A substantial body of literature demonstrates that gender dynamics and collective identities influence and shape the emergence, mobilization, and outcomes of social movements, including the gay and lesbian rights movement (Gamson 1997; Robnett 1997; Roth 1998; Taylor 1996, 1999; Taylor and Rupp 1993; Taylor and Whittier 1992; Ward 2004; Whittier 1995a, 1995b). For example, lesbians have sometimes split off from homosexual groups and formed their own organizations in response to domination by gay men (D’Emilio 1983; D’Emilio and Freedman 1997; Phelan 1989; Stein 1997; Whittier 1995a). However, historical studies typically mention changing gender dynamics within the movement only in passing, as part of the movement’s history rather than a topic worthy of empirical analysis. In this article, we examine the factors that influence shifts in the gendered
collective identity of the gay and lesbian rights movement over time. We examine how changing political opportunities for both the women’s movement and the gay and lesbian rights movement influence mobilization by altering the salience of different identities, thereby changing the gay and lesbian movement’s collective identity.

Although social movement research increasingly demonstrates the importance of collective identity to mobilization (Gamson 1997; Johnston et al., 1994; Melucci 1989, 1995; Taylor 1989; Taylor and Whittier 1992), little research explores how a changing social context can influence a social movement’s collective identity. Shifting political opportunities may alter a social movement’s collective identity, with threats and opportunities having a differential effect (Almeida 2003). The threat produced by a countermovement’s promotion of stigma against a group may heighten the salience of that group identity for those who share it, inspiring them to take action in an effort to combat the stigma and fight for their rights. The common mobilization of men and women will also be influenced by the broader social movement field and by the internal dynamics of the movement. In this article, we combine insights from the literature on stigma with new advances in conceptualizing political opportunities to examine how changes in the sociopolitical context affect the gay and lesbian movement’s composition and collective identity over time.

We explore these issues using data on gay and lesbian movement organizations active from 1970 to 2000 and twenty-four interviews with movement activists. The gay and lesbian movement provides an ideal research setting for an examination of the relative salience of gender and sexual identities over time because of the importance of identity for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT) mobilization and the mixed-sex constituency of the movement. By examining thirty years of data, we are able to examine how the sociopolitical context influences gender composition and collective identity in different time periods.

**Shifting Boundaries of Collective Identity**

The boundaries of a movement’s collective identity change over time, partially reflecting which individual identities are most salient for group members at any given point in time. As Taylor and Whittier (1992) state, “individuals see themselves as part of a group when some shared characteristic becomes salient and is defined as important” (p. 110). Identity salience, a concept developed by Stryker (1968, 1980), refers to the idea that identities are organized into a hierarchy of salience or centrality to an individual. The salience of an identity helps determine which activities or actions an individual will choose to take (Callero 1985; Nuttbrock and Freudiger 1991; Serpe and Stryker 1987; Stryker and Serpe 1982). Because gender, race, sexual identity, and class are dimensions of social stratification in modern society, they are among the identities most likely to be highly salient to individuals (Buechler 1990). Interactions with group members and outsiders, changing historical conditions, and group experiences may work to highlight or enhance the importance, or salience, attached to a particular identity dimension or identity (Bernstein 1997; Einwohner 2002; Ferree and Roth 1998;
McCammon and Campbell 2002; Whittier 1995a). As the salience of individual identities changes, so will the groups’ collective identity.

In this article, we suggest that countermovements may inspire mobilization by promoting stigma against a population. Sociologists have established that stigmatized identities sometimes inspire mobilization as groups attempt to challenge the stigma (Berbrier 1998; Britt and Heise 2000; Kaplan and Liu 2000; Tajfel 1982; Taylor 1996, 2000), however few consider the fact that countermovements may promote stigma against a population, heightening the salience of that identity for group members and thereby inspiring their mobilization. Most studies of stigma and mobilization (Berbrier 1998; Britt and Heise 2000; Kaplan and Liu 2000; Tajfel 1982; Taylor 1996, 2000) focus on how groups challenge a stigmatized identity, while failing to examine the conditions under which they are inspired to do so. However, while negative cultural representations of minority group members may be a fairly constant feature of our society, there is fluctuation in the extent to which negative representations are widely publicized. We examine how the gender composition and collective identity of the gay and lesbian movement changes over time and argue that gay men and lesbians may be more likely to share a collective identity when facing stigmatizing attacks from the antigay countermovement.

Research demonstrates that threats from countermovements can shape a movement’s collective identity (Einwohner 2002; Reger 2002). Einwohner (2002) shows how animal rights activists responded to opponents’ claims that they were overly emotional by presenting alternate identity characteristics to the public, while in private they often embraced the “emotional” characterization. According to Einwohner, the importance of boundaries to the creation of a collective identity highlights the significant role outsiders can play in identity construction. Reger (2002) finds that the threat to abortion clinics in the 1980s motivated various suburban NOW chapters in the Cleveland area to overcome their class differences and work in coalition. Threats associated with gender identity may inspire women to put aside their otherwise highly salient class differences to mobilize around their gender identity. Similarly, research suggests that diverse coalitions involving multiple identity groups are facilitated by the presence of powerful antagonists who present a challenge that extends across identity boundaries, making broader identities more salient for movement actors (Van Dyke 2003). Thus, we predict that gay men and lesbians are more likely to work together within movement organizations when attacks from antigay opponents render their sexual identity more salient. We argue that these conditions existed in the 1980s and led to increased cooperation between gay men and lesbians and greater gender parity in GLBT organizations.

However, other changes in the political environment may also influence the salience of group identities. A decline in political opportunities, such as the loss of political allies, may have a differential effect on mobilization than does the appearance of new political threats, such as countermovements (Almeida 2003). A decline in opportunities may discourage individuals from mobilizing around a particular identity, whereas an increase in threats from political actors or countermovements may heighten the salience of group identities and inspire collective action.
Whittier (1995a) finds that as the women’s movement faced a decline in political opportunities in the 1980s, women’s groups that had previously preferred working in women-only groups increasingly engaged in coalition work with mixed-sex organizations, often focusing on issues less directly related to women’s oppression, such as opposition to the Apartheid system in South Africa. Her findings suggest that a loss of political opportunities and allies may discourage individuals from mobilizing around a particular identity, in this case gender, focusing instead on other issues. Thus, a loss of political opportunities appears to have a different effect on identity salience and mobilization than does the imposition of a new threat.

