

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION
NO. 1:09-cv-10309

NANCY GILL & MARCELLE LETOURNEAU,)
MARTIN KOSKI & JAMES FITZGERALD,)
DEAN HARA,)
MARY RITCHIE & KATHLEEN BUSH,)
MELBA ABREU & BEATRICE HERNANDEZ,)
MARLIN NABORS & JONATHAN KNIGHT,)
MARY BOWE-SHULMAN &)
DORENE BOWE-SHULMAN,)
JO ANN WHITEHEAD & BETTE JO GREEN,)
RANDELL LEWIS-KENDELL, and)
HERBERT BURTIS,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT,)
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,)
JOHN E. POTTER, in his official capacity as)
the Postmaster General of the United States of)
America,)
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, in his official capacity)
as the Commissioner of the Social Security)
Administration,)
ERIC H. HOLDER JR., in his official capacity)
as the United States Attorney General, and)
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)

Defendants. _____)

EXPERT AFFIDAVIT OF GEORGE CHAUNCEY, Ph.D

EXPERT AFFIDAVIT OF GEORGE CHAUNCEY, Ph.D

I, George Chauncey, hereby depose and state as follows:

I. EXPERT BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS

1. I am a Professor of History at Yale University, where I have taught since 2006. My testimony will relate to my opinions as an expert in the history of the United States in the twentieth century and gender, homosexuality, sexuality, and civil rights in the United States, with a particular focus on the history of discrimination experienced by gays and lesbians in the United States. I have actual knowledge of the matters stated in this affidavit and could and would so testify if called as a witness. My background, experience, and list of publications from the last 10 years are summarized in my curriculum vitae, which is attached as Exhibit A to this affidavit.

2. Prior to 2006 I was a Professor of History at University of Chicago for fifteen years, from 1991 through 2006. I am the author of *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994), which won the Organization of American Historians' Merle Curti Award for the best book in social history and Frederick Jackson Turner Award for the best first book in any field of history, the *Los Angeles Times* Book Prize in History, and Lambda Literary Award. I am also the author of *Why Marriage? The History Shaping Today's Debate over Gay Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 2004), coeditor of three books and special journal issues, including *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (NAL, 1989), and the author of numerous articles, which are listed in my Curriculum Vitae, attached to this affidavit as Exhibit A.

3. I base my opinions on my own research, experience and publications, the work of other historians and scholars as listed in the attached bibliography, the general statutes of Massachusetts, Mississippi, and Arkansas, and the archives of the Boston Globe, New York Times, Portland Press Herald, and Boston Magazine.

II. INTRODUCTION

4. While there is ample evidence that same-sex love and intimacy have persisted across the ages, most historians now agree that the concept of the homosexual and the heterosexual as distinct categories of people emerged only in the late nineteenth century. This had profound effects on the regulation of homosexuality. Early American legislators, drawing on their understanding of ancient Judeo-Christian prohibitions against sodomy and “unnatural acts,” penalized a wide range of non-procreative behavior, including many forms of what would now be called homosexual conduct. While these laws prohibited conduct, it was in the twentieth century that the government began to classify and discriminate against certain of its citizens on the basis of their status or identity as homosexuals.

5. Official hostility and discrimination had a profound and enduring impact on the place of lesbians and gay men in American society. In the 1920s, the State of New York prohibited theaters from staging plays with lesbian or gay characters. Beginning in the 1930s and 1940s, many states, including Massachusetts, prohibited gay people from being served in bars and restaurants. In the 1950s, the federal government banned the employment of homosexuals and insisted that its private contractors ferret out and dismiss their gay employees. It also prohibited gay foreigners from entering the country

or securing citizenship. Until the 1960s, all states penalized sexual intimacy between men. Across the century, many municipalities periodically launched police campaigns to suppress gay meeting places and sought to purge gay civil servants from government employment.

6. Many clergy condemned homosexuality as sinful, and leading physicians and medical researchers claimed that homosexuality was a pathological condition or disease. In the 1930s, the Hollywood studios enacted a censorship code that for nearly thirty years prohibited the discussion of gay issues or the appearance of gay or lesbian characters in the most powerful medium of the twentieth century. In the 1940s and 1950s, municipal police officials, state governmental leaders, local newspapers, and national magazines justified anti-gay discrimination and the suppression of gay meeting places by fostering frightening stereotypes of homosexuals as child molesters. Those stereotypes have had enduring consequences, and continue to inspire public fears and hostility, especially concerning gay teachers and parents. In the 1980s, the early press coverage of AIDS reinforced the view that homosexuals were diseased and threatened other Americans. In the 1990s, anti-gay groups threatened to organize boycotts against the sponsors of network television shows which included gay characters, and the Southern Baptist Convention called for a boycott of all Disney products because Disney offered domestic partnership benefits to its employees and Disneyland organized gay theme nights.

7. Historically, anti-gay measures were often enacted or strengthened in response to periods of relative growth in the visibility or tolerance of gay people. For example, the effervescence and visibility of gay life in the 1920s contributed to the

backlash gay and lesbian people endured during the Great Depression. The increased visibility of gays and lesbians during the Second World War helped precipitate a second wave of hostility in the late 1940s and 1950s. The dramatically increased visibility of gay people in the 1970s and 1980s, and their success in persuading some state and local governments to include sexual orientation in their anti-discrimination laws, resulted in a wave of referenda initiatives between 1977 and the early 1990s that overturned those laws and/or prohibited the enactment of others.

8. In recent decades, and especially in the last twenty years, many (though not all) of these discriminatory measures were repealed and there was a significant shift in public opinion toward acceptance of gay people. Given the long history of campaigns demonizing homosexuals as child molesters, for instance, it is unsurprising that as recently as 1977, two-thirds of Americans told pollsters they objected to lesbians or gay men being hired as elementary school teachers. By 1992, after fifteen years of extensive public discussion of this and other gay issues, only half of those polled still rejected the idea of their child having a gay elementary school teacher. By 2002, after another decade of reflection, often prompted by actual interactions with gay teachers, about 60 percent of Americans were willing to have elementary schools employ gay teachers, and two-thirds of them found gay high school teachers acceptable.

9. When marriage emerged as the new flashpoint in debates over gay rights a decade ago, the debate was shaped by the legacy of anti-gay policies and attitudes, and it appears to have followed a similar pattern. Many Americans initially responded to the idea that gay and lesbian couples should be allowed to marry with the same misgivings and even hostility with which they once greeted the idea of gay teachers or gay characters

on television sitcoms. Opponents of marriage equality mobilized some of the most enduring anti-gay stereotypes to heighten public apprehension. Several television commercials aired by the supporters of Proposition 8 in California, for instance, warned that marriage equality might encourage children to become homosexuals themselves. The recent campaign to repeal marriage equality in Maine used the same tactics, including recycling commercials and scripts from the Proposition 8 campaign because they were so effective the first time. The approval of Proposition 8 in California, Question 1 in Maine, and similar laws and constitutional amendments in 37 other states indicate the enduring influence of anti-gay hostility and the persistence of ideas about the inequality of gay people and their relationships. The civil rights enjoyed by gay and lesbian people throughout the United States continue to be subject to the vicissitudes of public opinion in an ever-changing social, political and cultural landscape.

