to ally themselves with the aforementioned legal organizations.

U.S v. Windsor and Obergefell v. Hodges. Both *Windsor* and *Obergefell* deal with the same issue: gay marriage. This had been a hotly contested topic since the 1996 passage of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) (Faderman 2015, 566). DOMA was the brainchild of conservative Republicans who wanted to make a preemptive strike against gay marriage by making it legal for states to not recognize a marriage between same-sex couples that was performed in a different state, i.e., a marriage that was not between one man and one woman in Hawai'i did not have to be recognized in Utah despite the Full Faith and Credit clause (Faderman 2015, 587). The push for DOMA happened because states like Hawai'i and Massachusetts legalized same-sex marriage and the Republicans in Congress wanted to put President Clinton, who was supported heavily by gay and lesbian voters, between the proverbial rock and a hard place heading into his re-election bid (ibid). Much has changed since the Defense of Marriage Act was signed by President Clinton in 1996 namely *Windsor* and *Obergefell*, both of which helped secure gay people's right to marriage in two drastically different ways.

Windsor was one of the first steps to combating bans on same-sex marriage in the United States. With assistance from the American Civil Liberties Union, New York Civil Liberties Union, and Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, Edie Windsor sued the Federal Government because she claimed she was unfairly taxed when her wife passed away and Edie inherited her late wife's estate ("Windsor v. United States | American Civil Liberties Union" 2014). In 2013, the Supreme Court found Section 3 of DOMA unconstitutional because it

violated the Due Process Clause of the 5th amendment (*U.S v. Windsor* 570 US 558 [2003], 578). While Section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act only dealt with federal recognition and spouse benefits, not the exclusion of marriage from the Full Faith and Credit Clause, its dissolution by the Court did mark a move toward recognizing that marriages between same-sex and different-sex couples should be treated equally by federal agencies (Faderman 2015, 628).

The decision that many people and organizations within the LGBTQ+ community were waiting for happened exactly two years after the decision in *Windsor*. With the help of the ACLU and Gerhardstein & Branch, Jim Obergefell and David Michener sued the state of Ohio because they would not be listed as spouses on their late husbands' death certificates ("Obergefell, et al. v. Hodges - Freedom to Marry in Ohio" 2015). On June 26th, 2015, the Supreme Court issued their ruling on *Obergefell v. Hodges* and with the words, "same-sex couples may exercise the fundamental right to marry. No longer may this liberty be denied to them," same-sex marriage bans were found unconstitutional and overturned (*Obergefell v. Hodges* 576 US __ [2015], 22-23). This ruling combined with *Windsor* created state and federal recognition of same-sex marriages and opened all the benefits of marriage to married same-sex couples because same-sex couples had to be recognized by both the individual states and the federal government.

Bostock v. Clayton County. The last Supreme Court win for the LGBTQ community came in June of 2020 with *Bostock v. Clayton County*. This case was a consolidation of three petitions accepted by the Court and litigated by the ACLU ("LGBTQ Discrimination Cases at the Supreme Court | American Civil Liberties Union" 2020). The Court ruled that firing someone based on sexual orientation or gender identity violates Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (*Bostock v. Clayton County* 590 US __ [2020]). This was a fight that had started back in December of 1957 when Franklin Kameny, the man who brought the Mattachine Society back to

lobbying and protesting, was terminated from the U.S Army Map Service (D’Emilio 1983, 151). The problem became more pervasive in the 1970s because LGBTQ+ people were being fired from their jobs or being the victim of harassment or assault simply because they were not cisgender or heterosexual (Faderman 2015, 566). It was a cause taken up in 1974 by Representatives Bella Abzug and Ed Koch in the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), but unfortunately there was no movement on the bill in the House of Representatives in the 1970s and gender protections would not be added into ENDA drafts until 2007, but there will be more on that later (Faderman 2015, 565).

Even though nothing happened with ENDA in the 1970s and 1980s, the 1990s saw the unthinkable almost happen. After intense lobbying on the part of, what was then called, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (NGLTF) and the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy and Representative Gerry Studds had to, “do something for gays and lesbians” (ibid). The two congressmen drafted a newer version of Employment Non-Discrimination Act that would protect gays and lesbians in the workplace and the hope was that it would be, “righting senseless wrongs” (Faderman 2015, 566). Unfortunately, ENDA died both in committee in 1994 and 1995 and in 1996 it failed on a deadlocked Senate floor with a vote of 49-50.

Activists and the Supreme Court

The very institutional setup of the Supreme Court prevents it from acting proactively on any issue; questions have to be brought to the Court, it cannot go searching for them (Fisher and Harriger 2019, 140). Regarding the cases of *Romer*, *Lawrence*, *Windsor*, *Obergefell*, and *Bostock*, gay rights organizations and activists played a huge role in getting the cases to the Court and crafting litigation strategies. Organizations that have become a bastion of support for gay

issues working their way through political institutions lent their support to these efforts. The American Civil Liberties Union, Lambda Legal, and GLBTQ Legal Advocates and Defenders (GLAD) crafted strategies to work these cases through the legal system and successfully litigated them to expand the civil rights and liberties of the LGBTQ+ community (“*Romer v. Evans*.” n.d.; “*Lawrence v. Texas*.” n.d.; “*United States v. Windsor* (Challenging the federal “Defense of Marriage Act”).” n.d; “*Obergefell v Hodges: Marriage Equality at the Supreme Court*.” n.d.; “*Bostock v. Clayton County, GA / Zarda v. Altitude Express / RG & GR Harris Funeral Homes Inc v. EEOC*”, n.d.).

The litigation strategy utilized by organizations like the ACLU, Lambda, and GLAD throughout the course of the Contemporary Era was developed in the aftermath of Colorado’s Amendment 2 passing. In *Romer* it was argued that Colorado violated the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment because the state was discriminating against people because of an immutable characteristic (*Romer v. Evans* 517 US 620 [1996]; Daum 2020, 34). The success of this argument led to, “construction of a heterosexual/gay binary that proved to be a persuasive tool for changing public perceptions thereby creating opportunities for legal change and confirming the efficacy of the politics of rights” (Daum 2020, 34). In *Romer*, the Court started to accept the idea of sexuality being a trait instead of a preference like it had ten years earlier in *Bowers* (Daum 2020, 34-36). The sociolegal conception of a heterosexual/gay binary created in *Romer* was further expanded in *Lawrence* and *Obergefell*. The opinion in *Lawrence* upheld the heterosexual/gay binary by striking down sodomy laws because they did not deprive heterosexual couples the same way they did homosexual couples (539 US 558 [2003]; Daum 2020, 35). Additionally, in 2015, the decision in *Obergefell* further cemented the heterosexual/gay binary (Daum 2020, 34).

The strategy used by Lambda, the ACLU, and GLAD was created on the basis of the false dichotomy of people being either heterosexual or homosexual. The consequence of the Court reducing the sexuality to a false binary is the signaling that, “homonormativity [is] a viable political and legal mechanism for advancing gay rights” (Daum 2020, 35). Court created homonormativity is the result of *Romer* because the Court equated same-sex relationships with different-sex relationships because a norm of heterosexuality was put on same-sex relationships (Faderman 2015, 466). The legal arm of the liberal faction ran with homonormativity as a mechanism to advance gay rights and created their litigation strategy around it, which situated gay rights in a framework that, “does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions but upholds and sustains them” (Duggan 2003, 50).

Exclusion Part One: Judicial Activism

Even though judicial activism in the Contemporary Era has advanced gay rights to a level that would have been unthinkable when the movement first started, exclusion is still being perpetuated by the liberal faction. As mentioned previously the decision in *Romer* created a dichotomous framework to analyze human sexuality and signaled to the ACLU, Lambda, and GLAD that, “homonormativity [is] a viable political and legal mechanism for advancing gay rights,” (Daum 2020, 34-36). The liberal faction used this dichotomous framework and the mechanism of homonormativity throughout the Contemporary Era to advance the rights of those who fall cleanly into the “homosexual” and “binary transgender” categories (Daum 2020, 34-37; Marcus 2020). The framework created by *Romer* and advanced in further litigation has put identities that are not on the far end of the gender and sexuality continua in a dangerous and precarious sociolegal position because they ignore sexual orientations that are not homosexual and alienate non-binary transgender identities (Marcus 2020, 231).

Romer v. Evans created a legal framework that rendered identities that are not on the extreme ends of the sexuality continuum unintelligible to the U.S legal system, which ironically excluded bisexuality from legal protections despite being explicitly named in Amendment 2 (Marcus 2020, 228). Before the decision in *Romer*, bisexuality, one of the identities between the extreme ends, was specifically mentioned over a dozen times in the briefs and opinions in *Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Group of Boston* (515 US 557 [1995]); however, the next year, the identity was rendered unintelligible by the Supreme Court (Marcus 2020, 228). The harms are numerous: until bisexuality is acknowledged bisexual people do not have the same course of redress as gay people do, the lack of bisexuality in litigation makes it difficult for any precedent to be found and lawyers are less likely to take on cases concerning discrimination because of someone's bisexuality, bisexuality is conflated with instability in adoption and custody hearings, and courts have denied asylum to people because the court cannot make sense of bisexuality and does not see the person at risk of persecution because of their sexuality (Marcus 2020, 230-32).

Additionally, individuals with identities that are not on one of the ends are more likely to face a lack of community, resources, a disparity in employment discrimination, mental and physical health issues, suicide/suicidal ideation, and interpersonal violence (Marcus 2020, 233). Courts' inability to understand bisexuality makes it harder for non-bisexual people to understand what it is and the unique set of issues that bisexual people face. The framework created by *Romer*, and advocated for and litigated by the liberal faction, not only places epistemic hurdles on society learning about bisexuality, it also actively harms the bisexual community because courts and greater society cannot understand the harms that bisexual people face. This framework makes it difficult at best and nearly impossible at worst for the bisexual community

to gain access to a community, access resources, or flee from government sanctioned persecution because of the faulty epistemic frameworks being used by the legal system and society.

The liberal litigation strategy grounded in the mechanism of homonormativity that was created and sustained by the ACLU, Lambda, and GLAD has extended the false dichotomy framework seen in the analysis of sexual orientation to sociolegal issues of gender, which erases the intelligibility of all of the identities that do not fall on either end of the homosexual/heterosexual and binary cisgender/transgender continua. The creation of this unintelligibility has served as a point of exclusion from the protections that have been granted to LGT persons to those whose sexuality is not homosexuality and/or those whose gender is not either man or woman. This exclusion comes straight from the litigation strategy that allowed for the creation and maintenance of a flawed sociolegal framework where the only sexual orientations and gender identities that can be recognized are binary ones.

Identity based exclusion is not the only type of exclusion that happened as a result of the liberal faction's successes in the Contemporary Era. LGBTQ+ identities were excluded from the public sphere. *Lawrence*, *Obergefell*, and *Bostock* exemplify this exclusion. *Lawrence* only applied to private acts of sexuality, "[States] cannot demean [the existence of gay people] or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime" (*Lawrence v. Texas* 539 US 558 [2003]). This frame led to the legal system and the government to recognize homosexuality but make it a private affair that could be regulated if it became public, "[LGBTQ+ identities] could exist free from explicit sanction so long as they did not publicly express their sexual identities" (Engel 2019, 203). *Lawrence* codified society's belief that homosexuality was a private endeavor, not something that could or should exist in public spaces, which meant a fundamental lack of recognition for same-sex relationships.

While *Obergefell* opened same-sex relationships to the public sphere, it did so with the caveat that they are only acceptable only if they fit into the rigid framework of the status quo; in order for same-sex couples to be seen as couples and given the rights of heterosexual relationships, they need to assimilate into a dominant institution that had been used to further their oppression (Polikoff 2008, 132; Faderman 2015, 635; Daum 2020, 35). If same-sex couples refused to acquiesce to that caveat, then they would either go unrecognized or misrecognized by the state (Daum 2020, 36). On the employment front, similar things happened because *Bostock* only explicitly mentions homosexual, which means that bisexuality is relegated to the private sphere for one to have the rights granted by the Court's ruling (Marcus 2020).

Institutional Reliance: Non-Judicial Activism

While groups like the ACLU, Lambda, and GLAD were working within the court system, the Human Rights Campaign, the NGLTF, and Freedom to Marry were working within state political systems to expand non-discrimination protections in employment and expanding access to marriage. A lot of organizing in the liberal faction outside of the courts and marriage equality in this era was surrounding the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA). With the help of the Human Rights Campaign, ENDA, or some variation like the Equality Act, has been introduced consistently throughout the Contemporary Era; however, 2007 marked an important milestone: it was the first time either chamber passed the bill ("U.S. House Takes Historic Step by Passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act" 2007). The draft of ENDA created in 2007 was also the first time it had included protections for gender, which would protect trans people in and entering the workforce. Regrettably, gender protections were removed from the bill with the support of the HRC before it passed the House (Schindler 2007; "U.S. House Takes Historic Step by Passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act" 2007).

While success for employment happened on the national level via the Supreme Court, there was also state level success via state legislatures. By the time *Bostock v. Clayton County* was issued in 2020, 33 states and D.C. had explicit state level protections for sexual orientation or interpreted existing protections to cover sexuality and gender identity (“Movement Advancement Project | Employment Nondiscrimination”, n.d.). With the exception of Missouri, the protections for sexual orientation and gender identity came from the state legislature (ibid). The Human Rights Campaign, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force worked together to pass LGBT workplace protections on the state level by sharing stories, fundraising, and lobbying state legislators to adopt protections (“HRC, ACLU and the Task Force Amass GLBT Workplace Discrimination Profiles to Help Pass Employment No” 2007). Employment non-discrimination has been a huge mobilization area for the gay rights movement.

No matter how many times or how long ENDA was introduced, same-sex marriage was the pinnacle of liberal organizing in the Contemporary Era. As the foremost lobbying body for gay rights, the Human Rights Campaign was very active during this era. Before the decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, the HRC worked on the local, state, and federal levels to diversify the people allowed to enter in the institution of marriage (“The Journey to Marriage Equality in the United States - HRC”, n.d.). The HRC had deployed its highest number of organizers and spent millions of dollars in states to legalize same-sex marriage and they were relatively successful (ibid). While the HRC was the most influential and equipped group, they were not alone on the battlefield of marriage equality in state governments.

Freedom to Marry (F2M) was formed in 2001 specifically to diversify those who could participate in marriage on a national scale (Wolfson, n.d.a) In the legislature, Freedom to Marry

was successful in lobbying several states to both legalize same-sex marriage and defeat homophobic restrictions on marriage in Massachusetts, Iowa, New Hampshire, and Indiana (Wolfson, n.d.d). Freedom to Marry also utilized referenda, but less effectively, to expand marriage (Wolfson, n.d.c). Losses on the referenda front in 2008 and 2009 painted a dismal picture for getting people to support same-sex marriage; however, 2012 saw voters in Maine, Washington, Maryland, and Minnesota approve of same-sex marriage for the first time in history because of F2M's campaigns (Joughin 2012).

Exclusion Part Two: Non-Judicial Activism

Legislative fights for marriage equality and employment non-discrimination were also full of exclusionary practices and consequences. The exclusion in non-judicial activism, just like judicial activism, is twofold. On the front of identity exclusion, the Human Rights Campaign is like no other. Despite having helped write gender identity protections in ENDA that would have provided employment protections for transgender Americans, the Human Rights Campaign was willing to drop those protections if it meant increasing the standing of less marginally situated identities (Schindler 2007). When protections for gender identity were removed from ENDA in 2007 every single organization in the movement that supported the bill, with the exception of the HRC, pushed democratic leaders to reinstate protections for gender identity (ibid). Even though the Human Rights campaign was, “disappointed that [ENDA] did not include protections for transgender Americans,” there was no further lobbying to get those protections back in by the HRC, which was the foremost lobbying group on gay issues in the country (“U.S. House Takes Historic Step by Passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act” 2007; Schindler 2007). The Human Rights Campaign was willing to sacrifice objectionable members of the LGBTQ+ community for the community's more privileged members.

The Human Rights Campaign, along with Freedom to Marry, also showed exclusion in the fight for same-sex marriage; however, the exclusion was not only identity based. In regards to marriage, the HRC and Freedom to Marry were only concerned with legalizing same-sex marriage (Wolfson, n.d.a). Only fighting for same-sex marriage but not alternatives like civil partnerships or unions concomitantly shows identity-based exclusion and the exclusion of alternatives for recognition. The main goal of the fight for same-sex marriage was state and federal recognition of same-sex marriage and an extension of the benefits that come with marriage (Wolfson, n.d.b). Even though the goal was basic recognition, both the HRC and F2M decided to fight for that recognition by institutionalizing homonormativity. Instead of fighting for an expansion of alternative recognition like civil unions or domestic partnerships, the Human Rights Campaign and Freedom to Marry only focused on marriage, not other forms of recognition (Wolfson, n.d.a).

The exclusion of alternative institutions from the agenda of the HRC and F2M also meant an exclusion of people they were able to fight for. For example, people with disabilities face penalties if they get married because more often than not, when they get married, they exceed the income cap and will lose disability benefits as well as Medicare, all of which can be lifesaving (Mahoney 2022). The HRC and F2M's focus on marriage is inextricable from exclusion. Even though marriage was available to same-sex couples, there were still members of the community who could not join that institution or have those benefits. Additionally, the focus on marriage actively harmed people in the LGBTQ+ community and those with other marginalized identities because when same-sex marriage bans were lifted in individual states and by the Supreme Court, the alternative institutions that were created had been disassembled in many states and the heteronormative institution of marriage was all that remained (Koch 2015).

Not only does an exclusion of alternative forms of recognition alienate certain members of the community, it may also lead to an end of recognizing same-sex relationships. Alternative mechanisms to marriage began in Vermont as a way to give same-sex couples access to the rights and benefits of marriage that was more palpable to social conservatives (Halloran 2013). Unfortunately, as gay marriage started to become more prominent in the United States and after *Obergefell* marriage alternatives started to be revoked (Koch 2015). There has been a fear amongst the community that the civil rights granted by the Supreme Court will eventually be revoked, which has not been assuaged in recent months due to Justice Thomas' concurrence in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (Mangan 2022). If *Windsor* and *Obergefell* are overturned, it means that same-sex relationships would no longer be recognized in 35 states or by the federal government, which means same-sex relationships would lose a substantial amount of recognition (Povich 2022).

Beyond the potential for a reversal of *Obergefell* that would leave many same-sex couples without recognition as well as the rights, privileges, and benefits seen in a marriage, the push for marriage denies recognition for relationships and families because it does not provide, "just outcomes for the wide range of family structures in which LGBT persons, as well as many others, live" (Polikoff 2008, 84). The consequence of the liberal faction's success on the marriage front meant a sustained unrecognition of non-traditional family structures as well the labeling of those family structures as unacceptable (Polikoff 2008, 98). Additionally, the success of same-sex marriage has come at the expense of reforms that would have benefitted non-traditional families because mechanisms for their recognition would not have been dismantled (Koch 2015). Furthermore, organizations in the liberal faction that have fought for same-sex marriage have replicated rhetoric from their conservative counterpart that upholds the

idea that marriage is the superior form of a long-term relationship compared to co-habitation, civil unions, domestic partnerships, etc. (Polikoff 2008, 98-99; Warner 1999, 82).

Exclusion Part Three: Synthesis

The decisions in *Romer*, *Lawrence*, *Obergefell*, and *Bostock* as well as actions taken by the HRC and F2M helped keep up exclusion of certain identities in the LGBTQ+ Movement, helped usher in a sociolegal framework that codified the belief that there needs to be a privatization of certain LGBTQ identities, and supported the perception that marriage is superior to other ways of recognizing a long-term relationship. These decisions and policy changes were the direct result of litigation strategies created by organizations like the ACLU, Lambda Legal, and GLAD as well as advocacy taken on by the HRC and F2M. These court decisions and legislative actions were not only the result of litigation strategies and advocacy, but they were also celebrated by the organizations and the liberal factions as successes and victories even though they ended with identity-based exclusion, an exclusion from the public sphere that can only end with the caveat of acquiescing to heterosexual norms and came at the expense of recognizing long term relationships as well as what counts as a family.

Arc Toward Moderation

In this era, it is not the organizations that moderate, it's the era that does. The contemporary fights taken on by LGBTQ+ activists and organizations saw drastic changes within society. The ACLU helped litigate *Romer v. Evans*, and their litigation as well as their strategy helped lead to the creation of the framework that excluded identities that are not on the extreme ends of the gender or sexuality continua (Marcus 2020, 231). Lambda Legal litigated *Lawrence v. Texas*, which helped create the framework that excludes gay people from the public sphere (Engel 2019, 203). Lambda also helped litigate *Bostock v. Clayton County*, which further

developed the framework created by *Romer* (590 US __ [2020]; Marcus 2020, 231). These ends are ones of moderation as they helped create a sociolegal context that, “forces individuals to locate themselves in socially constructed diametrically opposed categories of identity” (Daum 2020, 25). The decision in *Romer* created the framework that Daum (2020) describes above, and that framework was sustained by both *Obergefell* and *Bostock* (Daum 2020, 26; Marcus 2020). As explained above the consequence of this litigation strategy is excluding certain identities from the public sphere.

The radical beginnings of this movement come from the very thing that these cases were arguing against. *Romer* argued against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, *Lawrence* argued against states banning people’s ability to have sex with one another, *Windsor* argued against the federal government refusing to recognize same-sex marriages, *Obergefell* argued against state and local governments refusing to recognize same-sex marriages, and *Bostock* argued against employers being able to fire people for their sexual orientation or their gender identity. The moderation comes at the end of these cases. *Romer* created a framework that renders the non-extreme ends of the sexual orientation and gender spectrums unintelligible to legal institutions, *Lawrence* helped sequester gayness to the private sphere, *Windsor* helped create a homonormativity of gay marriage with the latter sustaining the framework of dichotomous LGBTQ+ identities, *Obergefell* helped welcome same-sex couples to the public sphere but at the cost of assimilation into the institution of marriage, and *Bostock* also helped the framework of dichotomous identities within legal institutions (Marcus 2020; Engel 2019, 201-3; Faderman 2015, 635; Polikoff 2008, 132).

Furthermore, changing society to make room for people it had previously purposefully excluded is a radical goal, but that goal was eventually tempered. The Human Rights Campaign

fought to change society so LGBTQ+ people could exist out and proud in the workplace, but the moment objectionable members (trans people) put success at risk, the HRC was more than willing to disregard them (Schindler 2007; “U.S. House Takes Historic Step by Passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act” 2007). The fight for state and federal recognition of same-sex relationships also ended up revolving around assimilating the LGBTQ+ community into heteronormative institutions and excluding some intersectionally situated community members instead of helping create and keep alternative recognition mechanisms.

The ends of the radical battles served to produce liberal ends like excluding identities from protections that were granted to other members of their community, creating a homonormativity of marriage, and reinforcing the idea that one is either straight or gay and cisgender or transgender and male or female. The things that have been hailed as victories for the LGBTQ+ community by the liberal faction have served as ways to create homonormativity, create a legal framework of LGBTQ+ identities that codifies assimilation into dominant structures, and erased the full spectrum of LGBTQ+ identities from being recognized by dominant powers in society.