Whittier’s (1995a) research suggests that a movement’s ability to mobilize various constituencies and its collective identity will also be shaped by the conditions in the broader social movement field. In addition, dynamics internal to the movement in question, including member conflicts and framing processes, will affect its composition and collective identity. In the absence of a strong and vocal countermovement, a movement’s constituencies may have a difficult time working together because of conflict generated by group differences. Stockdill (2003) suggests that because a movement’s constituencies face multiple systems of oppression, they may have differences in political consciousness and available resources that lead to group conflict. Thus, gay men and lesbians may have difficulty working together when gender differences are especially salient to potential participants, for example, in the 1970s when the women’s movement was highly mobilized and many lesbians participated in lesbian feminism rather than working with gay men. Cooperation between men and women may also have been less likely during this time period because the women’s movement provided a venue through which lesbians could pursue their political and social goals, including those related to their sexual identity.

Different communities may also have a difficult time working together because systems of inequality generate unequal distributions of resources, which may result in conflict (Stockdill 2003). Reger (2002), for example, found that class differences prevented NOW chapters from working together in the absence of a highly mobilized countermovement. Queer women of color argue that socioeconomic inequalities have made it difficult for white women and women of color to work together in the feminist movement (Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Smith 1983). Thus, as political opportunities for gays and lesbians improved in the 1990s, with the election of Clinton to the White House and the failure of new outspoken gay opponents to appear, it may have been more difficult for gay men and lesbians to sustain a common collective identity because of economic inequality between gay men and lesbians. GLBT organizations flourished and grew in number during the 1990s, and although historically the movement has been able to avoid disabling fragmentation because of its flexible and inclusive ideology (Armstrong 2002), scholars have noted the emergence of conflicts over race, social class, and the inclusion of transgender issues within the GLBT movement in the 1990s (Gamson 1997; Ward 2003). Among Anglo gay men and lesbians, class differences may have become increasingly salient as the movement commercialized (Ireland 1999; Shepard 2001; Vaid 1995; Ward 2003). Thus, while during some
time periods gay men and lesbians may have found it easier to work together, in the 1990s, gender, class, and racial differences and sometimes conflict influenced their identity and common mobilization.

In the absence of serious incentives to common mobilization, systems of stratification may become more relevant and lead to group conflict. Internal conflict and disagreements over strategies and goals may reduce a movement’s ability to mobilize various communities partially through its effect on the movement’s ability to clearly articulate a position on current issues and the goals of a movement. As movements frame the issues and strategies for action, they also define the boundaries of the movement’s collective identity (Gamson 1997). The GLBT movement has historically publicized threats from the Christian Right in a conscious effort to inspire the mobilization of both gay men and lesbians (Britt and Heise 2000; Epstein 1999). In the absence of a highly mobilized countermovement, different GLBT communities may be unable to overcome their differences, and movement framing may appeal more or less to one constituency or another.

In sum, we hypothesize that the political context and opposition a movement faces influence the boundaries of its collective identity. Gay men and lesbians are more likely to work together when the antigay countermovement mobilizes stigma against them, rendering their sexual identity more salient. A movement’s composition and collective identity will also be influenced by the social movement organizational field and the political opportunities faced by other social movements, especially when movements share overlapping constituencies. In the absence of a highly mobilized opposition, other identities may be more salient to potential participants. Multiple systems of oppression, based on gender, class, and race/ethnicity, may cause differences in political perspective and resource inequities that make it difficult for different communities to work together.

**DATA AND METHOD**

We examine how the boundaries of a gay and lesbian collective identity can shift over time through an analysis of the gay and lesbian movement in a Midwestern city—Columbus, Ohio—from 1970 to 2000. We use both interviews and an examination of gay and lesbian newsletters to understand how the collective identity of the movement changed over time and how the changing political context influenced these changes. We conducted and transcribed twenty-four open-ended, semistructured interviews with both former and current leaders and participants of gay and lesbian organizations in Columbus. We created an initial sampling list of interviewees by contacting Columbus organizations listed in the *Stonewall Journal* and *Lavender Listings*, two publications listing the gay and lesbian organizations active in Columbus in 2000. After initial interviews, we identified additional informants using snowball sampling.

In addition to our own data collection, we also draw from Whittier’s (1995a) study of the lesbian feminist community in Columbus, primarily for information on the historical conditions in Columbus in the earlier portion of the time period. Whittier conducted interviews with thirty-four women who participated in the
lesbian feminist community in Columbus from 1969 to 1984. Many of the women she interviewed were active during the 1970s, thus providing her with strong information regarding the lesbian feminist community during this decade. Thus, we owe a great debt to her research. However, we extend her research by expanding the scope of the data collection to include gay male and GLBT collective identities. Our interest in studying how external political actors influence collective identities by rendering gender differences more or less salient requires data on a mixed-sex social movement. Data on only lesbians would not allow us to fully explore the conditions under which activists put their gender identity aside to organize around their sexual identity.

We conducted interviews with thirteen males and eleven females between November 31, 2000, and April 20, 2001, with each interview lasting approximately one hour. Demographic information about the respondents is provided in Table 1. Although our sample of respondents was not especially diverse in terms of race and class, this reflects, to a large extent, the characteristics of participants within Columbus’s gay and lesbian rights movement throughout the time period. The age of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Pseudonym</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Dates of Columbus Residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>1968 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>$155,000</td>
<td>1985 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>1977 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>1958 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>1980 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>1988 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>1986 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>1992 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candace</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>1963 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>1958 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>1975 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>1984 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>1974 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>1975 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>1959 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>1988 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>1963 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>1964 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>1993 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>1976 to 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>1975 to 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>1985 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>&gt; $100,000</td>
<td>1969 to present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = male; F = female; Unk = unknown.
respondents ranged from twenty-nine to sixty-three, with an average age of forty-five. We address how the relatively high mean age of our respondents may have influenced our findings later in the article. Only two of the respondents were African American, and most were middle to upper class, with an average annual income of $46,750. We asked interviewees about their organizational memberships, the composition of those organizations, former and current issues of the movement, the gender dynamics between gay men and lesbians, and explanations for any perceived changes during the specified time period. We asked about both their current and former organizational memberships to explore the changing dynamics of GLBT organizations in Columbus over time.