10. At several critical junctures, a handful of state and federal courts have been the only authorities willing to defend the rights of gay people against the antipathy of the majority. In the 1950s and 1960s, at a time when overwhelming public sentiment supported the criminalization of gay bars and other meeting places, state courts in California and New York ruled that gay people had the right to assemble. In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that the US Post Office could not ban a gay political magazine from the mails. In the 1990s, when voters in cities and states across the country were voting to ban states and local municipalities from enacting gay rights legislation, the United States Supreme Court ruled in *Romer v. Evans* that gay people could not be excluded from the political process. Sometimes quickly and sometimes more slowly, these decisions played a critical role in shifts in public opinion.

III. ROOTS OF DISCRIMINATION

11. The first American laws against homosexual conduct were rooted in the earliest English settlers' understanding of the religious and secular traditions that prohibited sodomy, and they reflected the ambiguity of those traditions. Although sodomy included some forms of what today would be called homosexual conduct, medieval theologians did not use sodomy to refer systematically and exclusively to such conduct; they usually understood sodomy to include male anal intercourse, but less frequently oral sex and rarely sex between women.

12. The English Reformation Parliament of 1533 turned the religious injunction against sodomy into the secular crime of buggery when it made "the detestable and abominable vice of buggery committed with mankind or beast" punishable by death. The English courts interpreted this to apply to sexual intercourse between a human and animal and anal intercourse between a man and woman as well as anal intercourse between two men.

13. Colonial American statutes drew on these religious and secular traditions and shared their imprecision in the definition of the offense. Various definitions of the crime as (the religious) sodomy or (the secular) buggery, they generally proscribed anal sex between men and men, men and women, and humans and animals, but their details and their rationale varied. The southern colonies generally adopted the English law against buggery, while the Puritan New England colonies usually drew on religious traditions to penalize many forms of "carnall knowledge," including adultery, fornication, sex with prepubescent girls, and "men lying with men." Puritan clergy in the New

England colonies were especially vigorous in their denunciation of sodomitical sins as contrary to God's will, but their condemnation was motivated by the pressing need to increase the population and to secure the stability of the family as well as their reading of scripture. In the Massachusetts Bay Colony, sodomy was prohibited from 1641 by a statute taken directly from Leviticus: "If any man lyeth with mankinde as he lyeth with a woeman, both of them have committed abhominacion, they both shall surely be put to death." Although several men were executed for sodomy, the colonies rarely prosecuted men for this offense, for reasons that are still not entirely clear to historians.

IV. MODERN AMERICAN HISTORY: 1890-1940

14. Prosecutions for sodomy and related offenses increased dramatically in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a result of the emergence of the idea of the homosexual as a distinct category of person, the expansion of laws penalizing homosexual conduct, and the growing influence of religiously-inspired moral reform societies, which insisted on criminal prosecutions.

15. These types of prosecutions continued to penalize people on the basis of their homosexual conduct rather than their identity as homosexuals. Current historical research suggests that the concept of the homosexual as a distinct category of person developed as recently as the late nineteenth century. The word "homosexual" appeared for the first time in a German pamphlet in 1868, and was introduced to the American lexicon only in 1892. Between the 1920s and 1950s, the government, drawing on long traditions of hostility to same-sex conduct and responding both to new conceptions of the homosexual as an individual and to the growing visibility of those individuals, began to

classify and discriminate against certain of its citizens on the basis of their status or identity as homosexuals. This discrimination reached remarkable—and still largely unrecognized—proportions.

16. The dramatic growth of American cities in the late nineteenth century permitted lesbians and gay men to develop a more complex and extensive collective life than was possible in small towns and rural areas. While everyone was likely to know everyone else's business in small towns, the size, complexity, and relative anonymity of cities made it easier for gay people (and other nonconformists) to forge a collective life with people like themselves, away from the eyes of hostile outsiders. The early history of the migration of gay people to the relative freedom of the cities is little understood, but it seems to have increased in the early twentieth century, at about the same time as growing numbers of African Americans fled the small towns of the Jim Crow South for the relative freedom of northern cities. Like African Americans, gay people, both black and white, found that the relative freedom of city life was tempered by continuing hostility and discrimination.

17. The emergence of gay and lesbian communities described in this affidavit took place to varying degrees in every American city studied by historians. Because the field of lesbian and gay history remains relatively young in 2009 and has been hampered by the legacy of censorship described below, historians still know most about the history of such communities in major metropolitan centers such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, and they will therefore loom large in the history that follows. However, recent studies of the gay history of smaller cities and communities, ranging from Buffalo, NY, and Portland, Oregon, to Jackson, Mississippi, and its

surrounding rural areas, both confirm the broad outlines of the history described here and reveal regional variations in that history. Important recent historical studies of the development of federal and military policies concerning homosexuality and gay citizens have documented discriminatory laws and policies that had nationwide effects.

18. New York City provides one of the best documented examples of the emergence of a distinctive gay world in the early twentieth century. By the 1910s, New York's "gay world" included gay residential and commercial enclaves in several immigrant, African American, and bohemian neighborhoods; widely publicized dances and other social events; and a host of commercial establishments where gay people gathered, ranging from saloons, speakeasies, and bars to cheap cafeterias and elegant restaurants. In the 1920s and early 1930s, gay writers and performers produced a flurry of gay literature and theater. Some gay people were involved in long-term relationships they called marriages. Most remained very careful to conceal their homosexuality from nongay associates, though, for fear of losing their jobs, homes, and respect.

19. Many Americans responded to the growing visibility of gay life with fascination and sympathy, regarding it as simply one more sign of the growing complexity and freedom from tradition of a burgeoning metropolitan culture. Popular fascination with gay culture reached a crescendo during the Prohibition Era (or Jazz Age), when lesbians ran some of the most popular tearooms and cafes in bohemian neighborhoods such as New York's Greenwich Village and Chicago's Towertown. That said, the poor, immigrant, African American, and bohemian neighborhoods where gay life became most visible were regarded as the underside of city life by "respectable society."

A. Hostile Religious and Medical Views Prompted the Escalation of Anti-gay Policing in the Early Twentieth Century

20. Other Americans regarded the growing visibility of lesbian and gay life with dread. Hostility to homosexuals was sometimes motivated by an underlying uneasiness about the dramatic changes underway in gender roles at the turn of the last century. Conservative physicians initially argued that the homosexual (or “sexual invert”) was characterized as much by his or her violation of conventional gender roles as by specifically sexual interests. At a time when many doctors argued that women should be barred from most jobs because employment would interfere with their ability to bear children, numerous doctors identified suffragists, women entering the professions, and other women challenging the limits placed on their sex as victims of a medical disorder. Thus doctors explained that “the female possessed of masculine ideas of independence” was a “degenerate” and that “a decided taste and tolerance for cigars, * * * [the] dislike and incapacity for needlework * * * and some capacity for athletics” were all signs of female “sexual inversion.” Similarly, another doctor thought it significant that a male “pervert” “never smoked and never married; [and] was entirely averse to outdoor games.”