Conclusion

In order to accurately understand the forthcoming analysis of power, justice, and knowledge, it is important to understand the historical context of liberal LGBTQ+ activism, which this chapter provided. In all four eras that the LGBTQ+ Movement has been around, the liberal faction of the movement has acted in the same way: there has been an arc from radicalism to moderation, exclusion has been ubiquitous, and there has been an almost singular focus on being granted greater access to society via professional and political institutions. The moderate ends are not surprising because the liberal faction will sacrifice some to make progress for

others, which only ends up leaving the most vulnerable in society excluded from any progress that they have helped fight for. The focus on change through political institutions also helps provide for moderate ends because the political system in the United States was built on the foundation of incremental change. All of these characteristics truly make this faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement a *liberal* faction because their ties to liberal democratic theory are strong and persistent. While the liberal faction is starting to improve on the exclusion front, they are still heavily reliant on political and professional institutions to make change for the LGBTQ+ community, in fact it is the seemingly singular strategy to work within professional and political institutions that does the most to tie this faction liberal democratic theory because it is by working within these institutions that moderate ends and exclusion come from due to the inherent reliance on people who do not understand what it means to be LGBTQ+.

The Mattachine Society, the Daughters of Bilitis, the Gay Liberation Front, the Gay Activists Alliance, Lambda Legal, Gay and Lesbian Advocates and Defenders, the American Civil Liberties Union, and numerous other organizations represent the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement. They have embodied ideals that are rooted in classical liberal democratic thought and based their strategies, practices, goals, and agendas on those ideals. More often than not, this leads to a faction in a movement that fights for assimilation into dominant institutions that have helped oppress the people they are fighting for, exclude specific groups of people because they make the movement look bad, and provide moderate ends to fulfill promises of radical change. Each of these attributes can be attributed to the organizations mentioned above and others that occupy the liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement.

Chapter Three- The Progressive LGBTQ+ Faction: An Overview

Just like its liberal counterpart, the progressive faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement has characteristics that help classify and situate this faction as progressive. This part of the movement takes a much different approach to achieving an equitable society for their community. To the progressive faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement, the liberal reliance on political and professional institutions via civil rights strategies limits the outcomes of the movement because the end is assimilation into and a replication of dominant institutions that have been used to oppress the LGBTQ+ community; the progressive faction wants to reform both the society and social institutions that give rise to the oppression that the community faces (Cohen 2013, 75). For example, the progressive faction's focus is not on the fight for opening the social institutions of marriage and parenthood to members of the LGBTQ+ community, it is about reforming the very notion of what it means to be a family because the limited focus of inclusion into these institutions leads the community to become a part of the very system that oppresses them (Cohen 2013, 80). The disparity of the goals between the liberal and progressive factions of the movement are not only revealed through the actions of the groups, but also through what success means to them. In the liberal faction there is a definitive end: success means equal protections enshrined in law; however, there is no such definitive end within the progressive faction because it is, "about practice and process rather than arrival at a singular point of 'liberation'" (Spade 2015, 2).

Unlike its liberal counterpart, within the progressive faction there is little reliance on political and professional institutions and assimilation is not the only reason. This relationship is almost non-existent because the progressive faction realized that the community cannot wait

decades for friendly politicians, administrators, lawyers, or professors to ally themselves with the movement; the first executive director of the Gay Men's Health Crisis (an AIDS based community service provider) said when AIDS was the sole focus of the movement, "Until [AIDS] really got down to it... you realized they wanted you to die... You are literally left to die"(Ghaziani 2008, 80-81). Working within established institutions can only be successful if the people within those institutions are friendly toward the cause, which has not always been the case as exemplified by barriers to employment, response to the AIDS crisis, and basic recognition being denied by society. By working outside of political and professional institutions, the progressive faction is able to do for the community what society refuses to do for them.

The question must then be asked: if the progressive faction rarely works within political and professional institutions, what do they do? The answer to that question is quite simple. Instead of focusing efforts exclusively on lobbying, fundraising, etc. the progressive faction focuses more on mutual aid and direct action (D'Emilio 1983, 231-39; Faderman 2015, 419; Schulman 2021). Rarely will the progressive faction wait for others to act on the issues for them and they will do what they can to ease the suffering of their community themselves. The non-reliance on political and social institutions and participation in mutual aid and direct action are closely related because it is the latter that replaces the former.

The decreased action within political and professional institutions and a focus on mutual aid and direct action do a lot to set the progressive faction apart from the liberal one; however, the progressive faction's penchant for inclusion is arguably the strongest factor separating it from its liberal counterpart. It is through this inclusion that the faction is able to holistically look at the issues facing its community and address those problems. Exclusion from the movement will inherently mean that the movement will not be able to address the issues that face all of their

community. This means that while the liberal faction of the movement will mainly work for white cisgender homosexual men, the progressive faction will look at the needs of the entire community.

Similar to its liberal counterpart, the progressive faction has four distinct eras: Homophile (1950-1969), Stonewall (1969-1981), AIDS (1981-1996), and the Contemporary Era (1996-present). The defining attributes of the progressive LGBTQ+ Movement will be examined through all four eras in order to get a comprehensive and chronological understanding of the progressive faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement and why it is classified as the movement's progressive faction.

The Homophile Era: 1950-1969

The progressive faction of the movement was still mainly isolated to the early years of the Mattachine Society. There is one period of progressivism with the Mattachine Society itself which lasted from its founding in 1950 until May of 1953; however, the periodical that was associated with the Mattachine Society, *ONE*, helped the progressive side of the organization stay around after Mattachine's 1953 convention. Toward the end of this era, another organization was created called the Erikson Educational Foundation that helped one of the most marginalized members of the LGBTQ+ community: transgender individuals (Nownes 2019, 27).

ONE, Inc.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, after their Convention in May of 1953, the Mattachine Society took an accommodationist turn. They stopped any and all forms of direct action, questioned the involvement of women within the movement, and they started to actively look toward doctors, lawyers, and policy makers, instead of themselves, to change society's perception of homosexuality (D'Emilio 1983, 75-91). While Mattachine's leadership may have

taken a liberal turn after 1953, their publishing arm did not follow suit. After the liberal overtake of Mattachine in May of 1953, Dale Jennings became *ONE*'s editor and Chuck Rowland was one of the editorial's main contributors (D'Emilio 1983, 87). Jennings and Rowland, with the help of others, filled the pages of *ONE* with articles that were harshly critical of the new direction taken by Mattachine as well as the philosophy of the organization's leadership and maintained several progressive ideas like gays and lesbians being the ultimate authority on homosexual life and homosexuality is not a medical problem that could be cured (D'Emilio 1983, 87-88).

ONE was publishing critiques of the Mattachine Society, ran stories on issues that affected homosexuals, and was a forum of discussion for homosexuals (D'Emilio 1983, 88-89). While the critiques of Mattachine stopped in 1955 with the departure of Rowland and Jennings, *ONE* kept publishing progressive ideas (D'Emilio 1983, 87). Even though it did not organize in the traditional sense, the three tenets of a progressive movement are present. There was no reliance on political and professional organizations to get out their message and they actively published articles that attacked Mattachine for taking that direction, *ONE* actively sent the message that gay people need to make a better life for themselves and waiting for others to do it for them would only lead to trouble, and *ONE* published articles and debates on a wide array of issues that could resonate with almost all of its readers (D'Emilio 1983, 88). *ONE* helped keep the progressive message alive after Mattachine moved from progressivism to liberalism. Arguably, the most progressive aspect of *ONE* is its existence. It is a prime example of creating alternative institutions that provide services to communities that mainstream institutions ignore.

The Erickson Educational Foundation

The Erickson Educational Foundation (EEF) was founded in 1964 by Reed Erickson, a transgender man (Pettis 2015, 1). The aim of the EEF was to help fund research that was

unconventional, faced adverse physical, mental, or social conditions, or new (ibid). The homophile movement was one of the biggest beneficiaries of the funds provided by EEF (Pettis 2015,1-2). The Erickson Educational Foundation provided substantial funding to *ONE*, the Gender Identity Clinic at Johns Hopkins University, and the Harry Benjamin Foundation (now the World Professional Association for Transgender Health) (ibid; Nownes 2019, 27). Much of the Foundation's work came from philanthropy during its early days; however, as the 1960s became the 1970s, the Erickson Educational Foundation, "functioned as an information and counseling resource for [transgender people], creating a referral network of physicians and psychologists" (Pettis 2015, 2). The Foundation also provided one on one counseling with transgender patients, sponsored conferences focusing on gender identity, developed support groups, engaged in public outreach, and provided much needed education on what gender is and what it means to be transgender (Nownes 2019, 18). The EEF had essentially created a way for trans people to access trans specific healthcare in the 1970s.

While the Erickson Educational Foundation helped fund and create the professional associations for gender and sex in the United States, they also provided significant help through direct action. Because much of what is provided in terms of health care now for trans people was considered illegal for most of the foundation's existence (1964-1977), there was much work to be done for transgender people to get the care they needed (Nownes 2019, 18). This work was done by the EEF through one-on-one counseling with trans people and creating a system of support and referrals for trans people all across the country. Not only did this work help transgender people get access to gender affirming care, but it also helped legitimize transgender identities and actively worked against the idea that trans women are men in dresses exploiting women for money. Due to the work of the Erickson Educational Foundation, transgender people,

who were routinely the victims of the most heinous behavior carried out by individuals and the state, were able to get some kind of medical care during the early stages of the Gay Movement (Pettis 2015; Nownes 2019, 2-3 and 17).

The very existence of the Erikson Educational Foundation is progressive in nature. Just like *ONE*, EEF created alternatives to mainstream institutions that found a way to aid LGBTQ+ people. This aid came through helping fund the homophile movement, research on gender, and transgender healthcare as well as creating a system that gave people access to trans specific healthcare. Reed Erikson saw a need for the LGBTQ+ community and helped fill that when it became evident society would not.

The Gay Liberation Era: 1969-1981

The second era of the movement came on June 28th, 1969, with the Stonewall Inn Riots (Faderman 2015, 172). After police raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested several of its patrons, those who were fortunate enough to escape police questioning started fighting back after being prompted by one of the patrons who was arrested (Faderman 2015, 174). The riot lasted two days and was all about transgender and gay individuals, especially trans and gay people of color, fighting against the New York City Police Department and a racist, homophobic, transphobic society that had shunned them into the margins (Faderman 2015, 175-76). For the transgender and gay communities, this was a pivotal moment, especially for those sitting at an intersection of gayness and/or transness and skin color. Gay people, trans people, and gay and/or trans people of color were fighting back against those that oppressed them and were discriminatory towards others for their sexuality and gender expression. June 28th and 29th of 1969 showed the transgender and gay communities that they can fight back against a homophobic and transphobic society in ways never before considered.

STAR: Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries

Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries (STAR) was formed by two trans women of color in the 1970s after it became apparent that the new formed gay liberation movement was not going to help the plight of transgender individuals. While there were instances of STAR being involved in political and social institutions, most of the work the organization did was in mutual aid and direct action with an emphasis on including those other organizations were happy to leave behind. While STAR was only around for three years, the organization has massive importance within the movement (Cohen 2009, 90-155).

While the Gay Liberation Front ceased being a radical organization a year and a half after being formed, the group Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries did not suffer the same fate. STAR was formed by Sylvia Rivera and Marsha P. Johnson, two trans women of color, to advocate for transgender individuals with an emphasis on those who were homeless (Daum 2020, 137). The group was one of the first LGBTQ+ mutual aid organizations in the United States and was interested in the “Practical needs of gay and transgender people” (Nownes 2019, 21). STAR had a huge emphasis on helping homeless trans people in New York City by giving them food and shelter (Cohen 2009, 90). The mutual aid provided by STAR cannot be understated. By housing young transgender and gay individuals and letting them explore their identities that society had ostracized, STAR improved the quality of life among one of the most vulnerable populations of the LGBTQ+ community. Not only did this allow those who were left to the streets to have shelter and escape both sex work and drugs, it provided transgender youth with affirmation (Cohen 2009, 91-92). Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries, “fostered self-reliance that enabled transvestites to both publicize the underlying causes of oppression and collectively fight back” (Cohen 2009, 92).

STAR also participated heavily in direct action to address social injustice and demand a social revolution. STAR had set its sights on lethal prison conditions, police harassment, harmful legal and mental health systems, as well as discrimination in housing and employment (Cohen 2009, 92). To address the problems found in the previously mentioned targets, STAR organized pickets, visited prisons, published the mistreatment of inmates, signed letters indicting organizations for harassment, testified in favor of a gay rights bill, wrote articles for the liberation press, and ran a gay community center (Cohen 2009, 92-93). Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries was also an extremely inclusive organization who fought with other groups and members of the movement to make it more inclusive (Cohen 2009, 93). STAR also published a lot of early queer theory in an attempt to get people to understand the experiences that transgender people had and the life they were relegated to in hopes that it would change for future generations (Cohen 2009, 95-103).

While the group was involved and supportive of and involved in efforts that worked within political and social institutions, that does not prevent STAR from being a group belonging to the progressive faction of the movement. A majority of the work that STAR engaged in was geared more towards direct action and mutual aid than lobbying political bodies or being a force within politics (Cohen 2009, 93). Because Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries was involved in pickets, letter writing campaigns, housing homeless gay and trans youth, fighting with the Gay Activists Alliance and the Gay Liberation Front to make the movement more inclusive, and so much more, the organization rightly belongs in the progressive faction of the movement.

There is a difference between seeing the necessity of acting within political, professional, and social institutions to make important changes for a community while also engaging in mutual

aid and/or direct action and only working within political, professional, or social institutions. STAR is a great example of the former. They realized that in order to change prison conditions or discrimination in work and housing for gay and trans people, they needed to work within political systems to do so, but they also realized that in order to make sure that needs of homeless gay and transgender youth were being met working with institutions was not going to yield favorable results.

Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries is one of the earliest organizations within the movement that was truly progressive from when it started until it ended. STAR did not rely solely on political, social, or professional institutions to make social change, its members participated in direct action and mutual aid, and most importantly the organization fought within the movement so it could be as inclusive as possible and not see trans people and trans people of color as expendable, which the movement was wont to do during the 1970s. The work of STAR, as short as the organization's life span was, was important in the early stages of the transgender and gay liberation movement because it showed the community the power that they have and what they are able to accomplish if its members are willing to work together to help each other.

Lavender Menace

When women left the Gay Liberation Front 18 months after it had been founded, they formed their own organization to deal with the intersection that lesbians sat at in the Gay Movement and the Women's Movement. In the Gay Movement women's issues had been, for nearly two decades, dismissed. The Gay Movement did not care about issues facing lesbians and the Women's Movement did not care that much either, in fact the National Organization for Women did not believe that lesbian needs should be included in the organization because they were a threat to getting any traction for the Women's Movement (Friedan 2001, 222; Faderman

2015, 233). Lavender Menace was only around for a short period of time before changing their name to Radicalesbians, which was covered in chapter one. Before the change to being Radicalesbians, Lavender Menace had one goal: get the mainstream Women's Movement to recognize lesbian issues (Faderman 2015, 236).

Lavender Menace was successful at getting the National Organization for Women (NOW) to recognize lesbian issues and the fact that lesbians are inherently situated at the intersection of two marginalized identities: gayness and womanhood. At the second congress to unite women in 1970, a group of lesbians held the congress hostage in order to get the members of NOW to listen to what it is like to be a lesbian (Faderman 2015, 236; Marotta 1981, 244). Members of the Lavender Menace distributed their manifesto *The Woman Identified Woman*, which was critical of the direction NOW was taking and gave ideas on how to integrate lesbians into the movement (Marotta 1981, 241-43). Members also shared stories of the lesbian experience so attendees of the second congress would understand what it meant to be a woman *and* a homosexual. The reason Lavender Menace belongs to the progressive faction is because they worked towards getting the Women's Movement to increase the scope of the issues they would fight for; Lavender Menace got the Women's Movement to recognize the issues facing people sitting at the intersection of woman and homosexual.

The Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization

Most of the research into post-Stonewall organizing that happened in the gay and transgender communities has been documented in New York City. While it was a hub for organizing to be sure, it should not be the sole center of attention. Thanks to the Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization (TAO) transgender organizing was brought to Los Angeles and Miami (Nownes 2019, 21). Unfortunately, not much is known about TAO; however,

the evidence that exists of the organization shows that it belongs in the progressive faction. The aim of the organization was to amplify and support trans voices, which was achieved through the publication of the Magazines *Mirage* and *Moonshadow* (“Angela Lynn Douglas and Transsexual Action Organization | ONE Archives”, n.d.). The organization, much like Lavender Menace, fought to increase the scope of what the feminist movement focused on by combatting the exclusion of trans women from groups and advocacy efforts (ibid).

While in Los Angeles, the Transsexual Action Organization had organized several confrontational protests and street demonstrations, with the most popular ones being the time Angela Douglas, the founder of TAO, and another trans person blocked the entrance to a showing of the movie *Myra Breckinridge* and when TAO protested LA’s welfare offices because they refused to aid, “men who dressed as women” (Meyerowitz 2004, 238). The organization also convinced California’s Peace and Freedom Party to add a plank to its platform calling for people being able to use their body however they see fit (ibid). The most progressive part of the Transsexual Action Organization is the support the organization had for women’s and gay liberation because, “all victims of prejudice and discrimination must work together to change this society” (ibid).

In 1972 Douglas moved to Miami and set up a new branch of the organization, which included many Cuban and Puerto Rican members (Meyerowitz 2004, 239). In Florida, TAO spent most of its time trying to end police harassment of trans women. It had set up a security force and publicized the mistreatment of trans women in the city (ibid). The Transsexual Action Organization also took aim at the American Psychological Association after it had removed homosexuality from its list of mental disorders and demanded that, “transsexualism [be removed] from its list” (ibid). Douglas’ successor as president of TAO stressed the importance of

people listening to the experiences of trans people because the trans community's biggest enemy was the ignorance that society had about "transsexualism"; she had also criticized the cost of transitioning and employment discrimination that those who transitioned experienced (Meyerowitz 2004, 240-41).

While the Transsexual Action Organization did spend time working with political and professional institutions by lobbying political parties and the American Psychological Association, it still belongs in the progressive faction because they did more than lobby those organizations and there is a distinct lack of exclusion in the organization. TAO took action into its own hands by picking up where the media stopped via publicizing what life was like as a trans person during the 1970s, TAO also criticized the media's creation of a transnormativity, and they also tried to stop the consumption of media that was harmful by blocking the doors to the theater that was showing it. The organization also opened its doors to anyone who had wanted to join and did not limit itself to only trans issues, it also focused on gay and women's issues. While it was around, the Transsexual Action Organization worked towards the liberation of trans people, women, and gay people while being cognizant of the intersectionality that people in those communities experienced.

The AIDS Era: 1981-1996

Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, also known as AIDS, marks a turning point in political action for the LGBTQ+ Movement. As mentioned in the last chapter, a majority of the work done by organizations and activists specifically to address the AIDS crisis is the epitome of progressive organizing and political action in the LGBTQ+ Movement. Organizations like the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP) and the Gay Men's Health Crisis (GMHC) were fighting to get society and the government to understand the reality of life as a non-straight

person during the AIDS Crisis, they organized help for those in need, and they picked up where the government and society left off (Shilts 1987; Schulman 2019). It is important to note that, in addition to education, direct action, and mutual aid, these organizations and activists did interact with the government by protesting its inaction and, in the case of the Gay Men's Health Crisis, worked with the government to gain a better understanding of AIDS and how to treat it: these organizations and activists *were* the experts on AIDS, they just worked on getting their knowledge out (Ghaziani 2008, 80; Schulman 2019).

AIDS organizing facilitated a marked change in the Gay Movement. It helped end the reliance on institutions that was seen by the liberal faction because the progressive faction knew that in some cases the community cannot wait decades for friendly politicians, administrators, lawyers, professors, etc. to ally themselves with the movement (Ghaziani 2008, 80-81). When AIDS dominated the LGBTQ+ Movement and life in the 1980s and early 1990s, the first executive director of the Gay Men's Health Crisis (an AIDS based community service provider) recognized that existing institutions would not lift a finger to help those with AIDS even if it meant death, "You are literally left to die" (Ghaziani 2008, 81). The progressive faction realized that if they work their way through political institutions as a way to act on issues affecting the gay community, the movement could very well be playing with people's lives and helping decide who lives and who dies.

The Gay Men's Health Crisis

The Gay Men's Health Crisis formed in New York in January 1982 when Larry Kramer had a meeting in his apartment with, "New York A-Gays" (Faderman 2015, 419). As Kramer and his friends exchanged stories about what it was like to have AIDS, they came to the conclusion that they needed to do for gay people what society was unwilling to (ibid). Unlike its liberal

counterparts like the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, Gay Men's Health Crisis was, "the first community-based AIDS service provider" (Ghaziani 2008, 80). GMHC lived up to its goal by creating a buddy system whose members would visit people with AIDS, clean their apartments, walk dogs, go grocery shopping, feed them, take them to the doctors, and read to them while in the hospital (Faderman 2015, 419).

Gay Men's Health Crisis set up a hotline so people all over the country could turn to someone for advice, ran therapy groups, and got lawyers to write wills and fight landlords who wanted to evict tenants with AIDS (ibid). The work done by GMHC was all about mutual aid and making sure that people with AIDS were able to live in relative comfort in their dying days. Gay Men's Health Crisis has worked with political institutions more than once; however, its main focus is directly supporting those with AIDS, no reliance on political institutions was formed ("History", n.d.). In 1983, the Centers for Disease Control requested GMHC help in creating a conference to help educate the American people on AIDS ("Eleven Years of AIDS and Gay Men's Health Crisis", n.d.). Other than organizing a conference with the CDC, Gay Men's Health Crisis focused on mutual aid to comfort those in need. The work of GMHC spoke to many people during the AIDS era and most of the people involved with AIDS activism preferred the mutual aid approach (Gould 2009, 56).

The Gay Men's Health Crisis has expanded throughout the last forty years and remains one of the most important and active organizations today providing services to people with AIDS, regardless of their sexuality, gender, race, and socioeconomic status ("History", n.d.). Gay Men's Health Crisis has helped major cities all across the United States achieve the Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS' goal of 90% of people with HIV knowing their status, 90% of people diagnosed with HIV having treatment, and 90% of people with HIV are virally

suppressed (“Impact”, n.d.). GMHC, despite largely focusing on mutual aid, has done a lot of work to help local and state governments in combating the AIDS crisis by providing care to the infected and donating to/fundraising for AIDS research. Despite its name’s focus on gay men, GMHC was there to help anyone and everyone who might have AIDS, which the organization has been doing for over 40 years.

The AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power

Unlike Gay Men’s Health Crisis, the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP), focused on both mutual aid and direct action. During its short lifespan, ACT UP was successful at organizing people to help their community through mutual aid and direct action. ACT UP was busy in the nine years it was active. From 1987 to 1996, ACT UP created a fast-track system to get sick people access to experimental drugs and forced the FDA to adopt it; it ran a campaign to get the CDC to change its definition of AIDS so women could get access to benefits; ACT UP got needle exchanges legalized in New York City and started a service for homeless people with AIDS; it forced pharmaceutical companies and the government to change research priorities so failed drugs were not being tested multiple times; ACT UP was instrumental in getting researchers to move away from the idea that one pill would cure AIDS and reconceptualized what an effective treatment would be; it ended insurance exclusion of people with AIDS and confronted the Catholic Church’s opposition to condom distribution in schools and needle exchange programs; images of ACT UP fighting back helped change the perception of people with AIDS and how society saw the gay community (Schulman 2021, 9).