The organizations to which the respondents belonged vary in terms of their membership composition and goals. Organizations include political groups such as Human Rights Campaign, Stonewall Democrats, and the Log Cabin Republicans; antiviolence organizations such as Buckeye Region Anti-Violence Organization (BRAVO); professional organizations such as the Human Rights Bar Association, the Gay Officer’s Action League, and the Lesbian Business Association; religious groups such as Dignity and Integrity; AIDS organizations including the Columbus AIDS Task Force and AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACTUP); and general interest groups such as Stonewall Columbus (including People of Color Council), Fusion, and the Sisters of Lavender. A full listing of organizations including descriptions and dates of operation are listed in the appendix.

In addition to the qualitative interviews, we studied two gay and lesbian newsletters that were published in Columbus, both of which have ceased in circulation. We examined forty-five issues of “News of the Columbus Gay and Lesbian Community,” which was published from 1977 through the early 1990s. As the title suggests, it was published for both lesbian and gay male readership. We analyzed forty-two issues of the second newsletter, “The Word Is Out!,” a specifically lesbian newsletter that began in 1990 and ended in 1999. We read through each issue of these newsletters, looking for information on GLBT organizations, their activities, and their stated goals. We also looked for information regarding the issues facing the gay and lesbian community, as well as any information regarding gender. The newsletters occasionally included information about the relationship between gay men and lesbians in the community and quotes from gay men regarding lesbians and vice versa. Because our primary newsletter for the 1990s was geared toward lesbians, we confirmed our findings regarding antigay countermobilization through a search of the Columbus Dispatch, the city’s newspaper. We ran searches on the newspaper’s online index using search strings such as antigay to verify that the antigay rights movement was not highly active in Columbus in the 1990s.

This is a study of gay and lesbian organizations in Columbus, a fairly large metropolitan city in central Ohio. Although an examination of the history of the gay and lesbian rights movement in other cities and nationally gives us some confidence that the dynamics we observed in Columbus were also operating throughout the country, we recognize that our results will be influenced by the social context of our sampling area. Throughout our discussion of the findings, we note similarities between Columbus and the rest of the nation and note possible areas of divergence. Caution should be exercised before generalizing the results of this study.
FINDINGS

The gay and lesbian movement in Columbus, as in other parts of the country, went through many changes over the course of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. The thirty-year time period is marked by an impressive growth in the number of gay and lesbian organizations, similar to trends nationwide (Armstrong 2002). Gender identities, along with racial and class-based identities, shaped the movement to a significant extent in each decade. Our findings are consistent with our expectation that men and women were most likely to work together during the 1980s, when they faced significant threats both from political opponents and from AIDS. In the following pages, we describe the gender dynamics and shifting collective identity of the gay and lesbian movement in Columbus over time.

The 1970s

Many mark the beginning of the modern gay and lesbian movement as June 1969, when patrons rioted in response to a police raid of the Stonewall Inn, a gay bar in Greenwich Village in New York City (Adam 1995; D’Emilio 1983; D’Emilio & Freedman 1997). The movement emerged during a cycle of left activism in the United States and was influenced crucially by the other political movements of the era (Adam 1995; McAdam 1995). Shortly after the Stonewall Riot, a number of mixed-sex gay liberation organizations emerged around the country, including the Gay Liberation Front. However, while Columbus did host a Gay Liberation Front chapter for a couple of years, a unified gay and lesbian movement was largely absent in Columbus during the 1970s. Separatism on the part of the lesbian feminist movement inhibited the formation of gay and lesbian political organizations, and lesbians found the women’s movement to be an avenue for pursuit of their social and political goals. Therefore, the gay men and lesbian communities were largely isolated from one another during this time period.

Columbus had a very strong and active women’s movement during the 1970s. As in other parts of the country, women’s organizations such as the Columbus–Ohio State University (OSU) Women’s Liberation group formed in 1970 in response to “dissatisfaction with male dominance and the lack of attention to women’s issues in other movements” (Whittier 1995b:184). As the women’s movement developed throughout the early 1970s, lesbianism increasingly came to be seen as the ultimate challenge to male domination. A lesbian separatist branch of the movement formed, with lesbian identity boundaries centered around separation from men, including gay men. As in many parts of the country, the women’s movement in Columbus attempted to create alternate, prefigurative institutions as part of their challenge to mainstream society. These organizations pursue social change by modeling themselves after the ideal society that they would like to create. The Women’s Action Collective (WAC) was created in 1971 to serve as an umbrella organization for a number of women’s cultural and political organizations, including the Women’s Co-op Garage, Women’s Publishing Group, and the Women’s Health Action Collective. From 1977 to 1979, WAC was almost entirely lesbian. Susan, a former member of Women Against Rape, portrayed what it meant to be a lesbian in the 1970s:
At least in the late '70s in Columbus, if you were an out lesbian, part of the lesbian feminist community, you were also politically active, because that’s where community events were. In the '70s, y’know everything was politically oriented, whether it was a fundraiser for a bookstore…everything had the underpinnings of political action.

Clearly, the identity of politically active lesbians during this time was founded in their experiences as women and their belief that value differences exist between men and women (Taylor and Rupp 1993). Scholars have noted a similar trend in lesbian feminist organizations throughout the country (Epstein 1999; Phelan 1989; Stein 1997). As Stein (1997) states, “there was little room in this politics for gay men, who, like heterosexual men, were considered to be part of the problem” (p. 37).