21. Such views about gender roles lost their credibility once public opinion had come to accept significant changes in women’s roles in the workplace and political sphere, but doctors continued for several more decades to identify homosexuality per se as a “disease,” “mental defect,” “disorder,” or “degeneration.” Until the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its list of disorders in 1973, such hostile medical pronouncements provided a powerful source of legitimation to anti-

homosexual sentiment, just as medical science had previously legitimized widely held (and subsequently discarded) beliefs about male superiority and white racial superiority.

22. Religiously-inspired hostility to homosexuality also inspired an escalation in anti-gay policing. In the late nineteenth century, native-born Protestants organized numerous “anti-vice” societies to suppress what they regarded as the sexual immorality and social disorder of the nation’s burgeoning Catholic and Jewish immigrant neighborhoods. Although these organizations focused on female prostitution and what they regarded as the weakening of moral strictures governing relations between men and women, they also opposed the growing visibility of homosexuality, which they regarded as a particularly egregious sign of the loosening of social controls on sexual expression under urban conditions. They encouraged the police to step up harassment of gay life as one more part of their campaigns to shut down dance halls and movie theaters, prohibit the consumption of alcohol and the use of contraceptives, dissuade restaurants from serving an interracial mix of customers, and otherwise impose their vision of the proper social order and sexual morality. For example, in Massachusetts, the Watch and Ward Society, established as the New England Society for the Suppression of Vice, conducted surveillance on virtually all the popular gay bars and gathering places of the time.

23. As a result of the pressure from Protestant moral reform organizations, municipal police forces began using misdemeanor charges, such as disorderly conduct, vagrancy, lewdness, loitering, and so forth to harass homosexuals. These state misdemeanor or municipal offense laws, which carried fewer procedural protections than felony sodomy charges, allowed further harassment of individuals engaged in same-sex

intimacy. In some cases, state officials tailored these laws to strengthen the legal regulation of homosexuals. For example, in 1923 the New York State legislature specified for the first time one man's "frequent[ing] or loiter[ing] about any public place soliciting men for the purpose of committing a crime against nature or other lewdness" as a form of disorderly conduct. Many more men were arrested and prosecuted under this misdemeanor charge than for sodomy. Between 1923 and 1966, when Mayor John Lindsay ordered the police to stop using entrapment to secure arrests of gay men, there were more than 50,000 arrests on this charge in New York City alone.

24. The social marginalization of gay men and lesbians gave the police and the public even broader informal authority to harass them. The threat of violence and verbal harassment deterred many gay people from doing anything that might reveal their homosexuality in public. Gay people knew that anyone discovered to be homosexual risked the loss of livelihood and social respect, so most gay people were careful to lead a double life, hiding their homosexuality from their heterosexual employers and other associates.

B. Censorship

25. The growing visibility of lesbian and gay life in the early twentieth century precipitated censorship campaigns designed to curtail gay people's freedom of speech and the freedom of all Americans to discuss gay issues.

26. The earliest gay activists fell victim to such campaigns. In 1924, when the police learned of the country's earliest known gay political group, which had been established by a postal worker in Chicago, they raided his home and seized his group's

files and membership list. After the raid, the group ceased publication of its short-lived magazine, *Friendship and Freedom*.

27. In the 1910s and 1920s, a handful of plays included lesbian and gay characters or addressed homosexual themes. But in 1927, after “The Captive,” a serious drama exploring lesbianism, opened on Broadway to critical acclaim, New York State passed a “padlock law” that threatened to shut down for a year any theater that staged a play with lesbian or gay characters. Given Broadway’s national importance as a staging ground for new plays, this law effectively censored American theater for a generation.

28. Such censorship had even wider-reaching effects when it reached the movies. A censorship movement led by religious leaders threatened the Hollywood studios with mass boycotts and restrictive federal legislation if they did not begin censoring their films. Seeking to avoid federal legislation, the studios established a production code (popularly known as “the Hays Code”) that from 1934 on prohibited the inclusion of gay or lesbian characters, discussion of homosexual issues, or even the “inference” of “sex perversion” in Hollywood films. This censorship code remained in effect for some thirty years and effectively prohibited discussion of homosexuality in the most important medium of the twentieth century. This stymied and delayed democratic debate about homosexuality for more than a generation.

29. In the early twentieth century, Boston had a particularly strict culture of “moral purity” censorship, and the phrase “Banned in Boston” was familiar to people throughout the country. In 1935, for instance, Boston Mayor Frederick W. Mansfield banned Lillian Hellman’s *The Children’s Hour*, a play with lesbian themes. Mansfield explained his decision to the press by asserting that the play “showed moral perversion,

the unnatural appetite of two women for each other.” Ironically, the ban gave the play a great deal of publicity elsewhere.

C. The Great Depression and the Curtailment of Gay People’s Freedom of Association

30. In the early years of the Great Depression, restrictions on gay life intensified. By depriving millions of men of their role as breadwinners, the Depression transformed already-existing anxiety over gender roles into a crisis in gender and family relations. Federal, state, and local governments responded to this perceived crisis with policies that directly affected women and gay people. New Deal public works projects, for instance, which offered jobs only to male heads of households, were designed in part to restore men’s status in their families and larger society, even when this meant limiting women’s economic opportunities.

31. The apparent fragility of the family and gender arrangements made the visibility of gay life seem more threatening, especially given the long-standing representation of gays and lesbians as gender deviants. After a generation in which gay life had been relatively visible and integrated into urban public life, restrictions on gay life increased. Gay people were forced into hiding by new laws that pushed gay people out of restaurants and bars as well as off the stage and silver screen.

32. New regulations curtailed gay people’s freedom of association. In New York State, for instance, the State Liquor Authority established after the Repeal of Prohibition issued regulations prohibiting bars, restaurants, cabarets, and other establishments with liquor licenses from employing or serving homosexuals or allowing

homosexuals to congregate on their premises. The Authority's rationale was that the mere presence of homosexuals made an establishment "disorderly," and when the courts rejected that argument the Authority began using evidence of unconventional gender behavior or homosexual solicitation gathered by plainclothes investigators to provide proof of a bar's disorderly character. Hundreds of bars were closed in the next thirty years in New York City alone.

V. MODERN AMERICAN HISTORY: WORLD WAR II

33. Changes in the policies of the Armed Forces of the United States during the Second World War both reflected and expanded the government's growing campaign of classifying and discriminating against gay citizens. The military had long made sodomy a criminal offense (and, indeed, it continues to do so). But the Second World War marked the first time the military moved beyond criminalizing homosexual conduct to develop policies that systematically endeavored to exclude personnel on the basis of their identity as homosexuals. All of the armed forces put in place screening mechanisms designed to ferret out homosexuals during the induction process. Thousands of men and women were kept from serving their country, and often faced public opprobrium as a result. Notwithstanding the new prohibition, many gays and lesbians served in the armed forces in World War II, but they had to be careful to whom they disclosed their sexual orientation.

34. Across the country, the number of lesbian and gay bars and other meeting places increased during the war years. Military authorities responded to the growth in the number of gay meeting places by collaborating with civil authorities to close them or at

least keep servicemen from visiting them. The Army and the Navy created a joint Disciplinary Control Board that worked together with state liquor control agents and municipal police forces to identify and police bars and night clubs, including almost one hundred in San Francisco alone, with the intent of harassing and suspending the licenses of those that served a gay clientele. Military and civilian police also cooperated in anti-vice raids against gay bars and other meeting places. Servicemen who were caught in these raids risked being discharged, and several thousand patriotic Americans who honorably served to defend their country were not honorably discharged solely because of their gay or lesbian identity.