Even though there are several accounts of sexism and racism within the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power, members of ACT UP listened to and learned from people who were different from them so they could learn how to best help those with AIDS (Schulman 2019, 31).

Furthermore, because AIDS did not discriminate in who it infected those involved in AIDS activism often lent their lives to the movement (ibid). There were also very few formal meetings, so ACT UP activists were spending much of their time in a casual, diverse setting, which led to white gay men befriending and learning from women and people of color and that helped tear down some of the barriers that had prevented the LGBTQ+ community from intersectional organizing (Schulman 31-32). The settings and environment that ACT UP members spent most of their time in helped create an organization that improved life for a wide array of people, not just cisgender white gay men.

The AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power was, unlike similar organizations e.g., the Gay Liberation Front and Gay Activists Alliance, was able to survive for a prolonged period of time without excluding people from the organization (Schulman 2019, 31).³ Furthermore, ACT UP, in contrast to all the organizations that preceded it, included more people to their cause as time went on, “It is very unusual for movements or groups that are dominated by men and white people to achieve transformational victories to improve the lives of women, people of color, and poor people” (ibid). The accomplishments of ACT UP are vast and do include political institutions, so it is important to look at their strategies and how they are different from the strategies used by the liberal faction.

The strategies utilized by the progressive faction are an expansion of the actions of the Mattachine Society in response to Dale Jennings being arrested and charged for cruising because ACT UP was not afraid to make noise so people in power would listen to them; however, the mechanisms for creating noise used by ACT UP differ greatly because they threw condoms at

³ I would like to acknowledge that there is a dispute surrounding this claim as contemporary accounts of ACT UP, like Schulman (2019), have been accused of downplaying the role of racism and overplaying inclusion in the organization; however, I am erring on the side of Schulman’s (2019) account because it is one of few accessible works containing an in-depth exploration of the history of ACT UP’s activism.

elected officials, wrapped Senator Helms' house with a condom, tried to shut down the New York Stock Exchange, created one of the largest and well known public art protests in history, dumped the ashes of loved ones on the Whitehouse lawn to protest the Reagan/Bush administration's refusal to recognize AIDS, and publicly protested the Catholic Church on Easter Sunday (Schulman 2019). While ACT UP created noise so society would listen to the plight of gay people as a result of the AIDS Crisis, it used so many different mechanisms and added to the repertoire of action taken on by the Gay Movement.

Two of the main facets that separates ACT UP and earlier organizations when it comes to political action is the targets of the organization and their methods. Where organizations like the GLF and GAA would conduct guerilla-esque zaps and participate in/plan the occasional that targeted the American Psychological Association and political officials, ACT UP focused their energy on providing social services to people with AIDS and protesting in ways that made sure people knew what they were fighting for. As mentioned previously, members of ACT UP would help people with AIDS do mundane things like walk dogs and bring them meals; however, that was not the only thing that the organization did. The political arm of the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power was very militant in nature, and they organized a wide variety of protests with the most prominent being protests on Wall Street, *Cosmopolitan* magazine (*Cosmo*), the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and the Catholic Church. While there are several protests that ACT UP organized and participated in, the aforementioned six had the biggest impact on the landscape of AIDS activism.

There were three distinct protests on Wall Street carried out by ACT UP. The first protest was on March 24th, 1987 to demand the FDA release drugs that will help treat AIDS, abolish double-blind studies that gave people with AIDS false hope, the release of all potentially helpful

drugs at affordable prices, public education to stop the spread of AIDS, policies to protect the rights of people with AIDS especially in insurance, employment, and housing, and an establishment of a comprehensive and compassionate national policy on AIDS (“ACT UP 1987 Wall Street Action – List of Demands”, n.d.). The purpose of this protest was to prevent the profiteering of AIDS at the expense of people’s lives and help expedite the process of treating AIDS; ACT UP was partially successful because shortly after the March 24th protest, the FDA announced it would shorten its drug approval process by two years (“ACT UP/New York Chronology 1987”, n.d.). Exactly one year later ACT UP returned to Wall Street to celebrate its first anniversary and the notion of AIDS activism starts to gain more credibility amongst the public (“ACT UP/New York Chronology 1988”, n.d.). On September 14th, 1989, ACT UP returned to Wall Street to protest the high cost of AZT, the only effective and approved drug to treat AIDS at the time (“The ACT UP Historical Archive”, n.d.; Park 2017). As a result of the protest, the manufacturer of AZT, Burroughs Wellcome, lowered the annual cost of treatment to \$6,400 down 20% from \$8,000 (“The ACT UP Historical Archive, n.d.).

After ACT UP’s first protest at Wall Street, the next major activity came in January of 1988. The Women’s Caucus in ACT UP protested and demanded a retraction of an article in the magazine *Cosmopolitan* where psychiatrist Dr. Robert Gould claimed that if women had sex with a man who had AIDS, the woman would not get infected (Schulman 2019, 385). This was the proverbial last straw for the women in ACT UP because it was perhaps the most dangerous installment in AIDS misinformation being spread by the media (ibid). The *Cosmo* protest started with a few women in ACT UP going to Dr. Gould’s house and asking him for a retraction and when he refused, the women took it back to ACT UP and men and women alike started planning the protest (Schulman 2019, 387). The protest got a lot of media coverage that put the lies into

the public eye and started a very public discourse about women and AIDS, which eventually got *Cosmo* to retract the article along with an admission that it did not tell the full story of AIDS and women (Schulman 2019, 387-88). Moreover, the *Cosmopolitan* article initiated the creation of an ACT UP documentary called *Doctors, Liars, and Women: AIDS Activists Say no to Cosmo*, which documented the lies the media was spreading about women and AIDS (Schulman 2019, 386-89). ACT UP did not only protest the lies; they also created their own media to help spread the truth about AIDS and women.

The Women's Caucus of ACT UP was not done after *Cosmo*. AIDS was effecting and infecting women, but the Centers for Disease Control refused to acknowledge the differences in how the disease manifested itself in men and women, "For men, full-blown AIDS often caused [Kaposi's sarcoma], while women experienced bacterial pneumonia, pelvic inflammatory disease, and cervical cancer" (Brier 2009, 173). James Curran headed the CDC's HIV Surveillance Project and, "characterized the disease in such a way that it was *only men*, and he had created a whole program around that" (Schulman 2019, 247). The reality of this exclusion was women being misdiagnosed, mistreated, ineligible for experimental treatment, and barred from getting disability benefits, which meant that women were dying of AIDS quicker than men (Brier 2009, 173). The exclusion of women from clinical trials and AIDS research prevented any kind of meaningful research from taking place because the disease could not be fully understood (Schulman 2019, 246).

The protests targeting the CDC were years in the making and were the crowning achievement of ACT UP's campaign for women with AIDS (Schulman 2019, 227). The actions that ACT UP took to combat the CDC's problematic definition of AIDS included letter writing, sending Curran postcards with a target on his face, and organizing simultaneous actions at local

CDC offices all across the country (Schulman 2019, 247-48). In mid-1990, the CDC had planned to meet with the ACLU and Gay Men's Health Crisis to discuss women and HIV; however, neither the ACLU nor GMHC had any meaningful background on the issue at hand (Schulman 2019, 257). Members of ACT UP demanded to have a seat at the table and when they were refused, they handcuffed themselves to people who were invited because ACT UP was either going to be involved or there was not going to be a meeting (Schulman 2019, 257-58). In January of 1993, after countless women died or were kept in the dark about their AIDS status, the Centers for Disease Control changed their definition of AIDS because of the work done by ACT UP (Schulman 2019, 263).

The Centers for Disease Control were not the only government agency to be targeted by ACT UP. The Food and Drug Administration was also a target. On October 11th, 1988, ACT UP shut down the FDA for a day in an effort to combat the lengthy and exclusive process of the availability of experimental drugs ("Police Arrest AIDS Protesters Blocking Access to FDA Offices" 1988). The success that came from shutting down the FDA meant that some of the demands, like utilizing parallel trials, were met, but more importantly the FDA and the National Institutes for Health started listening to ACT UP and included them in decision making (Crimp 2011). Radical inclusion is also featured heavily in the action against the FDA. One of the participants was quoted as saying, "We are here for all the people with AIDS but we are also here for all the other people with life-threatening illnesses who need drugs now" ("Police Arrest AIDS Protesters Blocking Access to FDA Offices" 1988). One of the demands of the demonstration was, "The FDA must mandate that drug trials recruit participants from all groups affected by HIV infection, including women, people of color, children, poor people, IV drug users, hemophiliacs, and gay men" (Crimp 2011). ACT UP also demanded that Medicaid and

private health insurance companies be billed for experimental drug therapies (ibid). This quote and the two demands show that ACT UP was working to better the lives of everyone, not just the white gay male middle and upper class.

In addition to the Centers for Disease Control and the Food and Drug Administration, ACT UP targeted the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to protest the lengthy, secretive, and inequitable process that made it research into AIDS not as effective as it could be and reveal the fact that people were being lied to about the progress of AIDS treatment (Schulman 2019, 538-40). Storming the NIH was a large undertaking with 1,500 people participating and there being many components to the protest, e.g., theatrical work like hanging banners from flag poles, legal pickets, and general civil disobedience on the NIH campus (Schulman 2019, 539). The demonstration at the National Institutes of Health was held on May 21st, 1990, and one month later Dr. Anthony Fauci, the Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), accepted some of the demands of the demonstrators (Schulman 2019, 541). ACT UP's Demonstration on the NIH campus got NIAID to establish the Community Constituency Group, put activists with voting power on the AIDS Clinical Trials Group and Community Programs for Clinical Research on AIDS committees, increased the amount of support given to opportunistic infection prevention and treatment research, and led to the best practice model of community involvement with AIDS research, which has been the standard of medical research ever since (Schulman 2019, 540-41).

One of the demands of the NIH from the flyers handed out to participants was, "End medical apartheid (make treatments open to everyone, not just white gay men)" (Schulman 2019, 540). This shows an inclusive element to the demonstration especially since the organizer was a man who received little feedback from the rest of ACT UP (Schulman 2019, 538). Even though

this protest and the ones targeting the FDA and the CDC were directed towards government agencies, this is not a mark of liberalism within ACT UP because it did not try to work with these agencies. The main goal of ACT UP's actions with the FDA and the CDC was not to gain an ally in government like liberal organizations wanted, it was to force the FDA and CDC to come face to face with the very people they cast aside and refused to help. The main goal of the protests was to let the community have better and more equitable access to life saving treatments and greater inclusion of people in medical research instead of focusing solely on civil rights. According to Fauci, members of ACT UP were producing "good, creative ideas" (Handelman 1990).

One of the protests that the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power is known for is Stop the Church. Cardinal Joseph O'Connor was a powerful and vocal opponent of safe sex education, condom distribution, homosexuality, abortion, and needle exchange (Gould 2009, 285). The Catholic Church represented a large and looming figure in many people's oppression and it had degraded people with AIDS in their hospices and made it difficult for people to be honored after death (Schulman 2019, 138). Originally, those who wanted to participate would enter St. Patrick's Cathedral wearing conservative clothes to blend in and at random intervals they would throw themselves in the center aisle to symbolize those who had died from AIDS (O'Loughlin 2019). However, ACT UP member Michael Petrelis blew a whistle, stood up on a pew and shouted, "You're killing us!" and two members took the Eucharist from Cardinal O'Connor, crumbled it in his hand, and let it fall to the floor (ibid). While nothing of import was achieved at Stop the Church, that was the point. The intent behind Stop the Church was to protest O'Connor's opposition to some of the only methods of stopping the spread of AIDS it also enabled ACT UP to reach the mainstream media outlets and made it nearly impossible for

society to ignore the AIDS crisis and it showed that the Catholic Church (which at the time was a powerful force in public policy) was not untouchable nor were its policy positions inviolable (Sindelar 2012).

All of these previous actions were all done by the ACT UP chapter in New York City, which was the initial chapter of the organization. The Boston chapter of ACT UP was also successful at getting Massachusetts to respond compassionately to the AIDS crisis. Through protests, demonstrations, and negotiations ACT UP Boston was able to disseminate information on AIDS, get the commonwealth of Massachusetts to create the first online registry of clinical trials for AIDS treatments, and made treatment more available (“New Acquisition: ACT UP/Boston Historical Records”, n.d.). ACT UP Boston took to die ins, sleep ins, and direct distribution of condoms and AIDS literature to people who were most likely to have a passe outlook on AIDS (ibid). Unfortunately, much of ACT UP Boston’s archives and history have been lost, but from what remains, they had similar strategies and goals of ACT UP. The chapter in Chicago made significant progress combating the refusal of insurance companies to cover the cost of treatments and the sexism that permeated AIDS treatment, which helped open up access to treatment (“ACT UP”, n.d.).

While other chapters of the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power existed, they fall mainly into the liberal category. ACT UP LA focused on civil rights issues when not supporting the national ACT UP chapter, ACT UP Atlanta’s only meaningful action was protesting sodomy laws in Georgia, ACT UP San Francisco dissolved because of their lack of action on AIDS, ACT UP D.C’s only real action, while important because it got one of the most vitriolic senators to come face to face with the consequences of his homophobic policy stances, was putting a condom around Senator Jesse Helms’ house, and many other chapters did not do anything

besides meet once or twice without any meaningful action besides some modest planning (Roth 2017; Gould 2009; Street 2019). Despite ACT UP not having many national chapters that were confrontational, the organization did a lot to help those with AIDS. ACT UP created a buddy system much like Gay Men's Health Crisis that enabled daily tasks to be done and people with AIDS not be completely ostracized and through direct action they were able to make changes to the way medical research is done, opened the definition of AIDS to include women, and so many other things that have had an impact on people both with and without AIDS all through direct action and mutual aid.

The Contemporary Era: 1996-Present

The 1990s saw a decrease in AIDS activism partially because the activists were successful in getting their demands met, treatments for AIDS proliferated, and AIDS activism became a social movement unto itself (Vaid 1995, 105). The contemporary actions of the progressive faction fall into two categories: 1) mutual aid and direct action and 2) critiquing. The former is a continuation of the same strategies and goals that the progressive faction had held since 1950 with the latter being normative and argues for what activists and organizations should be focusing their energies on instead of what is currently being done by the liberal faction.

Mutual Aid and Direct Action

Within the Contemporary Era of the LGBTQ+ Movement there have been a few organizations that have been formed to provide aid to the community and engage in direct action to help stop prejudice and discrimination. Groups like the Sylvia Rivera Law Project, FORGE, Southerners on New Ground, and Familia: Trans Queer Liberation Movement are participating in direct action and mutual aid to help fundamentally change people's views on the LGBTQ+ community.

Sylvia Rivera Law Project

The Sylvia Rivera Law Project (SRLP) was created by Dean Spade in 2002 (Shepard 2013, 106; Nownes 2019, 125). Sylvia Rivera Law Project, “provides free legal help to low-income people and people of color who experience gender identity and/or expression discrimination” (Benjamin 2013, 107). SRLP has also worked to make sure that trans people of color have a voice in its operations to make sure that SRLP can be as welcoming as it can to those who need help (Benjamin 2013, 109). The Sylvia Rivera Law Project does engage with political institutions like the Department of Homeless Services in New York City to prevent trans women from being put into men’s shelters and represents clients in court regularly; however, the engagement of the SRLP with government institutions is not liberal as it works to actively aid their clients who have no choice but to interact with these institutions (ibid). Sylvia Rivera Law Project’s work comes from the communities that it serves, its agenda is based on providing immediate relief for transgender people in poverty, and its methods are different from other nonprofit organizations (Benjamin 2013, 19; Spade 2015, 109). SRLP ensures that work is led by those most directly impacted, uses an intersectional frame to fully understand peoples’ “vectors of vulnerability,” models the change it seeks for society, being process oriented, developing new leaders especially amongst those who face the greatest barriers to leadership, makes change from the bottom up, strives for accountability and transparency to keep movements and constituencies in the proverbial loop, and recognizes that relationships are the underlying support system of the work and change that SRLP seeks (Spade 2015, 109).

Sylvia Rivera Law Project also does more than litigate precedent setting cases on behalf of impoverished transgender people, it uses training, public education, and policy reform to end state sanctioned and institutional discrimination, violence, and coercion because of one’s gender

identity and expression (“Our Approach and Principles/Nuestras Práctica y Principios”, n.d.). The trainings conducted by SRLP are geared towards service providers and public education is geared towards the community (“Trainings and Speaking Engagements | SRLP”, n.d.). The trainings for service providers revolves around making services more welcoming and accessible to people struggling with their gender identity so they can utilize community services and gain access to healthcare, employment, housing, and education (ibid). Education for the community helps people understand their rights in interactions with the police, healthcare professionals, and immigration institutions as well as getting name changes and updating identification documents (ibid). Even though much of the successes of SRLP that make it into the mainstream revolve around litigation and policy efforts, Sylvia Rivera Law Project does more than interacting with political institutions to change policy, it helps train and educate people providing important services to the community as well as people so they are safe and knowledgeable in their day to day lives.

Furthermore, Sylvia Rivera Law Project has measures in place that should prevent an exclusionary arc in the organization. The organization actively utilizes frames of intersectionality to understand the oppression of the people they serve (Spade 2015, 109). This means that transgender people, people of color, and low-income people have a strong voice within SRLP so the organization knows what it needs to focus its energies on; SRLP also has strong connections with groups created by people of color to ensure that people can get help if they need it (Benjamin 2013, 107-109). The lens of intersectionality that is utilized by SRLP also means that they recognize that there are other causes of their constituency’s oppression, that people who seek the services of Sylvia Rivera Law Project are experiencing discrimination and oppression based on their gender identity or expression, their socioeconomic status, potentially their race,

and how all of those identities combine to exacerbate the discrimination and oppression that people face. Sylvia Rivera Law Project is cognizant of the fact that they are not only providing services to transgender people, they are providing services to people of color and low-income people so their litigation strategies and topics covered in trainings and education sessions are developed with those identities in mind.

FORGE

FORGE was started in the Midwest in 1994 to connect trans-masculine people and provide them resources to receive healthcare (“Our History – FORGE”, n.d.). Throughout its first nine years FORGE steadily grew and its staff saw an increase in people revealing that they had been a victim of childhood sexual abuse or sexual assault as adults, which spurred FORGE to investigate the high rate of sexual violence that trans people had experienced (ibid). Since 2004, FORGE has worked to research and understand the causes of all types of violence that trans people experience and since 2011 the organization has worked on trainings so victim service providers could better understand transgender and non-binary survivors of abuse and violence (ibid). FORGE, much like other organizations in the progressive faction, picked up where society left off; they saw a need in their community and filled that need.

FORGE’s main work since 2016 has been holding training for service professionals so they can better understand how to meet the needs of transgender and non-binary clients (“Our History – FORGE”, n.d.). FORGE has presented and trained people at the National Sexual Assault Conference, International Summit on Violence, Abuse, and Trauma, National Conference on Health and Domestic Violence, American Society on Aging, American Psychological Association Conference, Philadelphia Trans Wellness Conference, and several state Sexual Assault/Domestic Violence Coalition conferences (“Trainings – FORGE,” n.d.).

FORGE also provides resources for transgender individuals specifically in regard to what legislation and court decisions means for transgender individuals (“Webinars – FORGE”, n.d.). Resources for service providers and the community as a whole are also geared toward harm reduction, not just addressing harm as it shows up. FORGE has a litany of different resources on how to support LGBTQ+ youth as a way to prevent victimization before it starts and attempt to create a more welcoming society (“Protecting LGBTQ+ Youth – FORGE”, n.d.).

Southerners on New Ground

Southerners on New Ground (SONG) is a regional organization in southern states that, “builds strategies for economic and racial justice through a lesbian, bisexual, gay, transgender, queer, gender non-conforming, and two spirit (LBGTQTS) lens” (Lynn et al. 2010, 1). SONG is the epitome of an inclusive organization bringing race, class, and gender analysis to LGBTQ organizing (McMichael 2014, 142). Like Lavender Menace before, SONG has worked to open the aims of other organizations and movements by training them how to integrate issues of homophobia and transphobia in their work (“Our Mission, Vision & History” 2022). In addition to training others on how to integrate weakening homophobia and transphobia in their work, SONG works to help those in the LBGTQTS community who live in more rural areas because they face a unique set of issues that other organizations do not pay attention to (ibid). There has been work with government institutions as SONG was instrumental in winning an injunction on HB 87 in Georgia a way to prevent more barriers from being erected that would deter undocumented people from seeking help from the community or organizations; however, there is no reliance on those institutions because SONG only works with them when policy will adversely affect marginalized people (ibid). SONG has shown a commitment to mutual aid and direct action, radical inclusion, and does not have to rely on political or professional institutions.

Familia: Trans Queer Liberation Movement

Familia: Trans Queer Liberation Movement (Familia), “works at local and national levels to achieve the collective liberation of trans, queer, and gender nonconforming Latinxs through building community, organizing, advocacy, and education” (“Familia:TQLM | Homepage”, n.d.). Familia is focused on liberation specifically for Latinxs by expanding on the work done by racial justice and liberation movements (ibid). Familia works to provide resources that already exist for cisgender and heterosexual Latinxs to trans and queer people so they can have access to the same opportunities and benefits of everyone else in their community (“Programs - Familia: TQLM”, n.d.). There is no history of the organization working within government institutions; however, if there were, it would still be a progressive organization because they mainly focus on grassroots organizing to bring justice to people sitting at the intersections of Latinx and queer or Latinx and trans or Latinx and queer and trans (ibid).

Progressive Critiques of the Modern Era

One of the hallmarks of the progressive faction is its drive to continuously question its effectiveness and how it can be better, which is something that the progressive faction has been doing extensively in the modern era (Spade 2015, 2). The critiques have held the same basic ideas for decades, the only substantive change from era to era is the content. The basic critique of the liberal faction is its drive for legal and policy change being inadequate to achieve liberation for the LGBTQ+ community because it keeps the basic structure of oppression intact and it leads to assimilation into institutions that are used to further others’ oppression (ibid). The consequence of keeping the basic structure of oppression is twofold: 1) the reification of LGBTQ+ identities is done through a lens of homonormativity and 2) LGBTQ+ individuals are assimilated into existing structures of oppression that are still being used to oppress other people;

while the community is able to find some escape from oppression, it comes at the cost of strengthening a structure that is used to further oppress marginalized peoples.

The liberal faction's end of liberation is problematic because adding sexuality to the list of protected characteristics has a reified sexuality as a dichotomy of gay/straight where non-straight identities are seen as opposing forces to straightness; including gender identity in the list of protected characteristics will lead to transgender identities being reified as an opposing force to cisgender identities (Warner 1993, xii). In other words, the rights-based approach taken by the liberal faction leads to a contextualization and reification of LGBTQ+ identities through a lens of cisgender and heterosexual identities. Because of this flawed framework, a rights-based approach will not facilitate the liberation of LGBTQ+ people because they are viewed in a way that is not compatible with their identities or experiences with a consequence of having to conform to hegemonic social norms to be accurately recognized (Daum 2020, 157-58).