Whereas the lesbian community was very involved in organizing politically, unlike in larger cities such as Los Angeles and New York, our interviewees suggest that few gay men in Columbus were involved in conventional political mobilizing during this time period, aside from the Gay Activists Alliance on the OSU campus. According to the interviewees, gay men were interested in other things, as Brian explained: “We were the party boys then, and we were much more interested in having a good time than we were in getting politically involved.” According to Mark, who was very active in the Gay Activists Alliance, the organization was part support group, part advocacy organization, focused on OSU issues. Their main political action involved issuing press releases and providing information and support to interested OSU students. The only off-campus event involving both gay men and lesbians was a gay rights march in 1976, organized by the Central Ohio Lesbians, in which about seventy people “marched around in a circle in front of the state house” (Greg), receiving no media coverage.

Not surprisingly, little interaction took place between gay men and lesbians during this time. The respondents best describe the relationships between gay men and lesbians:

Before the early '80s, I virtually didn’t know any women in our community. Oh, a couple, maybe that you might see at parties where they were friends of people that would show up. But almost none and I think that that was true for most of the women too. There wasn’t a feeling that we had very much in common. (Brian)

And we never saw ‘em [lesbians], they never even went to the bars or anything like that. (Doug)

When I first came out, it was women and men, and never the twain shall meet. You just did not do that. You didn’t go to men’s bars. (Candace)

These respondents demonstrate a clear recognition of the lack of social interaction between lesbians and gay men. The lesbian newsletter “The Word Is Out!” (1999) described some lesbians’ attitudes toward gay men in the 1970s as follows: “Gay men were dismissed as the lowest of the low because they were thought to belittle women with drag and stereotypical ‘effeminate’ behavior” (p. 3).

Divisions between gay men and lesbians were reflected organizationally. The only gay or lesbian organizations in Columbus during the 1970s were either lesbian
feminist organizations within the women’s community or student organizations formed on the OSU campus, including the Gay Activists Alliance, the Law Association for Gay and Lesbian Civil Liberties, and the Lesbian Research Project. According to interviewees Allison and Carol, the Lesbian Research Project was a group of five lesbian graduate students (four women’s studies students and one nursing student) who gave public speeches about lesbian studies on campus in the late 1970s. The Gay Activist Alliance comprised primarily male students, while the Law Association for Gay and Lesbian Civil Liberties was a group (of three students) formed around issues in the law school. For the male students involved in the Gay Activists Alliance, the lack of female participants was seen as a result of a lack of common interests between gay men and lesbians. As Vincent says, “women had issues, men had issues. . . . And, y’know, the whole issue boils down to birds of a feather.” These divisions reflect contextual differences between Columbus and other cities to some extent. While many cities were home to a strong lesbian feminist movement, gay men and lesbians worked together more in cities, such as New York and San Francisco, that were less dominated by a highly mobilized lesbian feminist movement and where gay men were more involved in gay rights organizing (Adam 1995; Armstrong 2002). However, these findings illustrate how dynamics in the social movement field and levels of mobilization in other movements can influence a movement’s composition and collective identity.

In the mid- to late 1970s, the national political climate started to become more hostile to gays and lesbians. Anita Bryant, a former Miss America and an ultra-conservative, initiated her campaign against civil rights statutes that would prohibit discrimination based on sexual identity in 1977 (D’Emilio and Freedman 1997). Antigay activists tried to repeal existing gay and lesbian rights ordinances as well as pass new discriminatory ordinances such as the Briggs initiative.3 The Bryant campaign publicized derogatory myths about gays and lesbians, accusing homosexuals of recruiting and abusing children and of destroying the American family (Adam 1995; D’Emilio and Freedman 1997). These assertions gained the interest of the media and soon spread across the nation, gaining support from religious fundamentalists and extreme conservatives.

The 1980s

As political conservatism became entrenched with the election of Ronald Reagan to the White House in 1980, the decade witnessed a significant shift in the degree of gender cooperation within the movement. In Columbus and nationwide, the waning of the women’s movement and rise of the antigay Christian Right shifted the salient identity boundaries for gay men and lesbians. Whereas gender was the salient boundary division in the 1970s, with gay men and lesbians believing they had nothing in common, their common sexual identity transcended these differences in the 1980s.

The initial unifying spark for the gay and lesbian movement in Columbus was the Bryant campaign in the late 1970s and an attempt to form a chapter of Jerry Falwell’s Moral Majority in Columbus in 1981.
When Anita Bryant went on her little vicious campaign, it woke people up and they realized that “Wow, I’m being targeted and demonized, not because of anything I’ve said or done, but because of who I am.” Men and women both now are demonized…[and] seen as a cultural threat eroding the basic family structure. (Vince)

Another respondent, Marcia, talks about the Reagan years more generally:

It was a more hostile environment, and so it was more us against them. The Reagan years were unbelievable. It was a much more hostile environment so you really didn’t have a choice about who your allies [were]; you were in this together.

According to our respondent Mark, three young gay men and their partners formed the Stonewall Union (now Stonewall Columbus) in response to the threatened formation of a Moral Majority chapter in 1981, as the founders realized there was “no venue, no vehicle” for activism in Columbus outside of the women-only lesbian organizations and student-only campus organizations. Through organizing efforts and the use of savvy public relations tactics, formation of a Moral Majority chapter in Columbus was thwarted and Stonewall Union emerged. Although originally founded by and consisting of men, women soon got involved in the organization. Julie, who became an instrumental figure in the movement in Columbus, described some of the issues and boundary challenges involved in forming the Stonewall Union:

The main first issue was Jerry Falwell, as I remember. And also the sexism, frankly, of the gay men who were involved. . . . I soon saw things were fucked up. So what I decided, I said “if you allow me to revamp the board, and I want twenty members on the board, and I want half of them women, and half of them to be men.”

At that point, gender parity became a permanent bylaw of the Stonewall Union constitution, as gay men and lesbians began working together to build the organization and to provide funding for its maintenance. Scholars have noted similar dynamics throughout the nation; attacks on gays and lesbians from the far right inspired increased cooperation between gay men and lesbians (Adam 1995; Epstein 1996, 1999; Stockdill 2003).