35. Following the war, the Veterans Administration denied GI Bill benefits to soldiers who had received undesirable discharges. Eventually most other groups of soldiers discharged in this way had their benefits restored, but the Veterans Administration steadfastly refused to restore them to homosexuals. This meant that gay veterans – members of the “Greatest Generation” – who had risked their lives for their country before being discharged were denied the educational, housing, and readjustment allowances provided to millions of their peers.

VI. MODERN AMERICAN HISTORY: POST-WWII PERIOD

A. Government Policies in the McCarthy Era

36. Even the stepped-up policing of gay life in the 1930s and 1940s fails to anticipate the scale of discrimination faced by homosexuals in the generation following the Second World War. The persecution of gay men and lesbians dramatically increased at every level of government.

37. In 1950, following Senator Joseph McCarthy's denunciation of the employment of gay persons in the State Department, the Senate conducted a special investigation into "the employment of homosexuals and other sex perverts in government." The Senate Committee recommended excluding gay men and lesbians from all government service, civilian as well as military. To support this recommendation, the Committee argued that homosexual acts violated the law and gave its imprimatur to the prejudice that "those who engage in overt acts of perversion lack the emotional stability of normal persons" and that homosexuals "constitute security risks." The Committee also portrayed homosexuals as predators: "[T]he presence of a sex pervert in a Government agency tends to have a corrosive influence on his fellow employees. These perverts will frequently attempt to entice normal individuals to engage in perverted practices. This is particularly true in the case of young and impressionable people who might come under the influence of a pervert. Government officials have the responsibility of keeping this type of corrosive influence out of the agencies under their control. ... One homosexual can pollute a Government office."

38. The Senate investigation and report were only one part of a massive anti-homosexual campaign launched by the federal government after the war. The Senate Committee reported that "[a] spot check of the records of the Civil Service Commission indicates that between January 1, 1947, and August 1, 1950, approximately 1,700 applicants for Federal positions were denied employment because they had a record of homosexuality or other sex perversion." In 1953, President Eisenhower issued an executive order requiring the discharge of homosexual employees from federal employment, civilian or military. Thousands of men and women were discharged or

forced to resign from civilian and military positions because they were suspected of being gay or lesbian. At the height of the McCarthy era, the U.S. State Department discharged more homosexuals than communists. The government's purge of its gay employees prompted the founding of some of the earliest gay rights organizations. Frank Kameny, for one, founded the first gay rights group in Washington, D.C. after he was dismissed from his job as a government astronomer for being homosexual in 1957. It was only in 1975 that the ban on gay federal employees was lifted, and it took until the late 1990s before such discrimination in federal hiring was prohibited.

39. President Eisenhower's executive order prohibiting federal employment for homosexuals also required defense contractors and other private corporations with federal contracts to ferret out and discharge their homosexual employees. Many other private employers without federal contracts adopted the federal government's policy by refusing to hire gay people. Furthermore, the FBI initiated a widespread system of surveillance to enforce the executive order. As the historian John D'Emilio has noted, "The FBI sought out friendly vice squad officers who supplied arrest records on morals charges, regardless of whether convictions had ensued. Regional FBI officers gathered data on gay bars, compiled lists of other places frequented by homosexuals, and clipped press articles that provided information about the gay world . . . Federal investigators engaged in more than fact-finding; they also exhibited considerable zeal in using information they collected."

40. Two years after the Senate Committee recommended that homosexuals be purged from government employment, the Congress signaled its conviction that homosexuals stood outside the boundaries of the nation in the most palpable way

possible: by denying them entry into the country. In 1952, Congress prohibited homosexuals (whom it called psychopaths) from entering the country, much as it had previously prohibited immigration from Asia and curtailed the immigration of Jews and Catholics from eastern and southern European. In the case of homosexuals, the prohibition extended beyond people seeking residency or citizenship; a generation of foreign visitors applying for tourist visas had to sign statements swearing they were not homosexual before they could make even the briefest trip to the United States.

41. Many state and local governments followed the federal government's lead in seeking to ferret out and discharge their homosexual employees. As a result of these official policies, countless state employees, teachers, hospital workers, and others lost their jobs. Beginning in 1958, for instance, the Florida Legislative Investigation Committee, which had been established by the legislature in 1956 to investigate and discredit civil rights activists, turned its attention to homosexuals working in the State's universities and public schools. Its initial investigation of the University of Florida resulted in the dismissal of fourteen faculty and staff members, and in the next five years it interrogated some 320 suspected gay men and lesbians. It "pressured countless others into relinquishing their teaching positions, and had many students quietly removed from state universities." Its 1959 report to the legislature called the extent of homosexual activity in the State's school system "absolutely appalling." In a well-publicized 1949 case in Massachusetts, Dr. Miriam Van Waters, long-time superintendent of the Women's Reformatory at Framingham, was dismissed by the Commissioner of Corrections, because she had either not known or had known and had not prevented "an unwholesome relationship" that "existed between inmates of the Reformatory" which had

“resulted in ‘crushes’, ‘courtships’, and homosexual practises [*sic*] among the inmates.” She was then forced to defend her policies in public hearings held by a State House committee over several months.

42. Both federal and local agencies sought to curtail gay people’s freedom of speech and the freedom of all people to discuss homosexuality. In 1954, postal officials in Los Angeles banned an issue of the first gay political magazine, *ONE*, from the mails, a ban overturned by the Supreme Court in 1958. In some cities the police continued to shut down newsstands that dared to carry it. In 1957, San Francisco officials arrested Lawrence Ferlinghetti and Shig Murao for publishing and selling *Howl*, a poem by Allen Ginsberg that openly proclaimed his homosexuality.

43. Censorship, government suppression, and the fear of both made it difficult for gay people to organize and speak out on their own behalf. Given the severity of anti-gay policing, for instance, the Mattachine Society, the most significant gay rights organization in the 1950s, repeatedly had to reassure its anxious members that the police would not seize its membership list. In Denver in 1959, a few weeks after Mattachine held its first press conference during a national convention, the police raided the homes of three of its Denver organizers; one lost his job and spent sixty days in jail.

B. The Demonization of Homosexuals

44. The official harassment of homosexuals received further legitimization from a series of press and police campaigns in the 1940s and 1950s that fomented demonic stereotypes of homosexuals as child molesters out to recruit the young into their way of life. In response to a series of local panics over sex crimes against women and

children, in which homosexuals were almost never identified as the culprits, numerous local newspapers and national magazines claimed that children faced a growing threat from homosexuals. The press warned that in breaking with social convention to the extent necessary to engage in homosexual behavior, a man had demonstrated the refusal to adjust to social norms that was the hallmark of the psychopath. In 1950, *Coronet*, a popular national magazine, asserted: “Once a man assumes the role of homosexual, he often throws off all moral restraints. . . . Some male sex deviants do not stop with infecting their often-innocent partners: they descend through perversions to other forms of depravity, such as drug addiction, burglary, sadism, and even murder.”