Pursuing LGBTQ+ activism through political institutions to end de jure discrimination practices, e.g., employers not being able to fire LGBTQ+ individuals simply because they are LGBTQ+, does not address the underlying force that created that mindset, nor will it allow for a way for LGBTQ+ people to change homonormative structures created by elite dominant actors (Daum 2020, 35 and 158). The consequence of being confined to homonormative structures created by elite dominant actors is that the LGBTQ+ community cannot create their identities, interests, or needs on their own terms using their own vernacular: LGBTQ+ identities and needs will not have the ability to counteract the forces that marginalized them by working in the system created their marginalization and maintains their oppression (Fraser 1990, 67). The limits of a rights-based strategy was alluded to by Justice Kennedy through his majority opinions in *Romer*, *Lawrence*, and *Obergefell* via the creation of a sociolegal analysis that views sexuality and

gender as, respectively, gay or straight and cisgender or transgender because this analysis would not contest dominant institutions and assumptions (Daum 2020, 35-36).

Not only does working within the system formed by those who are dominantly situated in society come at the cost of being governed by dominant norms and expectations, it also assimilates LGBTQ+ individuals into institutions that were created to exclude them and used to oppress them that are still being used to oppress marginalized people (Cohen 2013, 75). The most prevalent example of this is marriage. When marriage was diversified to include same-sex couples the structure and role of marriage did not change. There was no fundamental shift in the way marriage is seen nor was there a shift in the way that marriage operates in society, which leads to the relief of oppression for some at the expense of the oppression for others (Polikoff 2008, 98). Not only does this oppression affect people outside of the LGBTQ+ community, it affects people inside the community as well. The inclusion of same-sex couples strengthens the institution of marriage, which leads to further unrecognition of family structures that do not include marriage because alternatives are weakened or dismantled (Polikoff 2008, 84; Koch 2015). The strengthening of marriage and weakening or dismantling of alternatives also harms those at intersections of identities. Low-income people with disabilities in same-sex relationships are continually excluded from marriage because they are unable to get married do to their reliance on disability benefits, which means that the strengthening of marriage strengthens their oppression (Mahoney 2022).

“Marriage, in short, discriminates” (Warner 1999, 82). Conservative rhetoric around marriage being sullied by the inclusion of same-sex couples shows that the institution of marriage by its very nature is discriminatory. The institution of marriage has been constructed in a way that ennobles some at the expense of disparaging others, “the ennobling and the

demeaning go together” (ibid). By diversifying marriage via including same-sex couples, the liberal faction has allowed marriage to be simultaneously a way to weaken and strengthen oppression because some are able to escape oppression, but that just makes the oppression faced by those who cannot escape it even stronger. Expanding marriage to same-sex couples has led to the maintenance of oppressive institutions and structures created by hegemonic society that makes members of the LGBTQ+ community who join the institution complicit in making oppression for those who are sitting at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities even worse.

The Contemporary Era’s critique of the liberal faction is twofold: 1) the rights-based approach taken by the liberal faction keeps oppressive power structures in place and 2) the inclusion of LGBTQ+ individuals in institutions that have previously excluded them strengthen the tools of oppression used by hegemonic powers. While the liberal faction is helping people escape oppression it is being done at the expense of strengthening the tools of oppression used against those who cannot escape it.

Conclusion

In order to accurately understand the forthcoming analysis of power, justice, and knowledge, it is important to understand the historical context of progressive LGBTQ+ activism, which this chapter provided. The progressive faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement has a rich history of helping every member of their community in order to remove barriers and providing relief from oppression that are almost ubiquitous in society regardless of the political and social landscape. The progressive faction has done a lot of good for their community through direct action, mutual aid, and centering the LGBTQ+ community in their work. Furthermore, the progressive faction has been working towards liberation for all who experience oppression

because they recognize the intersectionality of the LGBTQ+ community and in order for liberation to truly occur it needs to be done universally. The progressive faction is focused on changing the lives of all members of the LGBTQ+ community for the better, which means fighting for change that affects other marginalized people as well. In order to do this, the progressive faction is not working in or fighting to diversify institutions and systems that oppress them. Instead, it is focused on transforming institutions and systems that oppress people as well as the stigma that comes with being a member of a marginalized community all from the ground up.

The early days of Mattachine and the Gay Liberation Front, *ONE*, the Erikson Educational Foundation, the Stonewall Riots, STAR, TAO, the response to the AIDS crisis, the Sylvia Rivera Law Project, FORGE, and numerous other organizations and people represent the progressive faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement. They are rooted in the practices of mutual aid and direct action with ideals of inclusion and liberation. The progressive faction is fighting against assimilationist practices of their liberal counterpart and for a liberated society for the marginalized, the oppressed, and those branded as other. There is a recognition within the progressive faction that the work of the LGBTQ+ Movement's work does not stop when able bodied cis white queer people gain access to institutions that had excluded them for decades; the LGBTQ+ Movement's work stops when the marginalized have access to institutions that have excluded them for centuries and when alternatives to those institutions have been created that allow people to live their life the way they want to, not how those who are dominantly situated think is acceptable.

Chapter Four- Power in the LGBTQ+ Movement

The framework of power, justice, and knowledge introduced in chapter one is a useful way to examine the effective change brought by the actions of the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement. This chapter will provide a review of Lukes' (2021) framework of power and how it is reified in the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement and its predecessors. As mentioned in chapter one, the lens of power allows for an evaluation of the change made by the two factions because facilitating policy and social change requires power. By looking through such a lens when evaluating the effects of social movements, one is able to see the changes that movement has made and what changes it is capable of making. The analysis of power in the liberal and progressive factions will show that the liberal faction's capacity for power is limited compared to its progressive counterpart's. The liberal faction has ample capacity to act within both the first and second dimension of power (respectively, power over observable action and power over agenda setting), but limited capacity to act within the third dimension (power over ideology); however, the progressive faction is able to work within all three dimensions to influence people's observable action, others' agendas, and ideology both internal and external to the movement.

Power Revisited

Lukes (2021) provides a comprehensive framework with which to view power. This framework consists of three dimensions provided by, respectively, Dahl (1957), Bachrach and Baratz (1970), and Lukes (2021). Each successive dimension dives deeper under the surface of what power is than the last. The first dimension of power examines the ability to influence observable action, "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B

would otherwise not do” (Dahl 1957, 80). The second dimension of power examines the ability to influence agendas, “Power is also exercised when A devotes his energies to creating or reinforcing... practices that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration on only those issues which are comparatively innocuous to A” (Bachrach and Baratz 1970, 7). The third dimension of power examines the ability to influence ideology:

is it not the most supreme and insidious exercise of power to prevent people... from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognitions and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things because they can see and imagine no alternative to it (Lukes 2021, 33)

The third dimension of power has negative and positive reifications. The former happens when ideological influence helps maintain oppression and the latter happens when the ideological influence that furthers the goal of social movements. The dimensions of power provided by Lukes (2021) are, respectively: 1) influence over behavior, 2) influence over agenda setting, and 3) influence over ideology (Lukes 2021, 19-33). It is through these dimensions of power that the liberal and progressive factions’ ability to facilitate change is understood.

Power in the Liberal Faction

The capacities of power in the liberal faction of the movement are easy to ascertain. Within this framework, the liberal faction can act within both the first and second dimension of power, but a restricted ability to act within the third dimension.⁴ The liberal faction has been able to get state actors and social institutions to behave in ways that they otherwise would not, which shows their capacity to influence observable behavior; it has also been able to control portions of the political agenda, their progressive counterpart, and some organizations within the liberal faction have been able to influence the agendas of the political sphere, the progressive faction,

⁴ Respectively, influence over observable behavior, agenda setting, and ideology.

and other organizations within the liberal faction; there is a capacity to work within the third dimension, but that activism has begun to do more harm than good.

Power Over Observable Action

The liberal faction has shown its ability to influence observable action through what it has done and their reliance on political and professional institutions. As mentioned in chapter two, the liberal faction works within existing political and professional institutions in an effort to grant the community access to social institutions. By working within political and professional institutions to initiate social change, the liberal faction is only successful to the extent that the institutions are malleable enough to be influenced by organizations and activists. Through concerted efforts of lobbying politicians and political institutions, the liberal faction has been able to get legislation that protects the LGBTQ+ community in the realms of housing, employment, public accommodation, and laws banning gay and trans panic defenses written and in most cases passed (Faderman 2015). It is because of the lobbying efforts and pressure campaigns taken on by the liberal faction that these pieces of legislation have been created and in most cases enacted (Faderman 2015, 250). Additionally, the liberal faction's zaps against the American Psychological Association were able to get homosexuality declassified as a mental illness and recognized as a valid expression of human sexuality (Adam 1995, 88).

The liberal faction's ability to influence observable behavior does not stop at its ability to guide the actions of professional and political institutions. The liberal faction has also shown an ability to influence the behavior of individuals. Dress codes imposed by the Daughters of Bilitis show a capacity to influence people's actions and behavior in the movement because they acted and behaved in ways they otherwise would not (D'Emilio 1983, 106). Beyond aesthetics, the liberal faction has influenced behavior of people in the LGBTQ+ community via the

advancement of normativities. The liberal faction has advanced, sustained, and amended several different normativities that influence people's actions. The most prevalent examples are the homonormativity furthered by the Mattachine Society, the Daughters of Bilitis, the Gay Liberation Front, and later institutionalized by the ACLU, Lambda Legal, GLAD, the HRC, and F2M. The homonormativity that exists today that has been crafted over the last 69 years has influenced the behavior of generations of the LGBTQ+ community by creating and institutionalizing an ideal way for members of the community to behave, present themselves, and how their relationships manifest.

The advancement of homonormativity started after the Mattachine Society's conference in 1953. The new leadership of Mattachine overhauled the organization and took on the idea that the only difference between the homosexual and the heterosexual is their sexuality (D'Emilio 1983, 84). The Daughters of Bilitis took that normativity and pushed it to the extreme by postulating that the only acceptable lesbian presented and acted femininely that maybe had a non-blue-collar job (D'Emilio 1983, 92-107). The image of the ideal homosexual conjured by Mattachine and the DOB was propagated by the publishing arm of the organizations and in a time when homosexuality was seen as a pathology, illness, or moral defect, any way of destigmatizing one's sexual proclivities was actively sought out (D'Emilio 1983, 109-13; Woods 2017, 146). This early iteration of homonormativity developed by the homophile movement was influential to the homosexual population of the 1950s and 1960s, which undoubtedly caused people to act in ways they otherwise would not (D'Emilio 1983, 103).

The image of the ideal gay man was further developed by the Gay Liberation Front when they tried to combat the fairy stereotype by overcompensating in masculinity that dictated how people dressed, talked, and looked like (Kissack 1995, 111). The implications of this

overcompensation cannot be understated. Even though society had lessened its hostility toward gay people throughout the 1960s, finding a place where it was okay to be gay was rare. The GLF provided one of those places with the caveat of hypermasculinity and pushed the idea that gayness is fine as long as one is not simultaneously transgressing gender norms (Kissack 1995, 120-22). The AIDS crisis saw a concerted effort to create domestic partnership laws in the United States that effectively pushed the idea that gay couples are just like heterosexual ones (Chambers 1992, 184-85). The ACLU, the HRC, and F2M did not only develop homonormativity that was provided by its predecessors, they institutionalized it in the Contemporary Era through dismantling alternatives to marriage like civil unions (Koch 2015). By fighting to legalize same-sex marriage federally and in the states, the aforementioned organizations institutionalized homonormativity because their success meant a dissolution of civil unions and companies ending policies that gave employees' same-sex partners benefits, which left the only option for recognition and benefits of marriage (Koch 2015). Furthermore, the institutionalization of marriage privileges dual partnerships and the traditional family structure at the expense of other valid forms of family creation and partnership (Polikoff 2008, 84).

Liberal organizations' tendency to exclude people has manifested the use of power over behavior. Because Mattachine focused on issues that were only salient to gay men and questioned the involvement of women in the homophile movement, they influenced Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon's behavior to create the Daughters of Bilitis (D'Emilio 1983, 92-93). The DOB is not the only organization that was created as a result of exclusion. Because they were turned away from both the Gay Liberation Front and the Gay Activists Alliance on account of their trans and racial identities, Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera formed the Street Transvestite

Action Revolutionaries (Daum 2020, 137). The exclusion of lesbians from GLF and GAA also spurred the creation of the Lavender Menace, which eventually became the Radicalesbians (Faderman 2015, 232). In an odd twist, inclusion also created an organization. The Gay Activists Alliance was created by members of the Gay Liberation Front who were disgruntled by the inclusion of racial justice in the Gay Movement (Bronski 2011, 212). Exclusion of people from the liberal faction influenced the behavior of those who were excluded because that was the catalyst of creating many liberal organizations as well as STAR; the inclusion of racial issues in the GLF influenced people's behavior because that was the catalyst that led to the creation of the GAA (Bronski 2011, 212; D'Emilio 1983, 92-93; Daum 2020, 137; Faderman 2015, 232).

Power Over Agenda Setting

Via the liberal faction's focus on a rights-based framework and reliance on institutions, they have revealed an ability to wield influence over agenda setting. Through getting local, state, and federal legislators to write policy that protects the LGBTQ+ community, the liberal faction is also influencing the agenda of these institutions. When these pieces of legislation are submitted to their respective bodies, they are scheduled for committee hearings, committee votes, and oftentimes floor votes (Ghaziani 2008, 204-6). However, this ability does not only come through getting these bills written and on a legislative or judicial agenda by influencing actors within legislative bodies, it also comes through acts like coming out, vigils, and testimony. When Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy heard that people were losing their jobs because they were coming out he helped re-introduce the Employment Non-Discrimination Act in 1994, two decades after it was first introduced (Faderman 2015, 429).

Agenda setting is not only present in legislatures it is also present in ballot initiatives and professional institutions like the American Psychological Association. With success in getting

states to legalize same-sex marriage, the Human Rights Campaign and Freedom to Marry took state organizing one step further and turned to referenda when state legislatures were deadlocked (Wolfson n.d.c). The HRC and F2M influenced the agenda of state ballot initiatives through mobilizing for the legalization of same-sex marriage. Agenda setting power was not only exercised in the political realm. The series of zaps aimed at the American Psychological Association put declassifying homosexuality as a mental illness on that organization's agenda. Furthermore, second dimensional power is not only exercised through explicit political mobilization. Society's public mourning after the murder of Matthew Shepard in 1998 caused state and federal legislators to focus on hate crimes legislation (Ghaziani 2008, 222). Through lobbying, coming out, zapping, and public acts of mourning, the liberal faction has shown an ability to exert power in the political arena by influencing potential action taken in that space.

Power over agenda setting is also used, unknowingly, to influence what future eras and other factions do. Due to Mattachine and the DOB focusing on reading groups and working with professionals to make change, the Gay Liberation Era organizations put protesting back on the liberal faction's agenda because they saw what happens without active mobilization (Marotta 1981, 71). This also happened with Lambda Legal. Lambda was able to craft a litigation strategy that was successful in obtaining a gay friendly Supreme Court decision in 1996, which influenced the political action and strategy of the liberal faction moving into the new millennium (Engel 2019, 200). Furthermore, the liberal faction, knowingly or not, has influenced the actions of the progressive faction. Progressive organizations like the Gay Men's Health Crisis and ACT UP had a lot thrust upon them by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force's strategy of de-gayng AIDS (Vaid 1995, 75). Because the liberal faction decentered gayness in their AIDS mobilization, they put advocating for gay people with AIDS on the progressive faction's agenda.

By intentionally acting or not acting on specific things, organizations in the liberal faction have influenced the agenda of other liberal organizations as well as organizations in the progressive faction. It is by exerting this control over the agenda of others that second dimensional power is exercised by the liberal faction.

Ideological Power

There are some instances of the liberal faction influencing people's ideology. Some potential successful exercises of third dimensional power in the liberal faction came from the creation of homonormativity, lobbying, zaps, and public interviews. The creation and maintenance of homonormativity that is seen in the liberal faction is a negative influence of ideology whereas lobbying, zaps, and public interviews are positive influences. Unfortunately, negative ideological power is more prevalent in this faction.

The creation and maintenance of homonormativity has continued to this day as a result of liberal activism (Daum 2020, 35). This is a negative influence over ideology because it does not free people from oppression, which is the goal of both factions of the movement.

Homonormativity can, just like the hypermasculinization of homosexuality in the Gay Liberation Front, create a society that removes the stigma of LGBTQ+ identities while simultaneously enforcing standards one has to meet to be valid, i.e., homonormativity creates an environment of simultaneous freedom and oppression. Homonormativity that was developed by the liberal faction influenced the way that people within the community thought about themselves and their actions because they want to conform to the standard placed on them. The creation of homonormativity and the active practice of admonishing those who do not fit into that framework is an influence of people's ideology because it shapes perceptions in, "such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things because they can see and imagine no

alternative to it” (Lukes 2021, 33). In other words: the creation of trans- and homonormativities influences the way people think about the LGBTQ+ community.

As far as lobbying, Frank Kameny’s interactions with the ACLU do provide a compelling potential for positively influencing ideology. In 1958, the ACLU, “was on record supporting the constitutionality of sanctions against homosexuality because...the government had the right to regulate behavior” (D’Emilio 1983, 48). However, in 1962 Frank Kameny convinced the ACLU to instigate legal challenges to the ban on homosexual employment in the Civil Service Commission (D’Emilio 1983, 155). While there is no way to know for sure if Kameny was able to change the ideology of the ACLU or if the organization had changed its mind on its own via internal processes, but the potential for the exercise of third dimensional power does exist with Mattachine’s interactions with the ACLU.

Zaps also show the liberal faction positively influencing people’s ideology. By getting the American Psychological Association to remove homosexuality from their list of mental disorders and being able to defend homosexuality in front of a national audience, the GAA influenced ideology. Conventional “wisdom” during this time said that homosexuality was a disease, a sin, a manifestation of leading an unethical life (Rubenstein 1995, Abstract). Through the removal of homosexuality from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, homosexuality was no longer seen by professionals, as a psychopathy and paved the way for future generations to no longer see homosexuality as a mental disorder, which is liberal action influencing people’s ideology (Turner 2017). Zaps in general influenced people’s ideology. As eloquently provided by Jim Fouratt at the founding meeting of the GAA, “Sweet? Bullshit! There’s the stereotype homo again, man! . . . Bullshit! That’s the role society has been forcing these queens to play, and they just sit and accept it”, in other words, society thought gay people to be weak and ineffectual (Teal

1971, 28). However, the zaps changed society's mind. Gay people were showing society that they were neither weak nor ineffectual because they were fighting against government sanctioned oppression and winning (Faderman 2015). This facilitated a change in society's attitude towards gay people because society was seeing gay people fight the system and win.

Through a public interview, the Gay Activists Alliance was also able to change society's minds about lesbians. Society had this idea that lesbian activism was nothing to take seriously, that lesbians were less important than gay men (Marotta 1983, 286). However, the interview with *Jack Paar Tonight* helped change that notion. Not only was a lesbian able to voice her experience on national television, she did so after Jack Paar tried to silence her (ibid). The Gay Activists Alliance knew that lesbian activism was nothing to ignore, so they made sure a lesbian was included in the first opportunity to get visibility for experiences of the LGBTQ+ community. Through the inclusion of women in the GAA, society's outlook on lesbians changed. The interview showed the world the role lesbians played in an ever-growing social movement that was fighting against government sanctioned oppression and winning (Capsuto 2020).

The reason the liberal faction is unable to consistently wield positive power over others' ideology is the issues it decides to act on. With few exceptions, the liberal faction concerns itself with symptoms of the phenomena, e.g., homophobia, which gives rise to the issues the liberal faction combats (Vaid 1995, 75). Working within the third dimension of power means influencing people's ideologies and the way they think (Lukes 2021, 34). Without combating the root causes of the disparate treatment faced by the LGBTQ+ community, the ability of the liberal faction to work within the third dimension of power is limited because the root causes of the disparate treatment are ideological. Homophobia, transphobia, etc. are all ideologies that people use to view society, see what an ideal world looks like, and form policy opinions from. By

focusing on the consequences of these ideological phenomena, the liberal faction is not able to work positively in the third dimension because ideology is not being influenced in a way that frees people from oppression. The majority of the third dimensional power wielded by the liberal faction has been negative because while it does create an environment with less of a stigma surrounding LGBTQ+ identities, that environment is also oppressive if those identities are not reified in a way that conforms to the normativity that has been created.

Power in the Progressive Faction

Unlike the liberal faction, the progressive faction has the capacity to consistently wield influence over observable action, agenda setting, and positive influence over ideology in the framework provided by Lukes (2021). Through the action of the progressive faction, people acted in ways they otherwise would not, items have been placed on agendas, and ideology has gone through a metamorphosis.

Power Over Observable Action

The actions of the progressive faction have gotten people to behave in ways that they otherwise would not have, both in and out of positions of authority. Influence over observable action is something that has been exercised by the progressive faction since its inception.

When the Gay Liberation Front was still a member of the progressive faction of the movement, it espoused diametrically opposed ideals and strategies for social change than what had been utilized by Mattachine and the DOB. Through a desire to be inclusive and return to grassroots organizing, the Gay Liberation Front undoubtedly got people in the LGBTQ+ community involved in the Gay Movement because it was more welcoming for people who did not fit the rigid conceptualization of the ideal homosexual and homosexual activism that was sought by the GLF's predecessors (Marotta 1981, 91). While the Gay Liberation Front does sit

squarely in the liberal faction, it was not always this way. For the first year and a half of its existence the GLF was a progressive organization.

Getting people to join the movement and become activists were not the only ways the progressive faction was able to influence behavior. Lavender Menace was able to get the National Organization for Women to recognize the inherent intersectionality that exist within lesbians (Marotta 1981, 244). Lavender Menace got NOW to change their attitudes towards lesbians and incorporate their struggles in the greater Women's Movement. The Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization was also able to influence behavior. Through the work of TAO transgender issues were brought into the political realm (Meyerowitz 2004, 238). By organizing, campaigning, and some lobbying, TAO was able to get California's Peace and Freedom party to add a plank to its platform calling for complete bodily autonomy to allow people to transition with as little governmental burden as possible (ibid).

The litany of ways the progressive faction has been able to reify first dimensional power is best exemplified by the AIDS Activism. Both the Gay Men's Health Crisis and the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power increased the number of activists in the movement, changed professional practices, and changed social responses to issues affecting society (Schulman 2019, 9). These activities, which are detailed below, are exercises of first dimensional power because they influence behavior.

When the progressive faction started organizing around the AIDS crisis, they helped members of the gay community realize that, even if they could pass as straight, they needed to do something to help (Ghaziani 2008, 80-81). Because the progressive faction of the movement had coupled AIDS with gayness, people who otherwise would not have been involved in the movement started showing up to ACT UP meetings, joined the Gay Men's Health Crisis, and

participated in public demonstrations (ibid). ACT UP also protested the progress in AIDS research and treatment being frustratingly slow and ineffective. These demonstrations served as a catalyst for renewed research and increased access to AIDS treatment by getting treatment providers to lower the cost of treatment (Schulman 2021, 9). Perhaps the most important work of first dimensional power was getting the NIH and FDA to move away from a one-pill AIDS treatment strategy and looking into multi-pill treatments (Schulman 2019, 9).

ACT UP was also able to get people with AIDS health insurance coverage by advocating for an end to the policy that prevented HIV positive people from being covered, which changed people's behaviors because more people with AIDS were finally able to access medical care and medical staff treated more people with AIDS due to the former finally being able to access health insurance and healthcare. The Women's Caucus of ACT UP was also able to combat dangerous misinformation provided by medical professionals and got medical professionals to change how AIDS was viewed and how it would show up in women (Schulman 2019, 247; Brier 2009, 173). By protesting and fighting with medical professionals, the Women's Caucus was able to get women included in clinical trials, something that had been actively resisted for years and provided a means of conducting gender inclusive research into AIDS and AIDS treatment (ibid). ACT UP's activism not only had power over people's behavior in regards to the AIDS crisis, but the entire medical field. Inadvertently, the progressive faction also helped change patient advocacy within healthcare by convincing medical practitioners and people studying AIDS to listen to the needs of their patients (Aizenman 2019).