Cooperation between gay men and lesbians did not occur easily, though, as tension was still present. For instance, some lesbians in the community were still separatists, refusing to join Stonewall Union and work with men. The organization began sponsoring an annual gay pride march in 1982, but most of the participants were men the first couple of years. Furthermore, problems existed in a few of the community bars, where male patrons were charged a higher cover charge than women to enter a lesbian bar and vice versa or opposite-sex patrons were made to feel unwelcome. Stonewall became the mediating outlet in these disputes. Within the organization itself, though, tension still surfaced along gender lines, as former members describe:

We had a retreat…and the women went after the men. And it wasn’t pretty. And they accused the men of not being caring about gay rights but just wanting control. (Gary)
[A friend] was on the Stonewall board back at that time, and she would just bitch and bitch to me after coming home from a board meeting, and she’d say, y’know, “those damn men who are so self-centered and can only see things from their own perspective, don’t care about anything other than white men.”

. . . It was very frustrating. (Carol)

Respondents described this time as a period of adjustment and learning about one another. Many gay men did not yet relate to abortion rights issues and viewed lesbians as “militant, humorless dykes.” Likewise, lesbians, many coming from feminist activism, objected to drag and viewed it as reinforcing stereotypes. Through discussion and spending time together, Stonewall Union board members began to understand that “people on the board were viewing the world from different colored glasses. And I think the women really came to understand where the men were coming from and the men became much more sensitive to the issues of women in terms of use of language” (Paul). Collaboration between gay men and lesbians would continue to increase, solidifying in the mid-1980s for two reasons: the discovery of the HIV virus and increased attacks on gays and lesbians, and the continued fading of the women’s movement.

Same-sex sexuality subsumed gender as an organizing identity when the emergence of AIDS, along with the dissipation of the women’s movement in Columbus, strengthened the bond forming between gay men and lesbians. The WAC began to experience a shortage of funding in the 1980s with the increasingly conservative political climate cemented by the election of Ronald Reagan. In addition to the funding problem, the centrality of lesbianism to feminism began to be questioned and debated, and identity conflicts between lesbian feminists and radical feminists emerged (Whittier 1995a, 1995b). Perhaps because the hostile climate to feminism did not involve stigmatization to the extent the antigay mobilization did or perhaps because of the level of intermovement conflict, the women’s movement waned and lesbians increasingly worked with gay men on political and social projects. Carol described the shift in consciousness from separatism to cooperation with men:

No one wanted to be seen as part of this cultural feminist movement [any- more]. And very insidiously there became this notice of rainbow stuff . . . and sure enough that became the identifying symbol then for an emerging queer movement . . . something that both women and men could identify with.

The majority4 of the respondents named AIDS as an important factor in bringing gay men and lesbians together within the community. In addition to the mortal threat of the disease, gays and lesbians were politically attacked on the basis of their sexual identity, as AIDS was deemed the “gay disease” and “God’s punishment on homosexuals” by much of mainstream America (Gamson 1989; Stockdill 2003; Tester 2004). Our respondents illustrate the importance of AIDS in inspiring gay men and lesbians to organize around sexuality:

During the late ’70s and early ’80s, the gay and lesbian community was very much separate, isolated. . . . And [AIDS] is really what I think established “community.” It brought lesbians and gay men together, bisexuals, and everybody together to work to fight this thing. It wasn’t just the disease, but the homophobia surrounding the disease. I mean, we felt like we were entrenched
in some kind of battle, and we were getting it at all angles. But one of the good things that happened was that it really organized and grouped together GLBT people from all walks of life, rich and poor, and black and white. . . . And it helped us build, at least here in central Ohio, the foundation of what we have right now, which is a community center, lots of organizations. (Chad)

The AIDS movement helped families and friends and coworkers and what not, helped get that unity. . . . Because these are people that they loved that are dying. . . . When I do the AIDS walks, it’s not primarily gay or straight [people], just everybody there is fighting for the same thing. And I think that brings people closer together. (Jennifer)

[What brought men and women together in ‘80s?] I really see that as AIDS….

The impact of the homophobic backlash that came because of AIDS included me completely. I mean my nursing director said “AIDS is god’s punishment on homosexuals.” She clearly included me…. The backlash was so vocal, so visible, so clear. (Allison)

The AIDS conflict was the big problem at the time. It was changing everything, from the fact that friends were dying to the fact that politics was becoming more conservative. It all has to do with AIDS coming and hitting the gay community first in the U.S. and being seen as the gay disease and discrimination against people who had AIDS. (Tom)

Although lesbians were not affected by the disease in the same direct way that gay men were, they mobilized because they experienced the loss of many dear friends, and they themselves faced public homophobic attacks in the context of the disease. In Columbus as nationwide (Adam 1995; Epstein 1999; Schwartz 1993; Stein 1997; Stockdill 2003), lesbians joined with gay men to use their political knowledge and organizing skills from the women’s movement to help start AIDS organizations and push for AIDS services. One organization they founded was Blood Sisters, in which lesbians donated blood for AIDS research on behalf of gay men. Lesbians also volunteered as “buddies” to AIDS patients, allocating time and support to gay men afflicted with HIV and AIDS. Although gay men were hit much harder with the disease than were lesbians, members of both sexes worked together to combat the stigma associated with the disease and to provide much-needed services to AIDS patients. As Epstein (1996) notes, “lesbians, subject to . . . stigma by association, acted as collaborators with gay men…often playing leadership roles” (p. 78).

Brian best describes the devastation from AIDS experienced in the gay male community, as well as the impact of women’s support:

Their families were gone and nobody else was there to do anything for them. The male community was in shock in those early days, I mean it was happening so frequently. So many of our friends were dying that the rest of us sort of . . . didn’t know what to do, it was really a state of shock. And the women came through like champs. Out of that came these great relationships.

Jonathon makes a similar comment regarding the involvement of lesbians in AIDS organizing:
The lesbians didn’t want to see their brotherhood counterpart dying, and the whole community was being persecuted because of perceptions of what AIDS was. So everybody thinks the gay men got everything going, and there’s such a misconception out there ‘cause I really believe it was the lesbian community who had the organizing skills and taught the gay men how to organize and come together.

It is evident that their common sexual identity became central to the boundaries and consciousness of lesbians and gay men in response to the threats of the Anita Bryant campaign, Jerry Falwell’s Moral Majority, and especially AIDS and the stigma surrounding it.