45. The demonization of homosexuals by the press was reinforced by the statements of public officials. A Special Assistant Attorney General of California claimed in 1949 that “[t]he sex pervert, in his more innocuous form, is too frequently regarded as merely a queer individual who never hurts anyone but himself. All too often we lose sight of the fact that the homosexual is an inveterate seducer of the young of both sexes, and is ever seeking for younger victims.” Detroit’s prosecuting attorney demanded the authority to arrest, examine, and possibly confine indefinitely “anyone who exhibited abnormal sexual behavior, whether or not dangerous.” Such press campaigns and official statements created fearsome new stereotypes of homosexuals as child molesters, which continue to incite public fears about gay teachers and parents as well as other gay people who come into contact with children. Between the late 1930s and late 1950s, public hysteria incited by such press campaigns prompted more than half the state legislatures to enact laws allowing the police to force persons convicted of certain sexual offenses—or, in some states, merely *suspected* of being “sexual deviants”—to undergo

psychiatric examinations. These examinations could result in indeterminate civil confinements for individuals deemed in need of a “cure” for their homosexual “pathology.”

C. The Escalation of Anti-gay Policing

46. During the postwar era, bars became an especially important meeting place for lesbians and gay men because they were often the only public spaces in which people dared be openly gay. Given their growing importance to gay people as a social center and the growing pressure on the police to enforce regulations prohibiting bars from serving homosexuals, gay bars became an important battleground in the postwar years. Despite the prevailing popular animosity toward homosexuals, state courts in New York and California issued rulings that curtailed the right of state liquor authorities and the police to discriminate against gay bar patrons. Official antipathy to homosexuals was so strong, however, that police officials circumvented or simply disregarded these judicial decisions.

47. This sharp escalation in the policing of gay life after the Second World War occurred throughout the country. In 1955, for example, the government of Boise, Idaho launched a fifteen-month investigation of gay men in town, interrogating fourteen hundred persons and pressuring men known to be gay to reveal the names of other gay men. Police departments from Seattle and Dallas to New Orleans and Baltimore stepped up their raids on bars and private parties attended by gay and lesbian persons, and made thousands of arrests for "disorderly conduct." By 1950, Philadelphia had a six-man “morals squad” arresting more gay men than the courts knew how to handle, some 200 a

month. In the District of Columbia, there were more than a thousand arrests every year. In the three decades after 1933, hundreds of bars that tolerated gay customers were closed in New York City alone. Some bars in New York and Los Angeles posted signs telling potential gay customers: “If You Are Gay, Please Stay Away” or, more directly, “We Do Not Serve Homosexuals.”

VII. THE GAY RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND ITS OPPONENTS IN THE 1970S AND 1980S

A. Early Successes of the Gay and Lesbian Rights Movement

48. The dramatic escalation in policing and suppression in the post-war years failed to eradicate gay life. In larger cities, lesbians and gay men covertly patronized bars and restaurants, which they turned into informal meeting places, took over remote sections of public beaches, and held dances and parties. In many smaller towns, gay life took shape unnoticed in church choirs, amateur theaters, and women’s softball leagues and was sustained by closely knit social circles.

49. Nonetheless, most gays and lesbians responded to the escalation in policing after the Second World War by keeping their homosexuality carefully hidden from non-gay people. They developed elaborate verbal codes that allowed them to communicate with one another while remaining invisible to hostile outsiders. The word “gay” is a good example of this: before the 1970s few heterosexuals realized gay people had given it a distinctly homosexual meaning. But the very success of such subterfuges in concealing gay life made it difficult for gay people to find one another in the 1950s, and it severely limited the capacity of gay people to organize on their own behalf.

50. In Boston, anti-gay attitudes persisted. For example, in 1965 the Boston City Council's Committee on Urban Renewal debated whether to literally bulldoze many of the gay bars downtown. A proponent of the effort, City Councilor Frederick Langone, gave a speech at the meeting, calling for the destruction of "these incubators of homosexuality and indecency and a Bohemian way of life," and insisting that "[w]e must uproot these joints so innocent kids won't be contaminated." Many gay bars were razed in the "revitalization" that followed.

51. The earliest gay rights organizations, the Mattachine Society, ONE, and the Daughters of Bilitis, were founded in the early 1950s at the height of the demonization of homosexuals as dangerous, irrational and unstable pariahs who threatened the nation's children as well as national security. This initial generation of activists worked to educate and cultivate allies among sociologists, psychologists, criminologists, and other professionals who had the credibility to speak on homosexuality that was denied to homosexuals themselves. In Massachusetts, a chapter of the Mattachine Society was founded in 1957, and the Boston Demophile Center opened in 1962, both of which lobbied with little success early on. Most Bostonians—even gays and lesbians—were unaware of their activities. However, the Demophile Center was at least able to publish several newsletters and hold meetings.

52. Gay rights organizations began to influence public policy in the mid-1960s, although the pace of change varied enormously across the country. The New York Mattachine Society's success in 1966 in persuading Mayor John Lindsay to end the widespread police use of entrapment had a profound effect on gay male New Yorkers, who for the first time in decades did not have to worry that the men who approached

them in bars and elsewhere were undercover policemen. New York and California state court rulings finally curtailed the policing of gay bars and other meeting places in those states in the 1960s, but in some other parts of the country the police continued to raid gay bars well into the 1970s and 1980s. The growing divergence in the treatment of gay people in different parts of the country prompted a growing number of gay people to migrate from hostile areas to New York, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Chicago, and other more tolerant cities and regions. This mass migration, in turn, affected the political and cultural climate of those cities and regions, making them more likely to enact gay rights legislation and similar policies.

53. Major institutions that once helped legitimize anti-gay attitudes also began to change their positions. Medical writers and mental health professionals whose stigmatization of homosexuality as a disease or disorder had been used to justify discrimination for decades were among the first to change their views. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association voted to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders. The American Psychological Association soon followed suit.

54. Censorship of gay images and speech declined. By the early 1960s, competition from television led the Hollywood studios to reorganize their nearly-thirty-year-old censorship code, enabling the studios to make films for adult viewers which addressed “serious themes” such as homosexuality. These themes remained off-limits for television. The studios initially still included very few gay characters in their features, and the television networks included virtually none, but ending formal censorship opened a door that resulted in significant cultural changes in later years.

55. Religious attitudes toward homosexuals and homosexuality also began to change. The place of lesbians and gay men in religious life is still vigorously debated, but since the 1970s many mainline Protestant denominations have issued official statements condemning legal discrimination against homosexuals and affirming that homosexuals ought to enjoy equal protection under criminal and civil law. Several of these groups descended from the historically influential denominations whose religious authority had been invoked to justify colonial statutes against sodomy. The Lutheran Church in America, the Unitarian Universalist Association, the United Methodist Church, the United Church of Christ, the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Disciples of Christ, and the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. all issued statements in support of gay civil rights by 1980.

56. A small but growing number of municipalities enacted legislation protecting people from certain forms of discrimination on the basis of their sexual orientation. In 1972, East Lansing, Michigan, home to Michigan State University, became the first town to do so. Within five years, another 27 communities passed such legislation, more than half of them university towns such as Ann Arbor, Austin, Berkeley and Madison. They were joined by a handful of larger cities such as San Francisco, Minneapolis, Seattle, and Detroit.