In the Contemporary Era there is also influence over observable action to be seen in Southerners on New Ground and Familia: Trans Queer Liberation Movement. Most of the work done by these organizations is reminiscent of Lavender Menace's. SONG's main activity is

training other organizations and movements to integrate combatting homophobia and transphobia in their work (“Our Mission, Vision & History” 2022). In addition to training other organizations and movements, SONG is able to get people in rural areas to become LGBTQ+ activists, which is something that may have never been considered before because of how little attention is given to LGBTQ+ people in rural areas (ibid). Familia are able to get queer and/or trans Latinxs to use resources they otherwise would not have because now queer and trans friendly options are available (“Programs - Familia: TQLM”, n.d.).

Power Over Agenda Setting

Along with influencing behaviors, the progressive faction has been able to influence agendas (Marotta 1981; D’Emilio 1983; Faderman 2015; Schulman 2019). One of the first instances of the progressive faction influencing an agenda happened in regards to research. By creating the Gender Identity Clinic and the Harry Benjamin Foundation (now the World Professional Association for Transgender Health) the Erickson Educational Foundation created more agenda items for research surrounding the reification and manifestation of gender (Nownes 2019, 27). Additionally, EEF created ways for people to access transgender specific healthcare, which put accessing that care on people’s agendas (Nownes 2019, 18). In the Gay Liberation Era Lavender Menace forced NOW to expand their scope of who they included in their activism, which inherently changed that organization’s agenda (Marotta 1981, 244).

AIDS activism shows much of this faction’s ability to influence agendas. The Gay Men’s Health Crisis provided many services to people with AIDS and the gay community that several people provided and joined, which put items on people’s agendas because there was finally a concerted effort to combat the AIDS crisis and help people who had the disease have some comfort in their final days (Faderman 2015, 419). GMHC created a hotline for people to call,

made it easier to access a community of people, and was able to recruit lawyers to help those with AIDS fight evictions or set up their estate (ibid). By creating resources for people with AIDS, GMHC put providing, accessing, and utilizing those services on the agendas of people in the community.

ACT UP had a wider range of influence over agenda setting during the AIDS crisis. ACT UP did put providing and accessing services on people's agendas, but they also influenced the agenda of AIDS research and treatment as well as the agenda of research into diseases. Just like the GMHC before, ACT UP provided community services to those with AIDS, which put providing and accessing those services on people's agenda (Schulman 2019, 9). However, ACT UP was able to expand the scope of their agenda setting power to influence agendas of government organizations and publications, which is seen in the organization's demonstrations outside of the headquarters of the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health as well as the Women's Caucus' protests of *Cosmopolitan*. Through protests and demonstrations ACT UP was able to put research into AIDS, finding treatments for AIDS, and moving towards a multi-drug treatment strategy on the agenda of the FDA and the NIH. The Women's Caucus in ACT UP was focused on removing medical disinformation from the media and research into how AIDS affects women (Schulman 2019, 385-87; Brier 2009, 173). Protesting *Cosmo* and the head of the CDC's HIV Surveillance Project achieved both of the aforementioned goals and put publishing accurate medical information on the agenda of media outlets and research into women and AIDS on the agenda of the CDC (ibid).

Power over agenda setting in the Contemporary Era comes from organizations like SONG because it works to expand the scope of what other organizations and movements are doing ("Our Mission, Vision & History" 2022). By making other organizations and movements

aware of how they can integrate working against anti-LGBTQ+ phenomena and ideologies in their work, items are being placed on others' agendas.

Power Over Ideology

Unlike its liberal counterpart, the progressive faction is able to consistently influence public ideology, which shows power in the third dimension (Lukes 2021, 33). The reason that progressive faction is able to work in the third dimension more consistently than its liberal counterpart comes from the creation of alternative institutions that are run by members of the community that prioritize the needs of the LGBTQ+ community over the comfort of heterosexual society. The earliest example of this in the progressive faction is *ONE*. Through criticizing the liberal turn of Mattachine and publishing progressive ideas about the direction the Gay Movement needed to take, *ONE* was able to help keep the spark of progressive action alive during the early days of the movement (D'Emilio 1983, 87). Even though *ONE* was focused on ideological influence in the community, their actions are still situated in the third dimension because they were working to combat the ideological shift that was able to facilitate a return to militant strategies in Mattachine (D'Emilio 1983, 151). The Erickson Educational Foundation also exercised third dimensional power via the alternative institutions it created. Through the creation of the Gender Identity Clinic and the Harry Benjamin Foundation, EEF was able to help change people's conception of gender to create a more tolerant society for trans individuals (Nownes 2019, 18).

Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries continued the work of making a more tolerant society to members of the LGBTQ+ community. STAR was one of the earliest consistent producers of queer theory to challenge the notion of cisgender/heterosexualnormativity as ideal tenants in society (Cohen 2009, 95-103). STAR also combated the idea that trans people,

especially trans people of color, are objectionable members of society via providing housing to “street people” and distributing literature about transgenderism to cisgender society (Cohen 2009, 92-93). Again, even though STAR worked internally instead of externally, this is still power over ideology. The aim of STAR’s actions was to change the transphobic ideology that had imbued itself in the Gay Movement (Daum 2020, 5). Lavender Menace was also able to influence ideology, though they focused on changing the ideology surrounding lesbianism in the Women's Movement; LM was able to change the Women's Movement ideology by distributing literature and sharing their lived experiences at the second congress to unite women in 1970 (Faderman 2015, 236-43). This change in ideology facilitated an expansion of the scope of social activism taken on by the Women's Movement (ibid). There is also a potential that TAO was able to influence ideology, but not much is known about the impact of its actions (Nownes 2019, 21; Meyerowitz 2004, 240-41).

As with the other dimensions of power, the progressive faction’s work in the third dimension can be elucidated during the AIDS crisis. The actions of ACT UP against the FDA, NIH, CDC, the Catholic Church, etc. are just one aspect of the organization’s ability to work within the third dimension of power, specifically through the use of die-ins (Aizenman 2019). The die-ins took place mainly at churches and government institutions responsible for addressing AIDS. It happened at the former because of clergy’s opposition to the use of condoms, which helped AIDS spread like a wildfire, and it happened at the latter because of their decision to ignore the epidemic and gay advocacy (ibid). This tactic brought the institutions and people face to face with the very consequences of their actions. While people only feigned death at die-ins, it still sent the very real message of the severity of the disease and it helped humanize the group most likely to be infected because they showed society what it is like to live with AIDS (ibid).

Other forms of protest and demonstrations also allowed the organization to influence people's ideology. ACT UP getting society and the government to recognize the impact AIDS had on gay people and the consequences of the paralysis around society's response helped facilitate a change in the way people thought about the disease. The demonstrations outside of the FDA and NIH worked within the third dimension because they helped reconceptualize AIDS and gay people as worthy of attention (Schulman 2019, 9). Media created by ACT UP also works within third dimensional power. Through powerful messages like "Silence=Death" and posters of President Reagan with the phrase "AIDSGATE" on them, ACT UP was able to get people to realize how big of a deal the AIDS crisis was and the effect that it caused within the community especially by equating the government paralysis around the response to AIDS with the most prominent government scandal to date (Ghaziani 2008, 82). Most importantly though, the media created by ACT UP showed the humanity, the anger, the fear, and the love of the LGBTQ+ community (Gould 2009).

ACT UP getting the insurance exclusion for people with AIDS removed, the Women's Caucus fighting with the Centers for Disease Control because of the inherent exclusion of women from what was considered AIDS, their fight with the Catholic Church, and so much more of ACT UP's actions all had one of the same consequences: destigmatization of gay identities through mitigating the shame tied to homosexuality. The actions taken by ACT UP show people mobilizing around a stigmatized identity and publicly fighting for their lives because society refused to (Gould 2009, 55). ACT UP fundamentally changed the way government run health agencies, society, and even the community itself saw LGBTQ+ identities (Gould 2009, 5). The AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power fought against homophobia as well as flawed social conceptions of homosexuality and emerged semi-victorious.

The progressive organizations in the Contemporary Era have continued the legacy of combating homophobia. The Sylvia Rivera Law Project and FORGE are both fighting against homophobia and transphobia with relative success. The SRLP works in the third dimension by providing legal assistance to people of color and low-income individuals who experience discrimination based on gender or gender expression, provides trainings, public education, and utilizes policy reform to change a society built around excluding them (“Our Approach and Principles/Nuestras Práctica y Principios”, n.d.). Through the legal assistance provided by the Sylvia Rivera Law Project, the way the court system analyzes transgender issues has gone through a metamorphosis because of their inclusion in the institution, which helps change transphobic ideology that has woven itself into the court system (Benjamin 2013, 109-10). The trainings and education provided by SRLP is able to combat homophobic and transphobic ideologies that exist in those who provide social services (Hatch et al. 2016, 7-9).

FORGE does much of the same non-legal work as the SRLP does with the addition of creating support resources for LGBTQ+ youth. Trainings provided by FORGE help combat the transphobic ideology used by those who provide services to providers of anti-violence services (Pyne 2011). The epitome of progressive organizing in the Contemporary Era works within the third dimension of power and changes the way that society, people, and businesses see members of the LGBTQ+ community. The result of influencing people’s ideology as the SRLP and FORGE do means that they also influence people’s observable behavior. Through the education and trainings provided by both organizations, people are able to combat internalized homophobia, transphobia, and correct their biases of both people of color and low-income individuals, which translates to people behaving in ways they would not had they not received the trainings or education (Hatch et al. 2016, 7-9).

SONG is able to influence ideology as well. Through focusing on how oppression on the basis of race, class, and gender are interconnected, SONG can fundamentally influence and change the ideology of other movements and organizations because they have that additional epistemic frame to view the world (“Our Mission, Vision & History” 2022). SONG provides ideological supplements to other organizations and movements to show how interconnected oppression is and how to effectively mitigate it.

Conclusion

Both the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement have the ability to consistently influence people’s observable behavior and others’ agendas which means they both regularly work within the first and second dimensions of power (Lukes 2021, 21 and 25). However, the ability of the liberal faction to influence ideology has different consequences when compared to its progressive counterpart. While the liberal faction has been able to positively influence others’ ideology, there is no longevity to that influence, meaning the liberal faction has a weakened ability to work in the third dimension of power (Lukes 2021, 33). On the other hand, the progressive faction works consistently and positively in the third dimension of power because they are able to weaken systemic and local homophobia and transphobia both internal and external to the movement (ibid). One of the main causes of this discrepancy is the exclusion and institutional reliance that has been seen to permeate the liberal faction’s activism. The creation of normativities that is seemingly ubiquitous in the liberal faction has served as an excluding force that gives greater society an expectation to hold the actions of members of the LGBTQ+ community to and when those expectations are not met, society expects the individual to change to fit in instead of changing itself to make room for the individual (Vaid 1995, 4-6). The liberal reliance on institutions also prevents it from influencing ideology because one cannot

influence systems to change themselves, especially when it means weakening its power (Vaid 1995, 106).

This analysis of power not only revealed a discrepancy in the capacity for power in the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ movement, it also describes the kinds of changes the factions can make. Because the liberal faction can consistently work in the first and second dimension of power, it can only address individual issues as they show up instead of proactively working to prevent inequality and inequity in society. Additionally, the negative influences over ideology the liberal faction has demonstrated created an environment of simultaneous freedom and oppression. Since the progressive faction can work positively within all three dimensions of power, it is able to address issues as they appear and work proactively to stop inequality and inequity because it weakens the ideological forces like homophobia and transphobia that lead to inequality and inequity.

The above analysis of power in the liberal and progressive factions may lead some to think that one faction is more powerful than the other overall or in regards to one specific dimension; however, that is not an accurate way of looking at the power held by what has grown to be the LGBTQ+ Movement. The two factions' capacities of power are complimentary. The liberal faction is focused more on immediate change through influencing those currently in power, whereas the progressive faction is focusing its efforts on long term change by influencing future policy makers. These different foci working in tandem help usher in continuous, sustainable change and does not mean that one is more powerful or better than the other.

Chapter Five- Justice in the LGBTQ+ Movement

The framework of power, justice, and knowledge introduced in chapter one is a useful way to examine the effective change brought by the actions of the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement. This chapter will provide a review of Rawls' (1958; 1971; 2001) conception of justice as fairness and Fraser (1997) and Honneth's (2004) formulation of justice as recognition and redistribution. As mentioned in chapter one, the lens of justice allows for an evaluation of how effective the change brought by social movements is because social movements mobilize to make life more just for marginalized people, i.e., social movements are in the pursuit of justice (Thompson 2002, 721). By looking through a lens of justice, one can see how effective the change social movements have brought is at providing justice for their constituency. The analysis of justice in the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement will show that, similar to the reification of power, the liberal faction's capacity to provide justice is not as strong as its progressive counterpart's. The liberal faction has a limited ability to provide universal justice for the LGBTQ+ community under either formulation of the concept; however, the progressive faction has established a better ability to provide universal justice for their community through both fairness and recognition and redistribution.

Justice Revisited

Justice as fairness aims to create a society where everyone has just as much access to society by increasing the fairness of the practices of political and social institutions (Rawls 1958, 164-65). The criteria for measuring the fairness of said institutions are known as the Principles of Justice of which there are two: 1) everyone has the same infeasible claim to fully adequate

equal and basic liberties and 2) social and economic inequalities need to be: a) attached to offices and positions open to everyone and b) to the greatest benefit of society's disadvantaged members (Rawls 2001, 42). To Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) justice is achieved by giving everyone the same scheme of basic rights and liberties, the ability to hold office and influence election outcomes, and have any social and economic inequality be to the benefit of the least advantaged, which will create faire practices in political and social institutions. Justice as recognition and redistribution conceptualized by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004) is focused less on symptoms of inequality, e.g., gay people not being eligible for employment with the Civil Service Commission, and more on its causes, e.g., homophobia. The crux of justice as recognition and redistribution is combating phenomena that create injustices in the first place (Fraser 1997, 11; Honneth 2004, 352). Recognition is a requisite to provide a redistribution of rights, benefits, and privileges provided to people in society (Fraser 1997; Honneth 2004).

Justice and the Liberal Faction

The liberal faction is only able to provide limited justice, either as fairness or recognition and redistribution, to the LGBTQ+ community because of the exclusion that defines it. The liberal faction for the most part is only able to provide justice to the privileged members of their community because it is the most privileged members of the LGBTQ+ community that are able to have a claim to the same inalienable rights and liberties to those granted outside of the community due to intersectionality being ignored (Runyan 2018). Additionally, social and economic inequalities that remain in place after policy change advocated by the liberal faction are not being made to be to the benefit of the most disadvantaged, in fact any eradication of social and economic inequalities fought for by the liberal faction are done so at the expense of the least advantaged. Furthermore, there was a time when the liberal faction had the capacity to

provide justice as recognition and redistribution, but ever since the AIDS crisis, liberal activism's ability to provide justice as recognition and redistribution. .

Justice as Fairness

Since its creation in 1958, Rawls' (1958; 1971; 2001) conception of justice has always been institutionally based, "Justice as a virtue of particular actions or of persons I do not take up at all" (Rawls 1958, 164-65). Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) focuses his conception of justice on political and legal systems. Just as the liberal faction focuses on working within political and social institutions, so does Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001). The liberal faction's activism has been almost all done within political or social institutions, so much so that working within institutions is a defining feature of the faction. The first major public political action of the liberal faction was the Dale Jennings trial in 1952 and it was entirely focused on making fairer criminal justice and legal systems for homosexuals (D'Emilio 1983, 70). The liberal faction's activism aimed at changing institutional practices is something that has continued well into the Contemporary Era (Faderman 2015; Wolfson n.d.a; Daum 2020). The liberal faction adopted justice as fairness' (Rawls 1958; 1971; 2001) framework to achieve justice for the LGBTQ+ community, which is exemplified by its reliance on political and social institutions.

Along with the commonality of working through political and social institutions, the liberal faction's political activism roughly aligns with the First Principle of justice as fairness (Rawls 1958; 1971; 2001). The first principle is, "Each person has the same inalienable claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme of liberties for all" (Rawls 2001, 70-71). Here is where the justice provided by the liberal faction potentially strays a little bit from the provided framework. The exclusion that helps define liberal organizations arguably prevents their activism from aligning with the first principle

of justice because it categorically prevents some people from having access to the infeasible claim that liberal activism provides other people; however, the liberal faction is working on making sure that people cannot be excluded on account of their sexuality or, just recently, status as transgender (Faderman 2015; Daum 2020). While the liberal faction's activism does not encompass everyone, it is doing its part to make sure that, "Each person has the same infeasible claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme of liberties for all," (Rawls 2001, 42; Faderman 2015). After all, it is the *LGBTQ+* Movement and its activism centers around *LGBTQ+* specific issues so that the community can have access to the same rights and liberties as those who are not in the community.

Rawls' (1958; 1971; 2001) Second Principle, which concerns the distribution of social and economic inequalities, as mentioned above, has two parts. The first part is "[social and economic inequalities] are to be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality and opportunity" (Rawls 2001, 42). The liberal faction, once again by working through institutions, has created and mobilized a lavender vote that helps create equality of opportunity amongst the *LGBTQ+* community to have their voices heard in all levels of government (Faderman 2015, 266-278). Additionally, the Victory Fund was created specifically to help people in the *LGBTQ+* community get elected to public office ("Our History – *LGBTQ* Victory Fund", n.d.). The liberal faction has done a good job providing a, "fair equality of opportunity" in elections and access to elected offices amongst the *LGBTQ+* community (Rawls 2001, 42). However, the second part of the second principle is where the liberal faction diverges from the framework. Due to the liberal faction excluding and dropping protections for the least-advantaged members of the *LGBTQ+* community, which was seen in Mattachine's

activism, activism surrounding trans rights, and as recently as the decision in *Bostock*, the liberal faction's ability to make social and economic inequalities be to the benefit of the least advantaged members of the community is non-existent (D'Emilio 1983, 92-93; Daum 2020; Marcus 2020). The liberal faction's penchant for exclusion is to the detriment, not benefit, of the least advantaged members of the LGBTQ+ community.

The answer to the question "does the liberal faction provide justice as fairness to the LGBTQ+ community?" is complicated. The liberal faction, just like justice as fairness (Rawls 1958; 1971; 2001), is focused on working through institutions to make their practices fairer by creating a more even distribution of benefits and burdens (Faderman 2015). Additionally, the liberal faction is working to ensure that, "Each person has the same inalienable claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic liberties, which scheme is compatible with the same scheme of liberties for all," by adding sexuality and, just recently, status as transgender to civil rights laws (ibid; Rawls 2001, 42). Through creating a consciousness of a lavender vote and organizing to get members of the LGBTQ+ community elected to public office the liberal faction has opened up and strengthened the ability for members of the LGBTQ+ community to hold public office and affect the outcome of elections (Faderman 2015). Where the activism of the liberal faction diverges from Rawls' (1958; 1971; 2001) conception of justice is the second part of the Second Principle because of the liberal faction's defining feature of exclusion. The exclusion taken on by the liberal faction prevents them from working to make social and economic inequalities benefit the least advantaged members of the LGBTQ+ community. The liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement does provide justice as fairness to its community, but in a semi-limited capacity because of its penchant for exclusion prevents it from satisfying the second part of the Second Principle.

Justice as Recognition and Redistribution

Justice as recognition and redistribution developed by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004) is also present in the liberal faction, though to a limited extent. With the exception of the reading groups sponsored by Mattachine, the series of zaps on the American Psychological Association to recognize homosexuality as a valid expression of human sexuality, and the inclusion of a woman on *Jack Paar Tonight*, the justice provided to the LGBTQ+ community by the liberal faction of the movement is limited and existential. Just like justice as fairness, those who the liberal faction provided justice for tend to be cisgender, white, homosexual, and male. Once again, this is the direct result of exclusion within the liberal faction.

The liberal faction was more apt at allowing injustice to flourish in the movement in the framework provided by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004). The exclusion of women in the first two eras of the movement by and large prevented Mattachine, the Gay Liberation Front, and the Gay Activists Alliance from providing justice as fairness to the entire gay community. By not recognizing the unique issues that faced women, like a lack of economic freedom, several organizations in the liberal faction in the first two eras of the Gay Movement were unable to provide justice as recognition and redistribution to lesbians. Neither the organizations nor society could recognize the unique issues faced by homosexual women, which prevented a universal redistribution of rights, benefits, and privileges that were provided during those eras because the economic and social domination of women was not addressed or even recognized, which prevented justice as fairness from being achieved universally (D'Emilio 1983, 92; Kissack 1995, 110-12; Fraser 1997, 13).

Non-recognition continued into the AIDS era. Because the liberal faction framed AIDS as a human problem instead of a gay problem that implied being gay and being human were

mutually exclusive helped prevent gay people from being seen as people during the AIDS crisis, which only served to further oppression (Vaid 1995, 75). The Contemporary Era still facilitates non-recognition. The Human Rights Campaign was perfectly fine with the government not recognizing transgender issues and the HRC and Freedom to Marry helped keep non-recognition of untraditional families alive, which also facilitates misrecognition of these family structures because they are misrecognized as not a family (Schindler 2007; Wolfson n.d.a; Kacere 2015). Furthermore, the liberal faction is awash with misrecognition that helped strengthen the domination of people in the LGBTQ+ community. Misrecognition starts with the Daughters of Bilitis as they refused to accurately recognize butch women, women with blue collar jobs, and women who participated in the bar scene as valid lesbians by seeing them as “[women] who had been living pretty much as a transvestite most of her life” (D’Emilio 1983, 106). The consequence of this misrecognition only served to further the misogyny that continues to oppress women to this day because of the maintenance of gender normativity. Misrecognition continues to this day as a result of liberal activism by creating legal frameworks where bisexual individuals are recognized as gay or straight depending on the gender of their partner. By being complicit in the non/mis-recognition, the liberal faction is helping maintain the cause(s) of domination (homophobia, transphobia, etc.) that lead to the oppression of the LGBTQ+ community.

None of this is to say that justice as recognition and redistribution was not present in these organizations. The reading groups sponsored by Mattachine were able to provide the homosexual community with the tools to recognize that they are a community (Marotta 1981,71). That is justice because there was a fundamental shift in the way people recognized themselves (ibid). The zaps carried out against the American Psychological Association were able to provide justice to the gay community because homosexuality was recognized as a valid

expression of human sexuality instead of as a pathology and indicator of a moral deficiency by the APA and greater society (Turner 2017). The Gay Activists Alliance fighting for the inclusion of a lesbian to go on *Jack Paar Tonight* was able to get society to recognize that lesbians are facing a unique set of issues that cannot be brushed off (Marotta 1983, 286; Capsuto 2020). These actions were able to provide justice as recognition because the domination causing the aforementioned oppression was recognized and resources were redistributed to weaken the cause of the domination (Fraser 1997, 11).