Many of the organizations formed during the 1980s, such as Stonewall Union, Columbus AIDS Task Force, and the Ohio AIDS Coalition, were mixed in terms of sex composition. The chapter of the Human Rights Campaign Fund, though comprising mostly men, adopted gender parity for their board. The Gay Alliance changed its name to the Gay and Lesbian Alliance during the early 1980s as more women joined. Furthermore, the number of lesbians attending and participating in the annual Pride Parade greatly increased during the mid-1980s. Again, the transcendence of gender differences by a common sexuality is apparent in collective identity boundary formation, as barriers between gay men and lesbians were displaced by boundaries between homosexuals and heterosexuals.

Gender may not have been the prominent organizing identity during this time period, but it certainly did not disappear as an influence on the creation of collective identity; rather, gender influenced these processes to a lesser degree than it did in the 1970s. For instance, although lesbians and gay men were rallying around a common homosexual identity, men attributed lesbians’ support and organizing efforts surrounding AIDS to gender differences.

There wasn’t a feeling that we had very much in common. AIDS changed that and I think that’s a real tribute to the women in our community. I suppose it’s maybe that feminine nurturing thing that they saw a need and they suddenly realized that here were a bunch of guys, many of whom had nothing. (Brian)

Interestingly, none of the female interviewees referred to their actions in terms of gender characteristics. They discussed their role with AIDS as that of organizing, volunteering, and service, not “maternal instinct” or “feminine nurturing.”

Whereas gay men and lesbians perceived gender differences in the 1970s as negative (”militant dykes,” “sex-crazy men”), gender differences in the 1980s were viewed positively as gay men and lesbians came to understand each other better. The collective identities once constructed by separatist notions of gender were weakened as sexual identity emerged as the salient organizing identity, and a gay collective identity included both men and women.

The 1990s

Looking at the movement in Columbus through the 1990s reveals growth and diversity in the number of organizations and activities available to the GLBT community. A variety of organizations and services existed, including coming-out
support groups for adults and youth, religious groups, HIV/AIDS services, rape and domestic violence organizations, and political party organizations. An abundance of leisure activities were present as well, from bars, restaurants, and coffee shops to numerous sports leagues. Members of the gay and lesbian community in Columbus could access gay and lesbian attorneys, dentists, real estate agents, mechanics, and many more businesses and services through the Lavender Listings, a directory of gay, lesbian, and gay-friendly establishments, organizations, and services. Reflecting trends across the country (e.g., Armstrong 2002), in response to challenges from several different communities, including communities of color and the rapidly emerging transgender movement, the gay and lesbian rights movement in Columbus widened and attempted to become more inclusive. The homosexual community went from being referred to as “gay and lesbian” to “gay, lesbian, and bisexual (GLB)” to the “gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT)” community. Stonewall Columbus set aside four board positions for minorities and one seat for a transgendered individual, and it implemented a People of Color council. The OSU-affiliated campus group, founded as the Gay Activists Alliance, changed its name once more from the Gay and Lesbian Alliance to Fusion, reflecting the range of gender and sexual identities among its members. Interestingly, however, unlike in other parts of the country, Columbus did not see a significant “queer” mobilization. We did not find evidence from our interviews or review of newsletters that a Queer Nation or another specifically “queer” organization was formed in Columbus in the early 1990s, in contrast to other cities nationwide.\(^5\)

The gay and lesbian community nationwide faced an improved and more friendly political climate in the 1990s, with President Clinton openly courting gay and lesbian voters during his election campaign in 1991. Although many communities, including Cincinnati, continued to face threats from the Christian Right in the form of antigay legal initiatives, gays and lesbians in Columbus did not face similar threats. Although the far right began to pursue a statewide antigay ballot initiative in 1994 that had the potential of mobilizing stigma in a way that was hostile to gays and lesbians, the Supreme Court’s ruling that a similar law in Colorado was unconstitutional in 1996 ended the campaign and diffused that potential. Thus, a highly mobilized Christian Right was largely absent from Columbus during the 1990s, and this may have affected gay and lesbian mobilizing and collective identity. In cities such as Cincinnati or states such as Oregon that faced a highly mobilized antigay countermovement, we would expect to see more cooperation between gay men and lesbians.

Whereas gender was the most salient identity structure in the 1970s and sexual identity was salient in the 1980s, during the 1990s, no single identity structure appeared to be more salient than any other. Sexuality was still an important factor in shaping collective identity, but the reemergence of gender, as well as the race and class structures, seemed to be equally important in collective identity construction. Class differences increasingly divided the lesbian and gay male communities during this decade, with the community, in the words of Jonathon, “losing its bond.” A majority of the respondents attested to this divide, denoting gender differences strikingly similar to those described in the 1970s:
Gay guys for good, bad, or indifferent have this much more narrow range of interests. AIDS was one, getting sex is probably number two, and I know that sounds crazy but...gay or straight there's a fundamental difference between men and women and how we approach our lives. (Doug)

It's interesting because the lesbians were so there for the gay community on the AIDS/HIV issue, but the men are so not there for the women on breast cancer and other women's health issues.... They don't care.... Inherently it's a male-female thing. I think men are about survival, and if it doesn't affect them, it's not that much of an issue. Versus women are about nurturing and caring. (Jonathon)

Lesbians also shared this perception of the ensuing divergence between lesbians and gay men:

The lesbian feminist community . . . we have a history in Columbus of networking, of providing services for each other, just because they're needed.... And I don't see that quite as strongly in the gay male community. I think at a very basic level that women grow up thinking that volunteering their time and energy is appropriate, and I don't think that men get that same message. And whether we're lesbians, gay, or straight, we still grow up in this society as men and women. (Susan)

Gender clearly became a more prominent factor in boundary and consciousness formation than it was during the 1980s, though not to the level of separatism apparent in the 1970s.