B. Anti-Gay Discrimination in the 1970s and 1980s

57. Beginning in the late 1970s, the initial success of the gay movement in securing local gay rights legislation, as well as the increasing visibility of gay people in the media, provoked a vigorous reaction. Anti-gay rights advocates drew on pernicious

stereotypes developed in previous decades to argue that enacting gay rights laws, permitting gay people to teach, and even simply allowing gay characters to appear on television sitcoms threatened the security of children and the stability of the family.

58. The anti-gay rights campaign was effectively launched in 1977, when Anita Bryant, a prominent Baptist singer and the spokeswoman for the Florida citrus growers, led a campaign to “Save Our Children” from a newly enacted gay civil rights ordinance in Dade County, Florida. Her success in persuading a decisive majority of Miami voters to vote against the ordinance depended heavily on her use of the still powerful postwar images of homosexuals as child molesters. Her organization published a full-page advertisement the day before the vote warning that the “other side of the homosexual coin is a hair-raising pattern of recruitment and outright seductions and molestation.” Her victory in Miami prompted groups in other cities to take up the cause, and in the next three years, gay rights laws were struck down in more than a half-dozen bitterly fought referenda stretching from St. Paul, Minnesota to Eugene, Oregon. Gay rights advocates managed to defeat such referenda only in two elections, in November 1978, when Seattle voted to preserve its antidiscrimination ordinance and California rejected the Briggs Initiative. The Briggs Initiative was a proposal so onerous it would have prohibited public school teachers, gay or straight, from saying anything that could be construed as “advocating homosexuality.”

59. The Save Our Children campaign had other far reaching effects. The day after the Dade County gay rights ordinance was repealed, the governor of Florida signed into law a ban on adoption by lesbians and gay men, the first such statewide prohibition. Thousands of children who might otherwise have had loving parents were thus denied the

stability of family life. Similarly, in 1985, Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis removed two boys from their foster care placement with a gay male couple and implemented a policy of preferred placement in “traditional family settings.” While Massachusetts’ ban was reversed as a result of litigation in 1990, the Florida ban remains. Similar bans continue to be promulgated today in other states. Mississippi’s legislature passed a ban on adoption by same sex couples in 2000 which was subsequently signed by the governor, and in 2008, Arkansas enacted by popular referendum a ban on foster care and adoption by gay people.

60. Across the country, the unfounded fear that homosexuals posed a threat to children itself threatened some children: those already being raised by lesbians and gay men. In the 1970s, most children being raised by lesbian or gay parents had been born before their parents came out as gay. When a parent came out, any dispute over child custody that had to be resolved in court was likely to be heavily influenced by stereotypes and prejudices. A growing number of such cases reached the courts in the 1970s and 1980s, and in case after case the courts took the custody of children away from a mother or father whose estranged husband or wife raised the parent’s lesbian or gay identity. Some courts confronting early disputes of this nature articulated a “per se” rule against custody and visitation claims made by gay and lesbian parents, holding that homosexuality was inherently inconsistent with parenthood as a matter of law.

61. By the mid-1990s, the courts in most states followed rules that required individualized assessment of a parent’s fitness, even where a parent was gay or lesbian. But as Julie Shapiro’s 1996 study of custody cases around the country demonstrated, many courts continued to infuse those individualized assessments with their own

prejudice against lesbians and gay men. As she discovered, courts were especially disapproving of lesbians and gay men who did not hide their sexuality from their children or from outsiders. In the most widely publicized case, a Virginia trial court in 1993 granted a grandmother's petition to take Sharon Bottoms' two-year-old son away from her because, as the trial court judge explained, her lesbian "conduct is illegal . . . a Class 6 felony in the Commonwealth of Virginia." He went on to declare "that it is the opinion of this Court that her conduct is immoral" and "renders her an unfit parent." Virginia's Supreme Court upheld the trial court's decision terminating Sharon's parental rights despite the presumption favoring her as a natural parent, but it relied on a wider range of evidence, including the finding that Bottoms' lesbianism would subject her child to social condemnation and thus disturb the child's relationships with peers and the community at large. Some courts had used similar reasoning to remove children from the home of a divorced white mother who had married or moved in with a black man, a practice ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1984. In that case, *Palmore v. Sidoti*, Chief Justice Warren Burger ruled that "private biases [of the sort that might lead to the harassment of such a child] may be outside the reach of the law, but the law cannot directly, or indirectly, give them effect." 466 U.S. 429, 433 (1984). But courts in many states continued to give legal effect to the private bias they assumed existed against lesbian and gay parents.

62. Such rulings became less common in the 1980s and 1990s, especially in the Northeast and West Coast. But gay and lesbian parents continue to be forced by some courts to choose between hiding their gay identities and losing parental rights. According to Clifford J. Rosky, in 2004, after ordering a gay father not to expose his

child to his “gay lover(s) and/or gay lifestyle,” a Tennessee trial court sentenced the father to two days in jail for coming out to the child.

63. Courts continued to demonstrate harsh judgments toward gay and lesbian parents even where a child was conceived with two gay or lesbian parents intending to raise the child jointly. Most commonly, the courts had to decide where to place a child when its biological mother died and one of her relatives contested the right of her surviving partner, the child’s second mother, to continue to have a relationship with the child. In a number of cases, courts granted custody to those relatives despite clear evidence that the child wished to remain with her surviving mother.

64. The long-standing association of homosexuals with disease was reinforced in the 1980s by the media’s initial sensationalist coverage of AIDS, which frequently depicted homosexuals as bearers of a deadly disease threatening others. Fear of contagion prompted a new wave of discrimination against gay people in medical care, housing, and employment. Media coverage and the government’s slow response to the disease also reflected and reinforced the enduring conviction that homosexuals stood outside the moral boundaries of the nation. Even after the name AIDS (Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome) replaced the moniker GRID (Gay-Related Immune Deficiency), media reports initially minimized the crisis by reassuring Americans that the “general public” was not at risk, since the disease only affected homosexuals and a handful of other groups, as if gay people were not part of the “general public.”

65. AIDS and the numerous campaigns against local gay rights laws had a dramatic effect on public opinion. In 1987, six years after AIDS unleashed a new wave of fear of homosexuals, public disapproval of homosexuality reached its peak. Polling

data showed virtually no change through the 1970s, but the number of people who declared that homosexual relations were always wrong climbed from 73 percent in 1980 to 78 percent in 1987. In the 1980s, gay rights activists secured the enactment of gay rights ordinances in an additional forty cities, counties, and suburbs, including Boston, New York, Chicago, and Atlanta, bringing the national total to eighty. But these victories were often more difficult to achieve than they had been in the 1970s. In New York City, for example, the law passed the city council only after more than a decade of struggle.