At one time the liberal faction was able to provide justice as fairness. By Mattachine getting the homosexual community to recognize that they are a community, the GAA getting the APA and greater society to recognize homosexuality as a valid expression of human sexuality, and the GAA getting society to recognize the unique set of issues faced by lesbians that cannot be brushed off, the liberal faction was able to provide justice as recognition and redistribution because they were able to weaken the homophobia and misogyny that kept them oppressed. Unfortunately, that time came to a close in the mid-1980s (Vaid 1995, 75). Via its response to AIDS and activism in the Contemporary Era, the liberal faction seems to have lost the ability to provide justice as recognition and redistribution to the LGBTQ+ community because it perpetuates and is complicit in non/mis-recognition. The liberal faction has started to actively work against creating a just society as defined by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004) because of their acceptance and perpetuation of non/mis-recognition. However, some recent activism suggests there is a liberal revival of providing justice as recognition and redistribution.

Justice and the Progressive Faction

The progressive faction's strategies allow for a universal extension of justice to the LGBTQ+ community. When it comes to justice as fairness the progressive faction's activism

satisfies the First and Second Principles of Justice that allow for fairer practices of political and social institutions. However, there is a fundamental tenet in Rawls' (1958; 1971; 2001) theory that what is just for one person is just for the next, but that is not true because people's identities put them on different proverbial playing fields that require different criteria to be met for justice to exist (Crenshaw 1989). The progressive faction is able to provide justice as recognition and redistribution as defined by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004) because they are able to get society and other parts of the movement to recognize the oppression and domination experienced by the LGBTQ+ community that allows for the weakening of a social, institutional, or cultural failing that made the oppression and domination possible.

Justice as Fairness

The progressive faction's activism is able to satisfy the two Principles of Justice put forth by Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001). Lavender Menace is a wonderful example of the progressive faction providing an infeasible claim to the same equal and basic liberties as everyone else. In the 1970s, lesbians had been excluded from both the Gay and Women's Movements (Faderman 2015, 233-247). To rectify this exclusion Lavender Menace worked within the Women's Movement to get them to pay attention to lesbian problems and they were successful. Due to the work of LM lesbians had access to the equal and basic right of redress that had been enjoyed by heterosexual women and gay men (Marotta 1981, 244).

The progressive faction has mostly stayed out of electoral politics and activism, so they have not actively fought for LGBTQ+ people to have the ability to run for office or have influence over election outcomes. The progressive faction's activism does make social and economic inequalities work to the benefit of the least advantaged members of the community. For example, STAR's activism focused unequally on trans women of color, but it was the trans

women of color who were, and continue to be, the least advantaged members of the LGBTQ+ community. Additionally, the progressive response to AIDS focused on those with the disease as opposed to those who had not gotten it. While there is some inequality in the activism of the progressive faction it is done to benefit the least privileged members of the community.

While the progressive faction is able to satisfy the Principles of Justice, it has fundamental disagreements with the way justice is brought about and having a list of criteria that would provide justice to everyone. The progressive faction does not believe that justice comes from political or social institutions because that is the most basic cause of continued oppression for the LGBTQ+ community (Cohen 2013, 80). The progressive faction, unlike Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) does not operate from a top-down approach to social change (ibid). Additionally, the progressive faction fundamentally disagrees with there being one set of criteria that can provide universal justice because it knows that there is a difference in the needs of a white, cisgender, gay, man and a Black, transgender, bisexual, woman and justice for the former does not equal justice for the latter (Cohen 2013). Justice as fairness attempts to create normativity and the progressive faction is staunchly against any kind of normativity (Rawls 2001, 14-15; Cohen 2013).

When it comes to justice as fairness, the progressive faction is situated interestingly. It works to provide those in the community with an indefeasible claim to basic rights and liberties enjoyed by those outside of the community and works to make sure that any inequality in the movement affects the most privileged members; however, it rejects the fundamental idea that justice can be achieved through political and social institutions because they have helped codify homophobia, transphobia, misogyny, etc. into society (Cohen 2013). The progressive faction also disagrees with there being a list of criteria that can ensure justice for everyone because it

recognizes how different identities, either working alone or in tandem, affect the way people interact with the world and builds subjectivity into its work. The answer to “does the progressive faction provide justice as fairness to the LGBTQ+ community?”, the answer is not so simple. While its activism does align with the two Principles of Justices, it rejects the central idea of justice being achieved from the top down and the objective criteria to provide justice. The answer to the aforementioned question is yes; the progressive faction can provide justice as fairness to the LGBTQ+ community, but not in the way Rawls (1958, 1971, 2001) had in mind.

Justice as Recognition and Redistribution

The progressive faction is able to consistently provide justice as recognition and redistribution to the LGBTQ+ community because of its conscious practice of inclusion. With the inclusion practiced by the progressive faction comes an inherent understanding and acknowledgement of any lacunae that currently exist. Along with the progressive organizations recognizing exclusion and its harms, they worked internally and externally to get both the movement and society to accurately recognize what homosexuality is and what being trans is.

Internally, both *ONE* and Lavender Menace tried to get, respectively, the Gay Movement and the Women’s Movement to recognize lacunae in their activism. *ONE* worked to show Mattachine and the DOB that they were not doing enough for homosexuals because of their exclusion and went to turn to non-homosexual professionals as experts (D’Emilio 1983, 81). *ONE* was arguably successful at getting Mattachine to recognize their activism was doing much of anything by helping influence Frank Kameny to join the movement, which facilitated a shift in Mattachine’s activism that was more hands on than anything done post-1952 (D’Emilio 1983, 149). Furthermore, Lavender Menace got the Women’s Movement to recognize the unique situatedness of lesbians because they are at the intersection of two marginalized communities

(Marotta 1983 244). Both *ONE* and Lavender Menace worked internally to get, respectively, the Gay Movement and the Women's Movement to recognize flaws in their activism, which allowed for a redistribution of resources to address those flaws (D'Emilio 1983, 149; Faderman 2015, 233).

Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries also focused its energy more internally, but not in a way that was similar to the activism of *ONE* or LM. Sylvia Rivera and Marsha P. Johnson recognized that as long as the Gay and Women's movement were run by cisgender people, the needs of the transgender community would not be met, so they created STAR (Daum 2020, 5). STAR's goal was to focus on the, "Practical needs of gay and transgender people" (Nownes 2019, 21). To achieve this, STAR sheltered those who would have otherwise been left on the streets, which provided "objectionable members" of society a way to escape a reliance on drugs and sex work as well as receive gender affirmation (Cohen 2009, 90). STAR's activism addressed issues facing transgender individuals, particularly trans women of color, who had been disregarded by the Gay Movement and the Women's Movement.

Working externally to get society to recognize what homosexuality and transness is and the issues facing people in those communities is something that the progressive faction has been doing since the early days of the movement. The Erickson Educational Foundation was run by a trans man who recognized society's gaps in providing support for the transgender community and worked to get trans people the recognition they deserved. EEF founded organizations that would conduct and share research on what gender is as well as work to provide gender affirming care to transgender individuals (Nownes 2019, 27; Pettis 2015). EEF recognized the needs of transgender people who had been excluded from the movement and society; EEF worked to provide a redistribution of both the movement's and society's resources to meet those needs.

Working on getting greater society to recognize people for who they are and the issues they face has stayed with the progressive faction. The Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization actively worked to rectify the injustice they had recognized and fought to include the trans community in any redistribution of rights, benefits, and privileges that had been given to gay community (Meyerowitz 2004, 239). TAO also worked to get society to correctly recognize transgender individuals through their publications *Mirage* and *Moonshadow* (“Angela Lynn Douglas and Transsexual Action Organization | ONE Archives”, n.d.).

Justice as recognition and redistribution was ubiquitous in AIDS activism. GMHC and ACT UP recognized the harms of the paralysis surrounding the response to AIDS and they took action by providing resources for those who were affected by the disease (Shilts 1987; Schulman 2019). During the height of the AIDS crisis, both the GMHC and ACT UP organized, protested, and fought to get society to recognize the impact that AIDS was having on society in an effort to redistribute resources to combat the pandemic (Shilts 1987; Schulman 2019). Additionally, ACT UP worked to get the FDA, NIH, and CDC to recognize how their bureaucratic structure was killing people and there needed to be a restructuring of the process to save lives (Schulman 2019, 9). Furthermore, media created by ACT UP along with their novel demonstrations and protests helped society recognize gay people as human instead of as people who were morally flawed and working to end western culture (Aizenman 2019). All of the work surrounding AIDS activism by the Gay Men’s Health Crisis and the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power was about recognizing the short comings of society and trying to get society to do the same.

Progressive organizing and action in the Contemporary Era has provided justice as recognition and redistribution through providing legal aid, education, and training. Dean Spade recognized that low income trans people and trans people of color were essentially barred from

society because they had very little access to redress in systems that were created without room for them (Benjamin 2013, 107). Beyond assisting low income trans people and trans people of color, SRLP hosts educational and training sessions for service providers so they can recognize the unique needs of the transgender community and provide them adequate support and resources (“Trainings and Speaking Engagements | SRLP”, n.d.). The goal of FORGE’s work is the same as the educational and training sessions of SRLP: it wants to get society to recognize trans people for who they are, the barriers that exist in living as trans (“Trainings – FORGE,” n.d.). Additionally, SONG and Familia have recognized the need for a transition to a purposeful integration of intersectionality in social movements that allows oppression to be holistically weakened as a result of that incorporation (“Our Mission, Vision & History” 2022; “Programs - Familia: TQLM”, n.d.).

The progressive faction’s strategies have helped provide justice as recognition and redistribution to the community because it works to recognize lacunae in current activism and to get society to recognize what it is like to be LGBTQ+ with or without being at an intersection of other marginalized identities. Recognition of failings of current activism creates a pathway to rectify those failings, which is mostly done by including people who have been excluded. Externally, the progressive faction wants society to recognize members of the community for who they are. The progressive faction has been working for decades to get transgender people recognized for who they are and not someone crossdressing and playing pretend as well as getting society to recognize LGB+ identities as valid expressions of sexuality. The work of the progressive faction has revolved around recognizing the failings of the movement, working to rectify those failings, and getting society to recognize what gayness, transness, etc. is as well as what it means to sit at the intersection of one of those identities and another marginalized one.

Conclusion

The liberal faction's ability to provide justice as fairness (Rawls 1958, 1971, 2001) is limited because of the second condition of the Second Principle of Justice. When the liberal faction excludes people from either the movement or drops protections for specific members of the community, it is actively perpetuating social inequality that is to the detriment, not benefit, of the least advantaged members of the community (Faderman 2015; Colbert 2014). The liberal faction is able to provide justice as fairness to the LGBTQ+ community, just in a limited fashion because of its penchant for exclusion. Additionally, the time of the liberal faction being able to provide justice as recognition and redistribution (Fraser 1997; Honneth 2004) has, for the most part, passed. When the NGLTF created a strategy to address the AIDS crisis, they did so by allowing the government and society to not recognize the impact the virus had on the gay community, and the liberal faction was not working to regain its ability to provide that type of justice (Vaid 1995, 75). However, some recent activism suggests it is working on rectifying that.

The progressive faction, however, has a stronger capacity for justice. When it comes to justice as fairness, the progressive faction does a good job at providing justice despite its fundamental disagreements with justice being achieved in a top-down fashion and the idea that there can be a list of criteria that will universally provide justice. Just about the only reason the progressive faction's activism might diverge from justice as fairness is because it does not focus its attention on electoral politics, which is the first condition of the Second Principle of Justice (Rawls 2001, 42). Furthermore, the progressive faction has been working internally and externally to get the movement and greater society to recognize people for who they really are as well as the unique issues facing intersectionally identified people (Cohen 2013). Progressive activism today has continued to fight for accurate recognition of transgender people, people of

color, and others who have been excluded from the liberal faction (Benjamin 2013; McMichael 2014; “Familia:TQLM | Homepage”, n.d.; “Our Mission, Vision & History” 2022). In regards to justice, the progressive faction’s capacity to provide justice to the LGBTQ+ community is stronger and better established than the liberal faction’s.

It is difficult not to pass moral judgment on the liberal faction because of the limitation of a capacity for justice that stems from its penchant for exclusion. However, there is, once again, an interplay between the types of justice granted by the two factions. The work of the liberal and progressive factions in the framework provided by Rawls (1958; 1971; 2001) gives people de jure access to resources and institutions because of formal policy barriers being taken down. The work of the Movement, mainly from the progressive faction, in the framework provided by Fraser (1997) and Honneth (2004) is able to give people de facto access because the informal barriers that had been created are being taken down. Both factions work together to provide justice for members of the LGBTQ+ community; their work is complementary because together, they maximally increase the standing of the LGBTQ+ community in society.

Chapter Six- Knowledge in the LGBTQ+ Movement

The framework of power, justice, and knowledge introduced in chapter one is a useful way to examine the effective change brought by the actions of the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement. This chapter will provide a review of epistemic justice provided by Fricker (2007) and willful hermeneutical ignorance postulated by Pohlhaus (2012). As mentioned in chapter one, looking through a lens of knowledge, one can see what has fallen through the proverbial cracks in social movements' actions and what still remains to be done because without that mechanism of reflection, a full schematic of justice cannot be provided to social movements' constituencies (Fricker 2006). The analysis of knowledge in the liberal and progressive factions of what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement will show that, similar to power and justice, the liberal faction's capacity to allow for the proliferation is more problematic compared to the progressive faction's because it allows for the maintenance of oppression. The liberal faction has actively silenced intersectionally identified people, helped stifle the proliferation of vocabulary that would aid in people's ability to understand their experiences and identities, and has helped society maintain flawed epistemic framework they view the LGBTQ+ community through; however, the progressive faction has not silenced people, created their own media to provide people with ways to describe their experiences and identity, and actively given society, and the liberal faction, better epistemic frameworks to view the LGBTQ+ community.

Knowledge Revisited

Epistemic justice provided by Fricker (2007) has two distinct parts to it: 1) testimonial injustice and 2) hermeneutic injustice. Testimonial injustice occurs when, "prejudice causes a

hearer to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker's word" (Fricker 2007, 1). It relies on prejudice and this injustice can either be local or systemic (Fricker 2007, 27). At the core of testimonial injustice is someone being wronged in their capacity as a knower because their testimony does not carry the weight it ought to (Fricker 2007, 20). Unfortunately, testimonial injustice prevents knowledge from being transmitted because the speaker is deemed unworthy as a knower. Hermeneutic injustice is a, "gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experiences" (Fricker 2007, 1). This type of injustice can only affect marginalized people because, "The powerless are more likely to find themselves having some kind of social experience through a glass darkly, with at best ill-fitting meanings to draw on in the effort to render them intelligible" (Fricker, 2007, 148). This type of injustice cuts both ways. The marginalized are affected because they cannot make sense of their own experiences and identity and society is similarly affected because it also cannot understand that person's experience or identity; however, the individual, not society, bears the brunt of the injustice because they cannot understand themselves nor how they fit into society (ibid).

Willful hermeneutical ignorance created by Pohlhaus (2013) further developed the concept of epistemic injustice. This kind of injustice occurs when those who are dominantly situated cannot make sense of the lived experiences or social interactions of marginally situated people. Unlike epistemic injustice, willful hermeneutical ignorance only affects marginally situated people and is always systemic, "dominantly situated knowers... misunderstand and misinterpret the world" (Pohlhaus 2012, 716). This type of injustice is best exemplified by people ignoring phenomena like cisgender-heterosexual normativity or white privilege because the dominantly situated see the benefits of these phenomena and cannot understand how

something that benefits them harms others. The crux of willful hermeneutic injustice is dominantly situated individuals using and maintaining faulty epistemic frameworks they view the world through.

Knowledge and the Liberal Faction

Epistemic injustice and willful hermeneutical ignorance show how the liberal faction of the Movement prevents the creation and dissemination of accurate knowledge. This is done in two different ways: 1) the liberal faction can prevent knowledge that runs counter to the status quo from forming and 2) it will try to prevent an accurate account of knowledge that is created from being accessible to greater society if that knowledge weakens the status quo. Accurate knowledge is suppressed by the liberal faction because of its reliance on political and professional institutions as well as its penchant for exclusion.

Epistemic Injustice

Testimonial injustice and hermeneutic injustice have run rampant in the liberal faction. Testimonial injustice tends to be suffered by those who are not cisgender, white, men in the LGBTQ+ community to such an extent that it is a staple of the liberal faction. Mattachine is the earliest perpetrator of this injustice as demonstrated by Del Martin at an annual conference hosted by Mattachine and the DOB:

At every one of these conventions I attend... I find I must defend the [DOB] as a separate and distinct women's organization... [Mattachine has not] recognized the fact that Lesbians are women and that this 20th century is the era of emancipation of woman [sic] (D'Emilio 1983, 105)

After years of hearing about the plight of lesbians and working with the DOB, Mattachine did not acknowledge lesbians' testimony. Women as a whole were wronged in their capacity as

knowers because their testimony is not given the credence it deserves. This is not something that is isolated to the Mattachine Society either. The Gay Liberation Front ignored women in the organization when they informed the group that it was catering too heavily to the needs and desires of gay men (Kissack 1995, 119). The environment these organizations created were not conducive to the dissemination of knowledge because of the exclusion that defines liberal organizations.

Hermeneutic injustice is more of a pervasive problem than testimonial injustice because of the liberal faction's desire to both exclude and create homonormativity. In regards to exclusion, the liberal faction on many occasions has perpetuated hermeneutic injustice. By questioning the need for an organization focused on the issues faced by lesbians, the Mattachine Society showed that they were willing to allow society's lacuna of knowledge around lesbianism to stay intact (D'Emilio 1984, 104). The exclusion of women, people of color, trans people, etc., and those sitting at intersections of those identities from the GLF and the GAA meant maintaining the lacuna of knowledge that made it difficult for intersectionality-identified members of the LGBTQ+ community make sense of their lived experiences because there was no intersectional input in their activism. The same thing happened in the early days of AIDS activism because the liberal faction was more than willing to de-center themselves from the response to AIDS, which made it difficult at best and impossible at worst for gay people with AIDS to make sense of their experiences (Vaid 1995, 75). This trend has continued into the Contemporary Era by stifling the understanding of the complexity of human sexuality. With the exclusion of bisexuality from court decisions, it is difficult for people to know and understand the full spectrum of sexual orientations because of their exclusion from protections granted to the rest of their community.

The creation of homonormativity in the liberal faction has also made it difficult for people to understand their experiences. The Mattachine Society and the Daughters of Bilitis created a homonormativity that made it difficult for people who further transgressed what society deemed was acceptable (D'Emilio 1983, 109-113). The lack of inclusion of effeminate men, butch women, etc. in the discussions and editorials facilitated by Mattachine and the DOB, contributed to the lack of understanding that people who fell in those categories could have with their social experiences. Hermeneutic injustice was further developed by the liberal faction as they developed homonormativity. When the GLF pushed for the contextualization of homosexuality through hypermasculinity it made it harder for people to understand their identity because of the opposing views given by society and other gay people. The Gay Liberation Front and society worked parallel to each other and limited the understanding of homosexuality to either be hypermasculine or feminine and every other contextualization was left behind. The liberal faction in the Contemporary Era institutionalized a homonormative conceptualization of LGBTQ+ identities, which makes it difficult for people who fall out of that conceptualization to understand themselves.

Exclusion and homonormativity created by the liberal faction did not only harm people in the community, it harmed society as a whole. Because lesbians, people of color, trans people, etc. and those who are intersectionally identified could not understand their social experiences, society could not understand them either. The epistemic mechanisms for making sense of a butch lesbian's identity or the experiences of a gay individual with AIDS simply did not exist in greater society and the liberal faction was not creating them. As a result, flawed policy was implemented, people died, and the harms that were faced by those in the community who were not cis, white, gay, and male were ignored. Exclusionary tendencies and a desire to create and

enforce homonormativity prevented knowledge about the LGBTQ+ community from being formed and/or transmitted to greater society.

None of this is to say that the liberal faction is unable to foster environments that are conducive to the creation and dissemination of knowledge, but it is to say that the knowledge that is created may not be the most accurate. The creation of trans- and homonormativity is knowledge about the community, but it is knowledge that is not accurate for everyone. Just because there are some same-sex couples that do get married and have kids or trans people who start hormones and have gender confirming surgery, that does not mean everyone in the community is going to follow in their footsteps. Even though the liberal faction can create knowledge and disseminate it, it does not mean that knowledge tells the whole story. The existence of epistemic injustice in liberal activism inherently decreases the ability of that faction to create and disseminate knowledge that can be used to analyze and understand the experience of every member of the LGBTQ+ community.

Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance

Willful hermeneutical ignorance in the liberal faction runs rampant. The homonormativity that the liberal faction is intent on creating has made flawed epistemic frameworks for society to view the community through. This is easily seen through the homonormativity created by Mattachine and the DOB. When Mattachine tempered out and they started publishing articles about homosexuals being the same as heterosexuals in every aspect except sexual proclivities, the epistemic framework that was used to view homosexuals was not as accurate as it could have been because it could not make room for gay men that further transgressed gender norms nor could it make room for women homosexuals not needing the same things as male homosexuals (Vaid 1995, 38). Willful hermeneutical ignorance also plagued

the DOB. By only viewing lesbians as those who conformed to feminine stereotypes, were mothers, and maybe had a non-blue-collar job, the DOB used a flawed epistemic framework for their activism because they could only recognize the issues that faced a small number of lesbians. Unfortunately, this has not changed. The GLF, the GAA, and the Radicalesbians used improper epistemic frameworks because they ignored and excluded people they believed were objectionable, which gave them a flawed view of who was in the community they were fighting for and has helped keep oppressive structures, like transphobia, in place to this day.

The National Gay and Lesbian Taskforce did not necessarily have a flawed epistemic framework of the gay community, but it did allow for flawed epistemic frameworks to be used by heterosexual society during the AIDS crisis. By de-gayng AIDS, society thought that the most pressing issue of the time was the way AIDS deaths affected straight people (Vaid 1995, 75). The liberal faction allowed an epistemic framework that privileged heterosexual feelings over homosexual grief, sadness, fear, and death (Vaid 1995, 75). The existence of this epistemic framework necessarily limited greater society's ability to understand the extent of the devastation caused by the AIDS crisis because it was not only straight people and the dying who were impacted. Almost an entire generation of gay people died leaving their peers afraid of what was going to happen to them, leaving their peers isolated and without community, and knowing that society did not care about them, all of which could not be understood by heterosexual society because of the de-gayng framework they viewed AIDS through (Ghaziani 2008, 80-81).

The Contemporary Era has also seen improper epistemic frameworks developed and be used because of actions taken by the liberal faction. The most pervasive and prevalent example of a flawed epistemic framework is found in regards to bisexuality. Because there is such a limited way of viewing and understanding sexuality, the potential for a misunderstanding what

non-extreme identities on the sexuality continuum are is high. One of the best examples of society using a flawed epistemic framework as a result of the liberal faction's activism comes from Netflix's *Big Mouth*. The definition of pansexuality that the show uses when a pansexual character is introduced is problematic to say the least:

No, bisexuality is so *binary*. Being pansexual means my sexual preference isn't limited by gender identity... It's like, some of you borings like tacos, and some of you like burritos. And if you're bisexual, you like tacos and burritos. But I'm saying I like tacos and burritos, and I could be into a taco that was born a burrito, or a burrito that is transitioning into a taco, *comprende*? And honey, anything else on the ... menu. (Linnell 2019)

The problem here stems from the misinterpretation of the pansexuality/bisexuality distinction because of a flawed epistemic framework that heterosexual society uses to view bisexuality and pansexuality due the exclusion of intermediary identities on the sexuality continuum perpetrated by the liberal faction.