On the surface, many organizations appeared to be representative of the diverse GLBT community in the 1990s, with gender parity on the board, minority and/or transgender board seats, inclusive membership lists, and claims that “all are welcome.” However, a closer look indicates that this may not have actually been the case, as organizations were typically viewed by respondents as being either predominantly male or predominantly female, despite having gender parity on the board of directors. In the case of Stonewall, for instance, gender composition apparently fluctuated depending on whether the leadership positions (executive director, office manager, etc.) were filled by men or women. In 2000, many of the female interviewees, as well as a couple of the male respondents, described Stonewall as becoming a “men’s organization.” Similarly, BRAVO, which also has gender parity on the board, was viewed at the time as a “women’s organization.” However, gender was no longer the sole explanation given for these differences, as respondents increasingly identified social class as a dividing factor between men and women. Karen, who was actively involved in Stonewall since the mid-1980s and BRAVO since its inception in 1996, described the situation as follows:

Y’know, [unity between lesbians and gay men] has kind of come and gone together and apart over the years, and I think right now unfortunately we’re in a period again where it’s growing apart. And I think that there’s a real solid, classist, feminist analysis about why that’s going on. The boys have all the money. That’s the bottom line.

A few of the male respondents also attested to the emergence of a class identity, as stated here by Chad, a former member of Stonewall and on the board of BRAVO at the time of this interview:
Right now I believe that Stonewall attracts, generally, upper class people. And I think the majority of people who are upper class in our community are gay men. There are definitely lesbians who are involved with Stonewall, but they’re very much upper class.

This interaction between class and gender identities was evident in other organizations as well, such as Human Rights Campaign, Log Cabin Republicans, and Stonewall Democrats, in which the leaders and participants were primarily well-to-do men. Respondents discussed the dynamics between gender and class within the movement in general:

‘Cause men have money. Well men have more money, two men have way more money than two women. (Marcia)

I think our community’s done well at many levels to keep men and women involved. But there’s still just some basic gender issues that affect society that affect ours. Y’know when you get groups who don’t think anything in charging $150 a ticket, well more men are going to be able to afford that because, especially more male couples ‘cause you have two males making higher than average versus two women, both of ‘em per average make less, and so it just stretches it even further. (Jonathon)

About half of the respondents, most of whom were female, described the impact of economic differences between gay men and lesbians without being prompted to do so in the interview. Our findings support the argument that identities multiplied within the overall gay and lesbian movement in the late 1980s/early 1990s (Armstrong 2002; Gamson 1995) and that the commercialization of the movement caused some fragmentation. We should note that the relatively older mean age of our respondents may have influenced respondents’ perceptions of GLBT collective identity during the 1990s. Few of our respondents reached adulthood during this decade, with more entering their thirties and forties. Thus, several of our respondents noted that they were at a time in their lives where their contributions to collective action were more likely to be financial than through participation in direct action. It is possible that younger activists in Columbus during this decade would have reported different perceptions of GLBT collective identity at the time.

The 1980s seem to have been the most inclusive time period for the gay and lesbian movement in Columbus in terms of class, with leaders and participants from diverse economic backgrounds involved in Stonewall Union. However, while many of our respondents noted the class-based bias of the movement in Columbus, in contrast, only four interviewees described the influence of race on the movement, two of whom were African American. Although an examination of the racial dynamics of the movement is beyond the scope of this article, we feel that it is important to note that minority involvement in the mainstream movement in Columbus throughout the decades has been minimal, probably because of feelings of exclusion. Stockdill (2003) similarly notes how many AIDS organizations during the 1980s reflected the interests of white gay men, while failing to attend to the needs of women, people of color, and low-income individuals stricken by the disease.
The effects of racial inequality are clearly evident in the fact that race is seldom mentioned voluntarily by whites, who may find it easy to ignore racism since they largely benefit from it rather than facing its ill effects.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Our examination of the gay and lesbian movement in Columbus demonstrates that the boundaries of a movement’s collective identity shift over time as a movement’s composition changes, partially in response to the political context and the actions of movement opponents. Although scholars have documented changes in the gender composition of the gay and lesbian movement over the decades, few examine the factors associated with these shifts. We provide a theoretical framework for understanding fluctuations in the gender composition and collective identity of the gay and lesbian movement over time. We demonstrate that high levels of opposition and the mobilization of stigma can motivate gay men and lesbians to overcome the barriers to working together. However, during periods when the women’s movement enjoys political opportunities, gender may be a more salient mobilizing identity for lesbians. In the 1990s, the increasing salience of class differences seemed to drive gay men and lesbians apart. A brief summary of our findings illustrates these contributions.

In the 1970s, gender was the dominant organizing identity for women, as lesbian feminists identified with the women’s movement and the label *lesbian* itself became the epitome of feminist resistance. Gay men were not highly mobilized in Columbus at the time, and there was little collaboration between gay men and lesbians. Socially, neither group felt they had much in common, a fact that both men and women attributed to gender differences. However, mobilization around gender identities declined during the late 1970s, as the women’s movement faced a loss of political allies and opportunities. Sexual identity emerged as a salient organizing structure during the 1980s as threats from AIDS and the antigay right, including the Bryant Campaign and the Moral Majority, prompted the gradual breakdown of the barriers between lesbians and gay men. Public homophobia became pronounced with the discovery of the HIV virus and the promotion of stigma against gays by Christian Right groups who pronounced HIV a “gay disease” and “God’s punishment for homosexuals.” These threats against gays and lesbians prompted a breakdown of the gender barriers that often prevented gay men and lesbians from working together. Organizations became more inclusive of both women and men as each came to better understand the other sex.

In the 1990s and beyond, the relationship between lesbians and gay men within the movement once again diverged, although not to the extent seen in the 1970s. In the absence of an immediate threat such as AIDS or intense countermovement activity such as the Moral Majority, the need for cooperation between lesbians and gay men lessened. Class differences between men and women became increasingly salient as the movement in Columbus matured and became more commercial. Fundraising dinners by groups such as the Human Rights Campaign that charged $150 per person highlighted these differences and led to increased gender segregation. Echoing explanations from the 1970s, both women and men...
attributed this to gender differences, but many also suggested that economic inequality between gay men and lesbians influenced this divergence. However, in the absence of a highly mobilized women’s movement with an active lesbian separatist branch, men and women continued to work together in the 1990s more than they had in the 1970s. Overall, these findings demonstrate that changes in the political context as well as internal movement conflict can critically influence the composition and collective identity of a social movement.