C. The Growing Debate over Homosexuality in the 1990s

66. The spread of AIDS and the escalation of debate over gay rights at the local level fueled a growing polarization of the nation over homosexuality in the 1980s and especially the 1990s. By the end of the 1980s, even cities and states that had managed to pass gay rights laws found those laws under attack from an increasingly well-organized and well-funded opposition. Beginning in 1988 and reaching a crescendo in 1992-1994, groups in Colorado, Oregon, Maine, and half a dozen other states used anti-gay referendum initiatives to challenge gay rights laws and to build local organizations. In the 25 years after Anita Bryant's campaign in Florida, gay activists faced *more than sixty* anti-gay rights referenda around the country. In Oregon alone, there were sixteen local anti-gay initiatives in 1993 and another eleven in 1994. Oregon's gay activists lost all but one. Nationwide, gay rights supporters lost almost three-quarters of them.

67. Following Anita Bryant's lead, anti-gay rights activists frequently fomented voter fear of gay people by reviving demonic stereotypes of homosexuals as perverts who threatened the nation's children and moral character. Two videos which

were repeatedly screened in churches and on cable television, “The Gay Agenda” and “Gay Rights, Special Rights,” juxtaposed discussions of pedophilia with images of gay teachers and gay parents marching with their children in Gay Pride parades. With little subterfuge, the videos depicted homosexuals as child molesters. This message was reinforced by mass mailings and door-to-door distribution of anti-gay pamphlets, which fostered a climate of hostility and fear during the referenda.

68. In 1992, voters in Colorado passed Amendment Two, which amended the state constitution to prohibit any municipality or unit of the government from enacting anti-gay discrimination ordinances or policies. This amendment repealed the ordinances already enacted by Denver, Boulder, and Aspen. Moreover, it removed gay rights from the political arena by preempting any future effort to secure antidiscrimination legislation. In the face of public antipathy to gay rights, represented by the success of this and other referenda overturning gay rights laws, several legal groups filed a lawsuit, *Romer v. Evans*, challenging the constitutionality of such constitutional amendments. Once again, the courts protected the rights of the minority against the prejudice of the majority. In 1996, the Supreme Court ruled in this case that gay people could not be excluded from the political process.

69. With the lifting of censorship and the growing interest in gay people and issues, there was a dramatic increase in the coverage of gay issues in the media and in the number of gay characters in the movies and on television in the 1990s. By the time the immensely popular *Will & Grace* premiered on NBC in 1998, gay and lesbian characters were a regular part of the television landscape. This dramatically changed the dominant representation of homosexuals. Gay people usually appeared in the media in the 1950s

only as shadowy and dangerous figures, as discussed above, but they now appeared as a diverse and familiar group whose all-too-human struggles and pleasures drew the interest of large viewing audiences.

70. It was not only in the media that heterosexuals began to see homosexuals. Dramatically increasing numbers of lesbians and gay men revealed their homosexuality to their families, friends, neighbors, and co-workers in the 1990s. Polling data suggest the magnitude of the shift. In 1985 only a quarter of Americans reported that a friend, relative, or co-worker had personally told them that they were gay, and more than half believed they did not know anyone gay. Fifteen years later, in 2000, the number of people who knew someone openly gay had tripled to three-quarters of the population. Acceptance of gays and support for gay rights increased as growing numbers of heterosexuals realized that some of the people they most loved and respected were gay.

71. It is important not to overstate the results of this nationwide “coming out” experience: by 2000 a significant majority of Americans still expressed moral disapproval of homosexuality. Moreover, support for lesbian and gay civil rights and equality continued to show significant regional differences. Polls showed that public opinion in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Hawaii was the most tolerant. Support for civil rights was also strong in most other states in New England, in New Jersey and New York, and in other regional clusters: Maryland in the mid-Atlantic, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Illinois in the upper Midwest, California, Oregon, and Washington on the West Coast. Anti-gay sentiment was strongest in southern states and in the lower Midwest and plains states. The effects of these regional differences could be seen in regional variations in congressional votes on key gay issues, in the treatment of gay

couples and individuals by state laws and regulations concerning adoption and foster parenting, and in the passage of gay rights laws. Regional variations in judicial attitudes gave lesbian and gay parents greater risk of losing their children in the South and Midwest than in the Northeast and on the West Coast. As one Texas attorney commented in 1988, “unless [a mother] ended her open lesbian relationship I would have little chance of winning a custody trial.” Only two states—Wisconsin in 1982 and Massachusetts in 1989—enacted legislation banning anti-gay discrimination before 1990. The number rose to eleven by 2000, but eight of the states were in the Northeast or on the Pacific Coast. The rights of gay people continue to vary enormously across the nation.

72. At the national level, gay advocates remained relatively powerless to win gay rights protections. President Bill Clinton’s proposal to end the armed forces’ ban on lesbians and gay men in the military sparked a firestorm in the first months of his presidency and revealed how deeply divided the nation remained. The public outcry against his plan (calls to Congress ran a hundred to one against lifting the ban) had been stoked by years of local anti-gay organizing. Opposition to the new policy by both the Pentagon leadership and the public led President Clinton to implement a compromise policy, “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell,” which ultimately resulted in an increase in the number of soldiers discharged for homosexuality. Discharges rose from 597 in 1994 to 1,231 in 2000. According to the General Accounting Office, the military dismissed almost 10,000 service members between 1994 and 2003.

73. Gay people also continue to face discrimination and denigration from highly regarded institutions and officials. The Boy Scouts of America, a federally chartered organization, continues to insist that “homosexual conduct is not morally

straight,” and refuses to allow gay men into the organization. *Boy Scouts of America v. Dale*, 530 U.S. 640, 651 (2000). Just seven years ago, the Chief Justice of the Alabama Supreme Court referred, in a judicial opinion, to homosexual conduct as “abhorrent, immoral, detestable, a crime against nature, and a violation of the laws of nature and of nature's God upon which this Nation and our laws are predicated.” *Ex Parte H.H.*, 830 So. 2d 21, 26 (2002) (Moore, C.J., concurring).

74. Gay people also continue to face violence motivated by anti-gay bias. A handful of horrific incidents have drawn widespread media attention. In 1984 in Bangor, Maine, 23 year-old Charlie Howard was targeted by three teens due to his sexual orientation. They attacked him and threw him off a bridge into the Kenduskeag Stream, where he drowned. Then, in 1998, Matthew Shepard, a college student in Laramie, Wyoming, was bound, tied to a fence, beaten with a pistol, and left to die because he was gay. Ten years later, Lawrence “Larry” Fobes King, a 15-year-old student at E.O. Green Junior High School in Oxnard, California, died two days after he was shot in school by fellow student because of his sexual orientation. But the problem reaches far beyond these three incidents. The FBI reported 1,260 hate crime incidents based on perceived sexual orientation in 1998 and 1,265 in 2007. In 2008, the year of Lawrence King’s murder, a national coalition of anti-violence social service agencies identified 29 murders motivated by the assailants’ hatred of lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender people. The threat of violence continues to lead many gay people to hide their identities or to avoid such commonplace expressions of affection as holding hands with their partners in public.

75. The most vulnerable victims of discrimination are youth. A recent Massachusetts study found that LGB youth in the state are more likely than straight youth to have been involved in a physical fight (42 percent to 28 percent). The same study found that Massachusetts LGBT youth are three times as likely as straight youth to have been threatened or injured with a weapon at school.