Because of the creation of homonormativity and exclusion that is seen in the liberal faction of the movement, flawed epistemic frameworks have extended to greater society. The ramifications of this are numerous and dangerous. One of the most dangerous consequences of allowing these flawed epistemic frameworks to form and be maintained is an increase in hermeneutic injustice. Even though words to describe sexuality and gender are more enhanced than they were even a few years ago, if those words are artificially restricted because accurate epistemic frameworks are being suppressed, then hermeneutic injustice will continue to exist due to the fact that those words are not readily available. Furthermore, flawed epistemic frameworks lead to harassment, violence, and even death. Through the epistemic framework created by the Radicalesbians that misrecognized trans women as men that still exists to this day and is utilized

by people all over the world, trans women experience higher rates of harassment, violence, and murder (“Transgender people over four times more likely than cisgender people to be victims of violent crime” 2021). The utilization of flawed epistemic frameworks is dangerous and the liberal faction has supplied the tools to create these faulty frameworks by excluding certain identities from their activism.

Again, none of this is to say that the liberal faction cannot create and/or disseminate knowledge because it can. Homonormativity and transnormativity, as flawed as they are, are forms of knowledge. However, the normativities created by liberal activism do aid in the creation and maintenance of improper epistemic frameworks people use to view the LGBTQ+ community as demonstrated by quote from Big Mouth (Linell 2019). Just because the knowledge is faulty does not mean it is not knowledge, but it does mean that it is not as accurate as it can be, which leads to real world problems as a result of the flawed knowledge being used in the construction of epistemic frameworks.

Knowledge and the Progressive Faction

Unlike its liberal counterpart, the progressive faction stifles the permeation of epistemic injustice and willful hermeneutical ignorance, which allows for the proliferation of accurate knowledge internally and externally. The reason this is able to happen in the progressive faction is because of their inclusion and creation of alternative institutions. With the inclusion of people who had been systematically denied a voice and access to what has come to be known as the LGBTQ+ Movement, those who were part of the progressive faction were exposed to and formed strategies around the unique struggles that come with being at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities. The creation of alternative institutions, which is a defining feature of the progressive faction, makes it easier for knowledge to be shared, and in some cases created,

because these institutions and the people who created them have no interest in maintaining the status quo.

Epistemic Injustice

Neither testimonial injustice nor hermeneutic injustice are significantly present in the progressive faction. When *ONE* broke away from Mattachine after 1953, they did not harm people's capacities as knowers because it was politically expedient to do so. Unlike the *Mattachine Review*, *ONE* was not interested in creating media that prioritized heterosexual feelings over the realities of being gay (D'Emilio 1983, 87-88). Most importantly, *ONE* did not believe that the psychologist, doctor, lawyer, clergy, professor, etc. knew more about being gay than gay people did: *ONE* did not give less credence to the testimony of the homosexual by giving more credence to the professional like the *Mattachine Review* did (D'Emilio 1983, 87). By not overinflating the amount of credence given to the testimony of people outside of the community, *ONE* stifled hermeneutic injustice. The heterosexual professional had little to no idea what it was like being a homosexual in America, but that is who was listened to in the media and by Mattachine, which prevented gay people and society from actually knowing what it was like to be a homosexual. By incorporating the voice of the homosexual in *ONE*, the organization was able to share accurate accounts of what it meant to be gay, which came with giving the correct amount of credence to homosexual's testimony and providing homosexuals and society accurate tools to discuss what homosexuality is.

The Erickson Educational Foundation was not active in directly stopping or perpetuating testimonial injustice; however, EEF did create a foundation to combat hermeneutic injustice via funding the Gender Identity Clinic and what would eventually become the World Professional Association for Transgender Health as well as compiling medical resources for transgender

individuals. Funding GIC and WPATH enabled them to conduct research on gender and form gender confirmation treatments for transgender individuals. This provided society with the correct tools to discuss and understand what being transgender means (Nownes 2019, 27). Furthermore, by helping people access gender confirmation treatments, EEF was able to give people the epistemic tools needed to make sense of social experiences and themselves (Nownes 2019, 18). EEF funded and created resources to understand what transgender identities are, which gave trans people and society the epistemic tools to analyze transgender identities along with gender as a whole.

Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries, Lavender Menace, and the Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization also worked against epistemic injustice through inclusion and creating their own media. STAR was an organization for trans people created by trans people that, amongst other things, created works detailing what it means to be gay and/or trans and their work served as the foundation for modern queer theory (Cohen 2009, 95-103). The Transsexual Action Organization, similar to STAR, created and published editorials describing the transgender experience to greater society in an effort to share what it means to be transgender (Meyerowitz 2004, 240-41). In all three of these organizations exclusion was not present, making it easy to gain a more holistic frame of people's experiences. Furthermore, all three created media that gave their community(ies) and, more or less, society epistemic tools to analyze and understand their experiences.

Gay Men's Health Crisis focused more on combatting hermeneutic injustice than testimonial injustice. The hotline created by GMHC and their research helped prevent the spread of hermeneutic injustice by providing people and society with resources to understand what AIDS is and what it meant to live with the disease (Faderman 2015, 419). While GMHC's

actions did not help combat testimonial injustice, it still helped allow for the proliferation of knowledge about the community and AIDS alike. The work of GMHC gave people and society the knowledge of what it meant to be living with AIDS and how people with AIDS navigated society and life after their diagnosis.

The work of ACT UP combats both aspects of epistemic injustice. For the longest time during the height of the AIDS crisis women were not given any credence in their testimony about living with AIDS because 1) it conflicted with what professionals had said about the disease and 2) women were intentionally medically excluded from having AIDS (Schulman 2019, 385-89; Brier 2009, 173). By ACT UP actively including women there were people who knew that research into AIDS and its classification were problematic because of the CDC's and NIH's exclusion of women. This inclusion successfully changed the paradigm around AIDS research and its classification (Schulman 2019, 385-89; Brier 2009, 173). ACT UP's fights with AIDS research and classification excluding women combined with their other protests and demonstrations helped combat hermeneutic injustice. Because the women of ACT UP were able to get research and classification of AIDS changed, women and society would finally understand the experience of women with AIDS. ACT UP's demonstrations and protests targeting the relaxed response of AIDS by the government helped create a better understanding of the disease that let people with AIDS and society better understand both the disease and what it is like living with it (Schulman 2019).

The Contemporary Era has also seen a proliferation of knowledge about being LGBTQ+. The Sylvia Rivera Law Project is able to combat hermeneutic injustice in two different ways. By providing legal representation to low income trans people and trans people of color, SRLP is able to elucidate how their clientele interacts with society through a sociolegal lens that is shared with

the court system to hopefully get it to understand how the lens it views SRLP's clientele through is problematic (Benjamin 2013, 107). The legal representation provided by SRLP facilitates an understanding of how low income trans people and trans people of color interact with social institutions and how the court system views those people. Additionally, by providing training and educational sessions, SRLP is able to provide members of the LGBTQ+ community and society an understanding of those identities in the modern day ("Our Approach and Principles/Nuestras Práctica y Principios", n.d.).

FORGE is able to provide a similar service. Through their educational sessions, FORGE teaches people about how being transgender informs the way that people interact with society and access social resources giving the trans community and society an understanding of that process ("Trainings – FORGE," n.d.). Furthermore, SONG has been able to allow for the proliferation of LGBTQ+ knowledge through their work. Southerners on New Ground has been able to engage with other organizations and movements, which gives them a better idea of the many facets of how oppression is interconnected ("Our Mission, Vision & History" 2022). This allows people and organizations that fight oppression to have a better understanding of the social phenomenon they are trying to weaken because they are given a more holistic account of oppression and its impacts. Additionally, by working in rural communities, SONG is helping give more credence to the testimony of the LGBTQ+ community who live in rural areas ("Our Mission, Vision & History" 2022). By providing legal assistance, educational sessions, and training SRLP, FORGE, and SONG help combat both aspects of epistemic injustice.

Willful Hermeneutical Ignorance

The progressive faction actively attempts to provide people with the correct epistemic frames to view the experiences and lives of people in the LGBTQ+ community. The ability to

provide these new frameworks, or at the very least challenge the ones currently used, comes from the third dimension of power. By influencing people's ideology via working against racism, misogyny, transphobia, classism, and by centering experiences of community members in their activism and strategies, the progressive faction is able to provide new ways of thinking about and interpreting the LGBTQ+ community.

Fighting against racism, misogyny, transphobia, and classism while centering LGBTQ+ identities is present in all eras of the movement. *ONE* and EEF, respectively, combatted misogyny and transphobia in the movement. Mattachine's framework of viewing homosexual issues was faulty because they routinely questioned the need for the DOB and women's presence in the movement (D'Emilio 1983, 105). Additionally, Mattachine and the DOB had a narrow view of who the homophile movement should advocate for, which did not include low-income people nor people who further transgressed gender norms (D'Emilio 1983, 106). Furthermore, Mattachine chose to prioritize heterosexual comfort over the needs of gay people (D'Emilio 1983, 103). *ONE* staunchly disagreed with a vast majority of what Mattachine and the DOB were doing and actively worked to include those who had been excluded from the latter organizations (D'Emilio 1983, 87-88). By working against misogyny and classism in the homophile movement, *ONE* helped create a stronger framework for the movement and society to analyze the experiences and identities of homosexuals as the framework was now able to make sense of the experiences and reification of homosexuality in women, low-income people, and those who further transgressed social and gender norms.

The Erickson Educational Foundation actively worked against the ubiquity of transphobia and lack of understanding what gender is, both of which continue to exist. Through funding research into gender and gender affirming care, EEF was able to help create a framework to

adequately analyze the experiences and identities of transgender people as well as how to provide gender affirming care (Pettis 2015). Because of EEF's work, the ideas that gender is a binary, that transgender women are men who wear women's clothes and make a mockery of womanhood and seeing transgender men as a butch lesbians were weakened because society was able to better understand what gender is. The Erickson Educational Foundation fought against transphobia and to provide a better understanding of what gender is, which created an epistemic framework for society to view transgender identities, transgender experiences, and gender.

In the Gay Liberation Era, Street Transvestite Action Revolutionaries, Lavender Menace, and the Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization fought against transphobia, racism, and misogyny in the movement. STAR created a foundation for queer theory by sharing the experiences of trans women of color and what it mean to be trans during the mid-20th century, which helped create an epistemic framework that should be used to analyze the identities of trans women of color (Cohen 2009, 95-103). Lavender Menace shared the lesbian experience with the Women's Movement and how the existence of both the Women's Movement and the Gay Movement did not do anything to rectify the issues facing lesbians (Marotta 1981, 244; Faderman 2015, 233). The Transsexual/Transvestite Action Organization also combatted transphobia and racism. While TAO was in Los Angeles it published *Mirage* and *Moonshadow*, which amplified and supported trans voices by publishing trans people's lived experiences and how they understood their gender ("Angela Lynn Douglas and Transsexual Action Organization | ONE Archives", n.d.). One of the protests TAO organized was against the movie *Myra Breckenridge* because it portrayed a harmful and inaccurate depiction of trans women (Meyerowitz 2004, 238). When TAO moved to Miami, it was inclusive of people of color and centered their experiences as much as it did the experiences of white trans people (Meyerowitz

2004, 239). Lastly, TAO campaigned to have transgenderism declassified as a mental illness (ibid).

The progressive organizations of the Gay Liberation Era created a stronger epistemic framework to view the experiences and identities of transgender people, people of color, lesbians, and those sitting at an intersection of any of those identities. This was achieved through destabilizing the epistemic framework that was being used by showing its inaccuracies and limitations and providing a new framework via testimony about their experiences, identities, and how the movement was mistaken in its belief that it was working to better the lives of everyone. The epistemic framework created by the progressive organizations in the Gay Liberation Era provided a tool to analyze a more holistic LGBTQ+ community, which was given to both the movement and society as a whole.

AIDS activism also provided better epistemic frameworks to view both the AIDS crisis and gay identities. Gay Men's Health Crisis and ACT UP both researched AIDS and its effects, which helped give an understanding to the disease (Eleven Years of AIDS and Gay Men's Health Crisis", n.d.; Schulman 2019, 9). In addition to AIDS research, GMHC created a hotline to provide AIDS information, which, combined with research efforts, provided a foundation on which to understand and view the AIDS crisis. The Women's Caucus of ACT UP created an epistemic framework of AIDS that included women, specifically how the disease manifested itself in women (Brier 2009, 173; Schulman 2019, 246-47). ACT UP as a whole also provided a better epistemic framework to view the experience of people with AIDS because it researched the disease and publicly shared the experiences of people who had been diagnosed (Schulman 2019). Combined, the work of GMHC and ACT UP provided a more accurate framework to analyze the AIDS crisis through because it centered those who were more likely to get the virus

(gay people and intravenous drug users) than how the disease affected the heterosexual family and friends of HIV positive people. Both GMHC and ACT UP created a holistic epistemic framework to analyze AIDS by fighting against internalized homophobia in the movement and in society.

The Contemporary Era has provided better epistemic frameworks that are used by the legal system and society. The Sylvia Rivera Law Project has given the court system the ability to create a legal framework to recognize transgender identities and experiences through granting transgender people access to the court system via accessible representation (Benjamin 2013, 107). SLRP's legal activities also provide the trans community with a framework to view how they fit in the legal system (ibid). SRLP and FORGE both give service providers a better epistemic lens to view transgender identities and experiences. Through training and educational sessions, SLRP and FORGE share the experiences and needs of transgender people who seek social and government services ("Our Approach and Principles/Nuestras Práctica y Principios", n.d; "Webinars – FORGE", n.d.). The Contemporary Era provides better epistemic frameworks to the transgender community, the legal system, and society to view the experiences and needs of transgender individuals because they are actively combatting the root cause of unequal treatment: transphobia.

SONG is also able to provide a more accurate epistemic frame for the LGBTQ+ and other movements as well. One of SONG's strategies is to educate other organizations both in and out of the LGBTQ+ Movement on the interconnectedness of oppression ("Our Mission, Vision & History" 2022). As a result of the education provided by SONG, organizations and movements are able to have a better epistemic frame to view oppression because they now have the knowledge on how different types of oppression connect to each other and can do more work to

mitigate how oppression is reified. Familia also provides greater society with a better epistemic frame to utilize when analyzing the experiences and identity of their constituents because of their work to expand resources available to transgender Latinxs (“Programs - Familia: TQLM”, n.d.). By opening up resources or creating their own, Familia is able to show how the current framework is inadequate for intersectionality-identified people, which gives those who provide resources a better epistemic frame to view the needs of Familia’s constituency.

Conclusion

Similar to power and justice, the liberal faction’s capacity to allow for the creation and dissemination of knowledge is not without its flaws. Liberal activism has led to the creation and dissemination of a lot of knowledge about the LGBTQ+ community, but that knowledge is often problematic. The exclusion seen in the liberal faction is the main culprit as it allows for epistemic injustice and willful hermeneutical ignorance to weave their way into liberal activism. The inclusion of these epistemic phenomena in liberal activism means that the knowledge created by and disseminated from the liberal faction is not as accurate as it could or should be. Additionally, the exclusion of people and/or experiences that run contrary to the status quo leads to the development of improper epistemic frameworks used to analyze LGBTQ+ experiences and identities. While the knowledge produced and disseminated by the liberal faction may not be entirely accurate and can have undesirable consequences, knowledge is still being created and shared with greater society.

The progressive faction on the other hand is able to provide proper epistemic frameworks to people. Epistemic injustice and willful hermeneutical ignorance are not as active in progressive activism, which means that the knowledge it creates and disseminates is more accurate than what is produced and disseminated by its liberal counterpart. The knowledge that is

produced and shared by the progressive faction allows for the deconstruction of current, flawed epistemic frameworks that are in use and replace them with better ones. The inclusion seen in progressive activism allows the progressive faction to provide less flawed knowledge that is used by the community, the Movement, and greater society because there are fewer barriers to contribute to the creation of knowledge. Additionally, because progressive activism has no interest in maintaining the status quo, the progressive faction will not prevent the dissemination of knowledge that runs contrary to it.

Just like what was seen with power and justice, the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement work parallel to each other. The liberal faction is able to create and disseminate diluted knowledge to the community and greater society whereas the progressive faction comes in to conduct quality control by creating and providing accuracy to liberal knowledge. The knowledge created and disseminated by the two prominent factions in the LGBTQ+ Movement is complimentary. The liberal faction provides basic, albeit, flawed epistemic frameworks to society and the progressive faction comes in and amends the flawed parts of the frameworks that are currently being used. The interplay of the two factions allows for knowledge that is given to society to be continuously amended and strengthened.

Conclusion

In November of 1950, Henry Hay created what would come to be known as the homophile movement that would eventually evolve over the course of the next seventy-two years to become the LGBTQ+ Movement that we know today (Faderman 2015). In the early days of the movement, ideological differences led to a schism that resulted in the formation of two factions, with the eventual creation of a third, each with radically different strategies than the other to end the oppression of homosexuals. The strategies and actions of the liberal and progressive factions, whose separation persists to this day, has led to a variety of work and strategies by each being done to overcome LGBTQ+ oppression. The conclusions that have been drawn here are the result of analyzing a few exemplary organizations and activist groups in what has grown to be the LGBTQ+ Movement.

The liberal faction is defined as having an arc towards moderation, characterized by a reliance on political and professional institutions, and the intentional exclusion of people from the movement. The consequences of these defining features are threefold: 1) there is a weakened ability to combat the cause of LGBTQ+ oppression (homophobia, transphobia, racism, classism, etc.), 2) a virtually non-existent ability to provide universal justice for the LGBTQ+ community as the liberal faction actively denies justice to intersectionally situated community members, and 3) there is a limited ability to establish environments that are conducive to the creation and dissemination of LGBTQ+ specific knowledge. The progressive faction, on the other hand, is characterized by a non-reliance on political and professional institutions, making change through mutual aid and direct action, and active inclusion of people who have been intentionally excluded by the liberal faction. These defining features have led to greater success in the areas

where the liberal faction has fallen short. Due to the strategies and ideals of the progressive faction, it is consistently able to combat the root causes of oppression (homophobia, transphobia, racism, classism, etc.), it is better positioned to provide universal justice for the LGBTQ+ community, and they have an ability to create environments that foster the creation and proliferation of LGBTQ+ specific knowledge.

The liberal faction of the LGBTQ+ Movement as well as the movement's predecessors has shown to be able to consistently influence behavior and agendas while being able to influence ideology occasionally. The lack of consistency of influencing ideology shows that the liberal faction is mainly treating symptoms of the social phenomena (homophobia, transphobia, racism, classism, etc.) that lead to oppression instead of the phenomena themselves. The liberal faction has also actively worked against providing universal justice for their constituents through their penchant for exclusion and desire to create and uphold homonormativity, which means that liberal strategies will not provide universal relief from oppression. Furthermore, the liberal faction has stifled the production and dissemination of completely accurate LGBTQ+ knowledge, which has resulted in a perpetuation of people's testimony not being taken seriously, people and society not being able to understand LGBTQ+ identities and experiences, and the creation and sustaining of flawed epistemic frameworks that can harm the community.

Unlike its liberal counterpart, the progressive faction is able to work consistently within all three dimensions of power, work toward universal justice, and enable the creation and dissemination of LGBTQ+ knowledge. By actively working to change social paradigms, the progressive faction has shown its ability to work in the third dimension of power because it is able to influence and change ideology. Because the progressive faction includes people who would otherwise have no voice in the movement and their affinity for creating alternative

institutions, it has been able to provide justice as fairness and justice as recognition and redistribution universally to the community. The progressive faction actively works to increase the creation and spread of LGBTQ+ knowledge. The proliferation of LGBTQ+ knowledge is mainly seen through inclusion and creation of alternative institutions. Progressive inclusion allows for a more holistic understanding of LGBTQ+ identities because the different ways of the identities' reification are present and communicating with each other, which inherently means a better understanding of people's experiences within the community. Additionally, the creation of alternative institutions allows for the proliferation of knowledge because those institutions have no vested interest in maintaining the status quo because they were created to weaken mainstream institutions by providing a community centric analysis.

Both factions have done very important work towards the goal of mitigating the oppression felt by the LGBTQ+ community over the last seventy-two years; however, they have done so through vastly different techniques that lead to different consequences. The consequences of the liberal faction's actions have been an assimilation of LGBTQ+ identities in a society, systems, and institutions that were made to purposefully exclude them; the liberal faction tries to conform to social norms, mores, and behaviors instead of changing those to be more inclusive and welcoming of LGBTQ+ identities. The consequences of progressive activism are more liberatory in nature. Instead of trying to include LGBTQ+ identities into a society, systems, and institutions that were made to exclude them, they try to change social norms, mores, and behaviors to eradicate their exclusionary tendencies. Unfortunately, the suppression of accurate knowledge creation and dissemination seen as a result of liberal activism can be harmful because it may eventually prevent any kind of inclusive change to a homophobic, transphobic, racist society we currently find ourselves in.

While the liberal and progressive factions have different strategies and abilities for overcoming oppression faced by the LGBTQ+ community, both have the same goal: to free the LGBTQ+ community of social injustice and maltreatment. Both have, to varying degrees, been successful in the seventy-two years since the movement's nascent days. Because of the work done by both, members of the LGBTQ+ community are becoming increasingly recognized as legitimate members of society at large; the degree to which members of the LGBTQ+ community are considered social pariahs has been mitigated, they enjoy greater access to civil rights, and homophobia, while still strong in some quarters, no longer holds the same strength nor ubiquity it once did. While the liberal faction works within the status quo and the progressive faction works outside of it, both factions have worked parallel to each other to facilitate social change that would not have otherwise been achieved. Because these factions work in conjunction with each other, the LGBTQ+ community's standing has increased over the last 72 years.

It is really easy to look at the analysis of the liberal and progressive factions of the LGBTQ+ Movement and pass moral judgment on them for one reason or another, but we must refrain from doing so because it will only serve to entrench the infighting of the LGBTQ+ Movement. The differences seen between the factions allow the Movement to be as strong as it is. The progressive faction supplementing its liberal counterpart allows for a model of sustainable activism and social change because it forces the Movement to be critical of itself, understand where the flaws in current strategies lay, and how to rectify parts of itself that leads to sub-par activism. By working parallel to each other, the liberal and progressive factions have been able to create a social movement that allows for continuous, sustainable change that is able to reflect on itself, its strategies, and the outcomes of its activism and work to better its flaws. Without both of the factions working in concert with each other, it is doubtful as to whether or

not members of the LGBTQ+ community would have the standing that they currently do in society.

Even though this work has been an analysis of a movement that has grown into the LGBTQ+ Movement, the application of analyzing pressure groups through this lens does not end here. The LGBTQ+ Movement is a pilot for an analysis of pressure groups through the lens of power, justice, and knowledge. The purpose of the framework of power, justice, and knowledge is to evaluate pressure groups' ability to create effective change for their constituency. This framework can be applied to any number of different pressure groups regardless of if they are a social movement or not because all forms of pressure groups have varying degrees of power, ability to provide justice, and capacity to allow knowledge to proliferate.