This research supports research suggesting that a loss of political opportunities may have a differential effect on mobilization than the emergence of new threats. We demonstrate that countermovements may inadvertently trigger a movement’s mobilization by promoting stigma against the movement’s constituency. Thus, we contribute to studies of stigma and mobilization by showing that movement opponents may influence the timing of mobilization to resist stigma. The generation of stigma by countermovements may increase the salience of an identity, facilitating mobilization and the formation of a collective identity around that identity. A loss of allies and opportunities, on the other hand, can discourage group members from mobilizing around that identity. Further research should explore whether other stigmatized groups respond similarly to social conditions and whether other social conditions may heighten the salience of a stigmatized identity and inspire mobilization.

Although an in-depth discussion of the role of race and class structures, as well as their intersections with gender, is beyond the scope of this article, both have been important factors in the collective identity processes within the gay and lesbian movement throughout the aforementioned decades. For instance, the women’s movement in Columbus, and elsewhere in the country, during the 1970s comprised mostly white, middle-class women. The gay and lesbian movement throughout the period we study was primarily white and middle class as well. While our white respondents showed little awareness of the racial dimensions of their organizations, racial minority group members felt excluded from movement events, and our interviews suggest that their racial identity may have played a larger role in motivating their action than did their sexual identity. Our interviewees were primarily from the middle to upper classes, suggesting that lower class individuals may have felt excluded from the movement as well. Widespread attacks on gays and lesbians had a limited impact on the ability of sexual identity groups to overcome racial and middle/lower class divisions. The ways that race and class shape gay and lesbian organizing should be explored further in subsequent research.

This research suggests that an active opposition that promotes the stigmatization of a broad social group may inspire increased collaboration across class, racial, and gender boundaries. The close collaboration of African American men and women, who have historically worked together across gender divisions in the face of an opposition to their civil rights that included widespread negative stereotyping, is another example of this dynamic. This research does suggest, however, that stigmatization must be fairly widespread and well publicized before it will result in significant mass mobilization across group boundaries and that mobilization also depends on the dynamics of the social movement field. Gays and lesbians did not enjoy significant political opportunities or widespread social support in the 1970s, yet at the same time the opposition to the movement
was fairly diffused and disorganized. Thus, the ground swell of activism in the
women’s movement likely inspired lesbians to fight for their rights within the
women’s movement rather than collaborating with gay men. In addition, a shared
identity must also be available before coalition work can take place. Although
widespread racism and a mobilized white supremacist movement in the United
States may target multiple ethnic and racial groups and gays and lesbians, the
absence of a shared identity among these groups may limit their collaboration.
However, as this research demonstrates, when a group with a shared identity is
targeted and demonized by an active and vocal opposition, that identity may
become more salient and inspire collaboration across other group divisions.

APPENDIX

Descriptions and Dates of Organizations to which Interviewees Belonged

Note: All organizations still exist except where otherwise noted.

Organization/Dates/Description
Stonewall Columbus/1981 to present/Local nonprofit with goals of commu-
nity building, education, and advocacy
People of Color Council/Early 1990s to present/Part of Stonewall Columbus;
addresses issues pertaining to minorities
Human Rights Campaign/1983 to present/Local chapter of largest national
gay political organization
Buckeye Region Anti-Violence Organization (BRAVO)/1996 to present/Local
nonprofit organization with goals of prevention and advocacy
Log Cabin Republicans/1992 to present/Local chapter of national partisan group
Stonewall Democrats/1996 to present/Local partisan group
Ohio Human Rights Association/1980s to present/Network of lawyers doing
pro bono Bar work for gay and lesbian citizens
Gay Officers Action League/1995 to present/Advocacy and support group for
gay and lesbian police officers, firefighters, and paramedics
Dignity/1994 to present/Catholic support group
Integrity/1990s to present/Episcopalian support group
Columbus AIDS Task Force/1984 to present/Local organization providing ser-
dvices to HIV/AIDS patients and educating community
Fusion (originally Gay Activist Alliance, which emerged from Gay Liberation
Front and Ohio Gay Rights Coalition)/1971 to present/Campus organization pro-
viding support, services, education, and advocacy
Lesbian Business Association/1988 to present/Local organization supporting
women in businesses; social group for women in the community
Sisters of Lavender (formerly Slightly Older Lesbians)/1987 to present/Local
support and social group for women in the community
Lesbian Research Project/1970s to unknown/Campus group comprising five
lesbian graduate students speaking about lesbian studies
Blood Sisters/mid-1980s to unknown/Local group of women donating blood
for AIDS research on behalf of gay men
Gay and Professional (GAP)/1980s to unknown/Local support group for professional men
ACTUP/1980s to unknown/Local chapter of radical national organization advocating AIDS issues
Women Against Rape (WAR)/1972 to 1996/Antiviolence organization

NOTES

1. The use of the term gay and lesbian rights movement is somewhat misleading, especially in reference to the 1990s, because the movement has often included individuals who identify as other than gay or lesbian, including bisexuals, queers, and transgendered people. Throughout the text, we use primarily gay men and lesbians, and occasionally the term queer, for simplicity. However, we recognize that individuals and organizations involved in the movement hold various identities.

2. This time period was chosen because 1969 is typically viewed as the beginning of the modern gay rights movement (D’Emilio 1983; D’Emilio and Freedman 1997).

3. This initiative would permit school systems to fire gay employees as well as anyone who “advocated or encouraged homosexual conduct” (D’Emilio and Freedman 1997:347).

4. Only five of the respondents did not indicate AIDS as a key proponent in unifying gay men and lesbians. All five were women.

5. The fact that a Queer Nation chapter never formed in Columbus is supported by the Queer Resource Directory (2005) list of Queer Nation chapters in the early 1990s—they do not list a chapter in Columbus.

6. Although Christian Right groups also worked in opposition to many issues central to the women’s movement, they did not mobilize stigma against women as they did against gays and lesbians.
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