VIII. CONCLUSION

76. It is my professional opinion that the historical record outlined above demonstrates that gay people have been subject to widespread and significant discrimination and hostility. Through much of the twentieth century, in particular, gay men and lesbians suffered under the weight of medical theories that treated their desires as a disorder, penal laws that condemned their consensual adult sexual behavior as a crime, and federal policies and state regulations that discriminated against them on the basis of their homosexual status. These state policies and ideological messages worked together to create and reinforce the belief that gay persons were an inferior class to be shunned by other Americans.

77. Gay and lesbian people continue to live with the legacy of the anti-gay measures enacted in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s and the attitudes that generated those measures. That legacy is evident both in laws that remain on the books and in legal protections that have not been enacted. According to information provided by the Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund, in as many as 28 states, there is no statutory barrier to firing, refusing to hire or demoting a person in private sector employment solely on the basis of their identity as a gay man or lesbian. In as many as 20 states, there

is no statutory or administrative barrier to such discrimination even in state government employment. Similarly, gay men and lesbians remain without statutory protection from discrimination in housing in many states. And, despite the critical role played by harassment of gay and lesbian meeting places in enforcing discrimination toward them throughout the 20th century, gay and lesbian people in as many as 29 states have no statutory protection from discrimination in public accommodations.

78. Despite these many legal infirmities, the most conspicuous legacy of twentieth century discrimination today is found in the numerous state statutes and constitutional amendments that brand gays and lesbians as second-class citizens by denying them the right to marry the person they love, and in the federal Defense of Marriage Act that prohibits the federal government from recognizing such a marriage if it does occur. The legacy is also evident in the inflammatory stereotypes and demeaning rhetoric used by anti-gay organizations as they campaign to enact further measures meant to erode gays' civil rights and diminish their status as full citizens of the United States—campaigns that are still often successful.

79. Today, the civil rights enjoyed by gay and lesbian Americans vary substantially from region to region and are still subject to the vicissitudes of public opinion. Like other minority groups, they must often continue to rely on judicial decisions to secure equal rights.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States this 16th day of November 2009.

By: /s/ George Chauncey
George Chauncey, Ph.D

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allan Bérubé, *Coming Out Under Fire: The History of Gay Men and Women in World War II* (New York: Free Press, 1992).
- Nan Alamilla Boyd, *Wide Open Town: A History of Queer San Francisco* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
- California Safe Schools Coalition, et al., *Safe Place to Learn: Consequences of Harassment Based on Actual or Perceived Sexual Orientation and Gender Non-Conformity and Steps for Making Schools Safer* (2004).
- California State Assembly. Interim Committee on Judicial Systems and Judicial Process. Subcommittee on Sex Crimes, Preliminary Report of the Subcommittee on Sex Crimes (Sacramento: State Printing Office, 1950).
- Margot Canaday, *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).
- David L. Chambers and Nancy D. Polikoff, *Family Law and Gay and Lesbian Family Issues in the Twentieth Century*, 33 *Family Law Quarterly*, 1999-2000.
- George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1994).
- George Chauncey, *Why Marriage? The History Shaping Today's Debate over Gay Equality* (New York: Basic Books, 2004).
- George Chauncey, *Hidden From History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past* (NAL, 1989).
- George Chauncey, "From Sexual Inversion to Homosexuality: Medicine and the Changing Conceptualization of Female Deviance," 58-59 *Salmagundi* 114-46 (Fall 1982-Winter 1983).
- George Chauncey, "Christian Brotherhood or Sexual Perversion? Homosexual Identities and the Construction of Sexual Boundaries in the World War One Era," 19 *Journal of Social History* 189-211 (1985).
- George Chauncey, "The Postwar Sex Crime Panic," in *True Stories from the American Past* (William Graebner edit., McGraw-Hill: 1993), pp.160-78.
- Dudley Clendinin and Adam Nagourney, *Out for Good: The Struggle to Build a Gay Rights Movement in America* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1999).
- John D'Emilio, *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority, 1940-1970* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
- Lillian Faderman and Stuart Timmons, *Gay L.A.: A History of Sexual Outlaws, Power Politics, and Lipstick Lesbians* (New York: Basic Books, 2006).
- Estelle B. Freedman, "'Uncontrolled Desires': The Response to the Sexual Psychopath, 1920-1960" 74 *Journal of American History* 83-106 (1987).

- General Accounting Office, *Military Personnel: Financial Costs and Loss of Critical Skills Due to DOD's Homosexual Conduct Policy Cannot be Completely Estimated* (2005).
- Richard Godbeer, *Sexual Revolution in Early America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2002).
- David Halperin, *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality* (New York: Routledge, 1990).
- The History Project, *Improper Bostonians* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1998).
- David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).
- Mark D. Jordan, *The Invention of Sodomy in Christian Theology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
- Jonathan Ned Katz, *Gay/Lesbian Almanac: A new Documentary* (New York: Harper & Row, 1983).
- Ruediger Lautmann, "The Pink Triangle: Homosexuals as 'Enemies of the State,'" in Michael Berenbaum and Abraham J. Peck, eds., *The Holocaust and History* (Indiana, 2002).
- Eric Marcus, *Making Gay History: The Half-Century Fight for Lesbian and Gay Equal Rights* (2002).
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, *The 2005 Youth Risk Behavior Survey* (January 2007).
- The Mattachine Society, *Eastern Mattachine Magazine*, Vol. X No. 5 (June 1965).
- Martin Meeker, "Behind the Mask of Respectability: Reconsidering the Mattachine Society and Male Homophile Practice, 1950s and 1960s" 10 *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 78–116 (2001).
- The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, *Hate Violence Against Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People in the United States, 2008* (National Coalition, 2009).
- Richard Plant, *The Pink Triangle: The Nazi War Against Homosexuals* (New York: Holt, 1986);
- Amy Ronner, "Bottoms v. Bottoms: The Lesbian Mother and the Judicial Perpetuation of Damaging Stereotypes," 7 *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 1995.
- Clifford J. Rosky, "Like Father Like Son: Homosexuality, Parenthood and the Gender of Homophobia," 20 *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism*, 2009.

- Teemu Ruskola, *Minor Disregard: The Legal Construction of the Fantasy that Gay and Lesbian Youth Do Not Exist*, 8 Yale J. L. & Feminism 269 (1996).
- Douglass Shand-Tucci, *The Crimson Letter: Harvard, Homosexuality, and the Shaping of American Culture* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2003).
- Leslie A. Taylor, *I Made Up My Mind to Get It: The American Trial of The Well of Loneliness, New York City, 1928-1929*, Journal of the History of Sexuality, Vol. 10 No. 2, p. 250 (2001).
- US Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Hate Crime Statistics 1998*; id, *Hate Crime Statistics 2007*.
- C. Todd White, *Pre-Gay L.A.: A Social History of the Movement for Homosexual Rights* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009).
- William H. Whitmore, *A Bibliographical Sketch of the Laws of the Massachusetts Colony from 1630 to 1686* (Boston: Rockwell and Churchill, 1890).

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that this document filed through the ECF system will be sent electronically to the registered participants as identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) and paper copies will be sent to those indicated as non-registered participants on November 17, 2009.

/s/ Gary D. Buseck
Gary D. Buseck