References

- “About Us.” n.d. Log Cabin Republicans. Accessed September 10th, 2022.
<https://logcabin.org/about-us/>.
- “ACT UP.” n.d. Crossroads Fund. Accessed July 3, 2022. <https://crossroadsfund.org/content/act>.
- “ACT UP 1987 Wall Street Action - List of Demands.” n.d. ACT UP. Accessed July 2, 2022.
<https://actupny.org/documents/1stFlyer.html>.
- “The ACT UP Historical Archive.” n.d. ACT UP. Accessed July 3, 2022.
<https://actupny.org/documents/cron-89.html>.
- “ACT UP/NY Chronology 1987.” n.d. ACT UP. Accessed July 3, 2022.
<https://actupny.org/documents/cron-87.html>.
- “ACT UP/NY Chronology 1988.” 1988. ACT UP. <https://actupny.org/documents/cron-88.html>.
- Adam, Barry D. 1995. *The Rise of a Gay and Lesbian Movement*. Revised ed. New York, New York: Twayne Publishers.
- “Angela Lynn Douglas and Transsexual Action Organization | ONE Archives.” n.d. ONE Archives at the USC Libraries. Accessed June 23, 2022.
<https://one.usc.edu/archive-location/angela-lynn-douglas-and-transsexual-action-organization>.
- Aizenman, Nurith. 2019. “How '80s AIDS Activist Group ACT UP Changed The Face Of Medicine : Shots - Health News.” NPR.
<https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2019/02/09/689924838/how-to-demand-a-medical-breakthrough-lessons-from-the-aids-fight>.
- Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. 1970. *Power & Poverty: Theory & Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Baker v. Nelson 291 Minn. 310, 191 N.W.2d 185 (1971).

Bealey, Frank. 1999. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Political Science: A User's Guide to Its Terms*.

Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

<http://ndl.ethernet.edu.et/bitstream/123456789/59812/1/72.pdf>.

Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (3): 531-565.

https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/231250?casa_token=VzP8LwvSOlcAAAAA%3AQfJBWSj2H2tkQBKzFmfZ-Kf0v7DLDiNw-7bNIPNUE5TCYcMf5rtao5popUoGMHAFBg9_5P2-tOw&.

Bostock v. Clayton County 590 US __ (2020).

"Bostock v. Clayton County, GA / Zarda v. Altitude Express / RG & GR Harris Funeral Homes Inc v. EEOC." n.d. Lambda Lega. Accessed May 14, 2022.

https://www.lambdalegal.org/in-court/cases/bostock-zarda-harris?gclid=Cj0KCQjwpv2TBhDoARIsALBnVnkMNSztlhUoh16i0mNgX_Ex4mRdZR5ehgOv0HnwU_9ftfxYLd7ISRlAvtREALw_wcB.

Bowers v. Hardwick 478 US 186 (1986).

Brier, Jennifer. 2009. *Infectious Ideas: U.S. Political Responses to the AIDS Crisis*. N.p.:

University of North Carolina Press.

Bronner, Stephen E. 1999. *Ideas in Action: Political Tradition in the Twentieth Century*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Bronski, Michael. 2011. *A Queer History of the United States*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.

- Campbell, Alyson, and Dirk Gindt, eds. 2018. *Viral Dramaturgies: HIV and AIDS in Performance in the Twenty-First Century*. N.p.: Springer International Publishing.
- Campbell, Jeter L. 2007. *Jack Nichols, Gay Pioneer: Heard My Message?* First ed. N.p.: Harrington Park Press.
- Carter, David. 2004. *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution*. First ed. New York, New York: St. Martins Press.
- Capsuto, Steven. 2020. "Gay Activists Alliance on "Jack Paar Tonite," March 8, 1973." YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Yr_W0WhLPIU.
- Chambers, David. 1992. "Tales of Two Cities: AIDS and the Legal Recognition of Domestic Partnerships in San Francisco and New York." *Law and Sexuality* 2:181-208.
- Cohen, Cathy J. 2013. *Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics?* Edited by Annamarie Jagose, Donald E. Hall, Andrea Bebell, and Susan Potter. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, Stephan L. 2009. *The Gay Liberation Youth Movement in New York: "an Army of Lovers Cannot Fail"*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Colbert, Chuck. 2014. "In Apology To The Trans Community, HRC Pledges Push For Broad LGBT Bill." Pride Source. <https://pridesource.com/article/68007-2/>.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 1989 (1): 139-167.
- Crimp, Douglas. 2011. "Before Occupy: How AIDS Activists Seized Control of the FDA in 1988." The Atlantic.

- <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2011/12/before-occupy-how-aids-activists-seized-control-of-the-fda-in-1988/249302/>.
- Dahl, Robert A. 1957. "The Concept of Power." *Behavioral Science* 2:201-215.
- Daum, Courtenay. 2020. *The Politics of Right Sex: Transgressive Bodies, Governmentality, and the Limits of Trans Rights*. New York, New York: State University of New York Press.
- D'Emilio, John. 1983. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States 1940-1970*. First ed. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization 597 US __ (2022)
- Duberman, Martin 1994. *Stonewall: The Definitive Story of the LGBTQ Rights Uprising that Changed America*. 1st ed. N.p.: Penguin Random House LLC.
- Duggan, Lisa. 2003. *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Eisenbach, David. 2006. *Gay Power: An American Revolution*. New York, New York: Carroll and Graf.
- "Eleven Years of AIDS and Gay Men's Health Crisis." n.d. quod.lib.umich.edu. Accessed June 30, 2022.
- <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cohen aids/5571095.0063.010?rgn=main;view=fulltext>.
- Engel, Stephen M. 2019. *Fragmented Citizens: The Changing Landscape of Gay and Lesbian Lives*. New York: NYU Press.
- Faderman, Lillian. 2015. *The Gay Revolution*. New York, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- "Familia:TQLM | Homepage." n.d. Familia TQLM. Accessed September 28, 2022.
- <https://familiaratqlm.org/>.

- Farley, Lin. 1978. *Sexual shakedown: the sexual harassment of women on the job*. N.p.: McGraw-Hill.
- Fisher, Louis, and Katy J. Harriger. 2019. *American Constitutional Law: Constitutional structures, separated powers and federalism*. 12th ed. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press, LLC.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1990. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text*, no. 25/26, 56-80.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Fricker, Miranda. 2006. "Powerlessness and Social Interpretation." *Episteme* 3 (1-2): 96-108.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/epi.0.0004>.
- Fricker, Miranda. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Friedan, Betty. 2000. *Life So Far*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gan, Jessi. 2013. "Transgender Studies Reader 2." Edited by Suzan Stryker and Aren Aizura. *Still at the Back of the Bus*, 291-301.
- Ghaziani, Amin. 2008. *The Dividends of Dissent: How Conflict and Culture Work in Lesbian and Gay Marches on Washington*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Gould, Deborah B. 2009. *Moving Politics: Emotion and ACT UP's Fight Against AIDS*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Halloran, Liz. 2013. "How Vermont's 'Civil' War Fueled The Gay Marriage Movement." NPR.
<https://www.npr.org/2013/03/27/174651233/how-vermonts-civil-war-fueled-the-gay-marriage-movement>.

Handelman, David. 1990. "Act Up in Anger." Rolling Stone.

<https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-news/aids-activism-larry-kramer-act-up-fauci-241225/>.

Hershey, Marjorie R. 2017. *Party Politics in America*. New York, New York: Routledge.

"History." n.d. GMHC. Accessed July 1, 2022. <https://www.gmhc.org/history/>.

"History – Treatment Action Group." n.d. Treatment Action Group. Accessed September 11, 2022. <https://www.treatmentactiongroup.org/about-us/history/>.

Honneth, Axel. 2004. "Recognition and Justices: Outline of a Plural Theory of Justice." *Acta Sociologica* 47 (3): 351-364.

"How HIV Impacts LGBTQ People." n.d. Human Rights Campaign. Accessed September 11, 2022. <https://www.hrc.org/resources/hrc-issue-brief-hiv-aids-and-the-lgbt-community>.

"HRC, ACLU and the Task Force Amass GLBT Workplace Discrimination Profiles to Help Pass Employment No." 2007. Human Rights Campaign.
<https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/hrc-aclu-and-the-task-force-amass-glbt-workplace-discrimination-profiles-to>.

Hurley v. Irish American, Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston, Inc. 515 US 557 (1995).

"Impact." n.d. GMHC. Accessed October 5, 2022. <https://www.gmhc.org/impact/>.

Joughin, Charles. 2012. "'Marriage Voters' Take Center Stage in 2012 Votes." Human Rights Campaign.

<https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/marriage-voters-take-center-stage-in-2012-votes>.

"The Journey to Marriage Equality in the United States - HRC." n.d. Human Rights Campaign. Accessed September 18, 2022.

<https://www.hrc.org/our-work/stories/the-journey-to-marriage-equality-in-the-united-states>.

Kacere, Laura. 2015. "Homonormativity 101: What It Is and How It's Hurting Our Movement." *Everyday Feminism*. <https://everydayfeminism.com/2015/01/homonormativity-101/>.

Kissack, Terence. 1995. "Freaking Fag Revolutionaries: New York's Gay Liberation Front, 1969-1971." *Radical History Review* 62:104-134.

Koch, Brittany B. 2015. "The Effect of Obergefell v. Hodges for Same-Sex Couples." *The National Law Review* 11, no. 237 (July).
<https://www.natlawreview.com/article/effect-obergefell-v-hodges-same-sex-couples>.

"Lambda Legal History." n.d. Lambda Legal. Accessed September 11, 2022.
<https://www.lambdalegal.org/about-us/history>.

Law, Tara. 2019. "9 Landmark Supreme Court Cases That Shaped LGBTQ Rights in America." *TIME*. <https://time.com/5694518/lgbtq-supreme-court-cases/>.

Lawrence v. Texas 539 US 558 (2003).

"Lawrence v. Texas." n.d. Lambda Legal. Accessed May 14, 2022.
<https://www.lambdalegal.org/in-court/cases/lawrence-v-texas>.

"LGBTQ Discrimination Cases at the Supreme Court | American Civil Liberties Union." 2020. ACLU. <https://www.aclu.org/cases/lgbtq-discrimination-cases-supreme-court>.

"LGBTQ Rights Timeline in American History » Teaching LGBTQ History." n.d. Teaching LGBTQ History. Accessed April 27, 2022.
<https://www.lgbtqhistory.org/lgbt-rights-timeline-in-american-history/>.

Linnell, C. (2019, October 7). 'Big Mouth' Pansexuality vs Bisexuality Episode Stumbles Over Itself. Retrieved October 3, 2022, from

- <https://www.advocate.com/television/2019/10/07/big-mouth-pansexuality-vs-bisexuality-episode-stumbles-over-itself>
- Lukes, Steven. 2005. *Power: A Radical View*. 2nd ed. N.p.: Macmillan Education UK.
- Lukes, Steven. 2021. *Power: A Radical View*. Third ed. N.p.: Macmillan Education UK.
- Lynn, Evelyn, Noemi Y. Molitor, Cora Page, and Lamont Sims. 2010. "A Conversation about Southerners on New Ground: Transformation, Legacy and Movement Building in the U.S. South." *Polyphonic Feminisms: Acting in Concert* 8, no. 3 (Summer).
http://sfonline.barnard.edu/polyphonic/print_song.htm.
- Mahoney, Erika. 2022. "Millions of disabled Americans could lose federal benefits if they get married." NPR.
<https://www.npr.org/2022/02/13/1080464176/disabled-americans-cant-marry-able-bodied-partners-without-losing-federal-benefi>.
- Marcus, Nancy C. 2020. "BOSTOCK V. CLAYTON COUNTY AND THE PROBLEM OF BISEXUAL ERASURE." *Northwestern University Law Review* 115 (November): 223-239.
- Marotta, Toby. 1981. *The Politics of Homosexuality*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- McMichael, Pam. 2014. "The Power of Conversation." *Journal of Appalachian Studies* 20, no. 2 (Fall): 142-145.
- Meeker, Martin. 2001. "Behind the Mask of Respectability: Reconsidering the Mattachine Society and Male Homophile Practice, 1950s and 1960s." *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10, no. 1 (January): 78-116.
https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3704790.pdf?casa_token=BV7rnNokJAMAAAAA:kvZ

XOLIF_QSpVoRbE5jaem7LzSLSKeUn-WI7kNCX63jJp4JP3i14F7kGPticGovU11aL53
M-94dm3X9BxvCMmsy5UqQgsngcRBKcil0bSESyUpwpPSk.

Meyerowitz, Joanne J. 2004. *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States*. United States: Harvard University Press.

“Movement Advancement Project | Employment Nondiscrimination.” n.d. Movement Advancement Project |. Accessed September 18, 2022.

https://www.lgbtmap.org/equality-maps/employment_non_discrimination_laws.

“New Acquisition: ACT UP/Boston Historical Records.” n.d. Northeastern University Libraries. Accessed July 3, 2022. New Acquisition: ACT UP/Boston Historical Records.

Nownes, Anthony J. 2019. *Organizing for Transgender Rights: Collective Action, Group Development, and the Rise of a New Social Movement*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Obergefell v. Hodges 576 US __ (2015).

“Obergefell, et al. v. Hodges - Freedom to Marry in Ohio.” 2015. ACLU.

<https://www.aclu.org/cases/obergefell-et-al-v-hodges-freedom-marry-ohio>.

“Obergefell v Hodges: Marriage Equality at the Supreme Court.” n.d. GLAD. Accessed May 14, 2022. <https://www.glad.org/cases/deboer-v-snyder/>.

O'Loughlin, Michael J. 2019. “'Pose' revisits controversial AIDS protest inside St. Patrick's Cathedral.” America Magazine.

<https://www.americamagazine.org/arts-culture/2019/06/21/pose-revisits-controversial-aids-protest-inside-st-patricks-cathedral>.

O'Neil, Patrick H. 2020. *Essentials of Comparative Politics*. 7th ed. New York, New York: W.W. Norton.

One, Inc. v. Olesen 355 US 371(1958).

“Our Approach and Principles/Nuestras Práctica y Principios.” n.d. Sylvia Rivera Law Project.

Accessed July 12, 2022. <https://srlp.org/about/principles/>.

“Our History - FORGE.” n.d. Forge Forward. Accessed July 15, 2022.

<https://forge-forward.org/about/our-history/>.

“Our History – LGBTQ Victory Fund.” n.d. Victory Fund. Accessed September 13, 2022.

<https://victoryfund.org/about/history/>.

“Our Mission, Vision & History.” 2022. Southerners on New Ground.

<https://southernersonnewground.org/who-we-are/vision-mission-history/>.

Park, Alice. 2017. “AIDS Drug AZT: How It Got Approved 30 Years Ago.” TIME.

<https://time.com/4705809/first-aids-drug-azt/>.

Pettis, Ruth M. 2015. “Erickson, Reed (1917-1992).” Erickson, Reed.

http://www.glbqtarchive.com/ssh/erickson_r_S.pdf.

Pohlhaus, Gaile. “Relational Knowing and Epistemic Injustice: Toward a Theory of ‘Willful

Hermeneutical Ignorance.” *Hypatia* 27, no. 4 (2012): 715–35.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23352291>.

“Police Arrest AIDS Protesters Blocking Access to FDA Offices.” 1988. Los Angeles Times.

<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1988-10-11-mn-3909-story.html>.

Polikoff, Nancy D. 2008. *Beyond (Straight and Gay) Marriage: Valuing All Families Under the*

Law. Edited by Michael Bronski. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press.

Polsby, Nelson W. 1963. *Community power and political theory*. N.p.: Yale University Press.

Polsby, Nelson W. 1968. “Community: The Study of Community Power.” *International*

Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences 3:157-163.

- Povich, Elaine S. 2022. "Without Obergefell, Most States Would Have Same-Sex Marriage Bans." The Pew Charitable Trusts.
<https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/blogs/stateline/2022/07/07/without-obergefell-most-states-would-have-same-sex-marriage-bans>.
- "Programs - Familia: TQLM." n.d. Familia:TQLM. Accessed September 28, 2022.
<https://familiatqlm.org/programs/>.
- "Protecting LGBTQ+ Youth - FORGE." n.d. Forge-Forward.org. Accessed July 21, 2022.
<https://forge-forward.org/collections/protecting-lgbtq-youth/>.
- Pyne, Jake. 2011. "UNSUITABLE BODIES: Trans People and Cisnormativity in Shelter Services." *Canadian Social Work Review* 28 (1): 129-137. 41658838.
- Rawls, John. 1958. "Justice as Fairness." *The Philosophical Review* 67, no. 2 (April): 164-194.
- Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. 1st ed. London, England: Belknap Press.
- Rawls, John. 2001. *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Edited by Erin Kelly. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Romer v. Evans 517 US 620 (1996).
- "Romer v. Evans." n.d. Lambda Legal. Accessed May 14, 2022.
<https://www.lambdalegal.org/in-court/cases/romer-v-evans>.
- Roth, Benita. 2017. *The Life and Death of ACT UP/LA: Anti-AIDS Activism in Los Angeles from the 1980s to the 2000s*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubenstein, G. 1995. "The decision to remove homosexuality from the DSM: twenty years later." *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 49, no. 3 (Summer): 416-27.
10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.1995.49.3.416.
- Runyan, A. (2018). What is Intersectionality and Why is it Important? *American Association of*

- University Professors*, (November-December 2018).
- <https://www.aaup.org/article/what-intersectionality-and-why-it-important#.X80uI2hKiUl>
- Samar, Vincent J., ed. 2001. *The New York Times Twentieth Century in Review: The Gay Rights Movement*. Chicago, Illinois: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers.
- Schattschneider, E.E. 1960. *The Semisovereign People: A Realist's View of Democracy in America*. 1st ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Schulman, Sarah. 2021. *Let the Record Show: A Political History of ACT UP New York, 1987-1993*. New York, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Schindler, Paul. 2007. "HRC Alone in Eschewing No-Compromise Stand." Gay City.
https://web.archive.org/web/20080409024947/http://www.gaycitynews.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=18883568&BRD=2729&PAG=461&dept_id=568864&rfi=6.
- Seidman, Steven. 1993. "'Identity and Politics in a 'Postmodern' Gay Culture: Some Historical and Conceptual Notes.'" In *Fear of a Queer Planet*, edited by Michael Warner, 105-142. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shepard, Benjamin. 2013. "The Street Trans Action Revolutionaries to Sylvia Rivera Law Project." *Journal of Social Research* 39 (1): 95-114. 10.1080/01488376.2012.727669.
- Shilts, Randy. 1987. *And the band played on*. N.p.: St. Martin's Press.
- Simpson, Brent, Robb Willer, and Matthew Feinberg. 2022. "Radical Flanks of Social Movements Can Increase Support For Moderate Factions." *PNAS Nexus* 1, no. 3 (July): 1-11.
https://watermark.silverchair.com/pgac110.pdf?token=AQECAHi208BE49Oan9kkhW_Ercy7Dm3ZL_9Cf3qfKAc485ysgAAAtMwggLPBgkqhkiG9w0BBwagggLAMIICvAIB

ADCCArUGCSqGSib3DQEHATAeBglghkgBZQMEAS4wEQQMCqyEm6C4Qe5lQ5a
QAgEQgIIChvo10rVqyfKR7SZZ1TWOMkvnz2SvvQ4AmhuUPAX4O4sI6AtH.

Sindelar, Daisy. 2012. "Decades Before Pussy Riot, US Group Protested Catholic Church -- With Results." Radio Free Europe.

<https://www.rferl.org/a/before-pussy-riot-act-up-confronted-church-and-won/24668230.html>.

Spade, Dean. 2015. *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. United States: Duke University Press.

Street, Mikelle. 2019. "'Pose's 'Condom Over the House' Scene Actually Happened — Here's How.'" Out Magazine.

<https://www.out.com/television/2019/7/31/poses-condom-over-house-scene-actually-happened-heres-how>.

"Stonewall at 50. ACLU at 100. A Legacy of Fighting for Justice and Equality." n.d. American Civil Liberties Union. Accessed September 11, 2022.

<https://www.aclu.org/issues/lgbtq-rights/stonewall-50-aclu-100-legacy-fighting-justice-and-equality>.

Teal, Donn. 1971. *The Gay Militants*. N.p.: St. Martin's Press.

Thompson, Neil. 2002. "Social Movements, Social Justice, and Social Work." *The British Journal of Social Work* 32, no. 6 (September): 711-722. 23716490.

"Trainings and Speaking Engagements | SRLP." n.d. Sylvia Rivera Law Project. Accessed July 12, 2022. <https://srlp.org/trainings/>.

"Trainings - FORGE." n.d. Forge-Forward.org. Accessed July 15, 2022. <https://forge-forward.org/training/trainings/>.

“Transgender people over four times more likely than cisgender people to be victims of violent crime.” 2021. Williams Institute.

<https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/press/ncvs-trans-press-release/>

Trout, Hank. 2020. “Ben Schatz: Advocate.” A&U Magazine.

<https://aumag.org/2020/09/30/ben-schatz-advocate/>.

Turner, Allison. 2017. “In 1973, APA Removed Homosexuality From List of Mental Illnesses.”

Human Rights Campaign.

<https://www.hrc.org/news/flashbackfriday-today-in-1973-the-apa-removed-homosexuality-from-list-of-me>.

United States v. Windsor 570 US 744 (2013).

“United States v. Windsor (Challenging the federal "Defense of Marriage Act").” n.d. New York

Civil Liberties Union. Accessed May 14, 2022.

<https://www.nyclu.org/en/cases/united-states-v-windsor-challenging-federal-defense-marriage-act>.

“U.S. House Takes Historic Step by Passing the Employment Non-Discrimination Act.” 2007.

Human Rights Campaign.

<https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/u-s-house-takes-historic-step-by-passing-the-employment-non-discrimination>.

Vaid, Urvashi. 1995. *Virtual Equality*. New York, New York: Double Day Dell Publishing

Group.

Warner, Michael, and Social Text Collective. 1993. *Fear of a Queer Planet: Queer Politics and*

Social Theory. Edited by Michael Warner. N.p.: University of Minnesota Press.

Warner, Michael. 1999. *The trouble with normal : sex, politics, and the ethics of queer life*. N.p.: Harvard University Press.

“Webinars - FORGE.” n.d. Forge Forward. Accessed July 21, 2022.

<https://forge-forward.org/resources/webinars/>.

“Windsor v. United States | American Civil Liberties Union.” 2014. ACLU.

<https://www.aclu.org/cases/lesbian-and-gay-rights/windsor-v-united-states>.

Wolfson, Evan. n.d. “The Roadmap to Victory.” Freedom to Marry. Accessed September 18,

2022. <http://www.freedomtomarry.org/pages/Roadmap-to-Victory>.

Wolfson, Evan. n.d. “Why It Matters.” Freedom to Marry. Accessed September 18, 2022.

<http://www.freedomtomarry.org/pages/why-it-matters>.

Wolfson, Evan. n.d. “Winning at the Ballot.” Freedom to Marry. Accessed September 18, 2022.

<http://www.freedomtomarry.org/pages/Winning-at-the-Ballot>.

Wolfson, Evan. n.d. “Winning Legislative Campaigns.” Freedom to Marry. Accessed September

18, 2022. <http://www.freedomtomarry.org/pages/Winning-Legislative-Campaigns>.

Woods, Jordan B. 2017. “LGBT Identity and Crime.” *California Law Review* 105, no. 3 (June): 123-93.

Zamansky, Stephen. 1993. “Colorado's Amendment 2 and Homosexuals' Right to Equal

Protection of the Law.” *Boston College Law Review* 35, no. 1 (January): 221-258.