

HUMAN HISTORY IN ONE EASY LESSON,
AND ITS RELATION TO THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD

by
Walter L. Williams
May 9, 2009

I want to suggest that humanity today is right at the cusp of a new era of human history, as significant as during two other fundamental changes in human history, and our future as a species could go one of two ways:

1. Because the combination of human overpopulation, and human's domesticated animal overpopulation, is putting so much pressure onto earth's ecological system, we are teetering on the edge of ecological collapse. This will lead to massive depopulation, a new dark ages that will make the century after the collapse of the Roman Empire look like a garden party, if not the complete extinction of the human species.

Or

2. The crisis before us is going to result in some really fundamental and massive changes in the way human beings think, operate in relation to the environment. We are going to see the rejection of old ideas, the emergence of a new morality, a new ethical code, and a revolution in religion and philosophy.

If we do not make change number two, and quickly, then I suggest change number one is the inevitable result. I am very afraid that we will miss this small window of opportunity that the global financial crisis is forcing major institutions like corporations and nation-state governments to reassess some fundamental ways that we do things. There are extremely powerful forces that do not want any change in consciousness. Old ideas die hard, and there are many who will resist to the death, even as environmental collapse is happening. Combined with the general tendency of the human brain to follow the ideas one was taught in our youth, and the tendency of many to simply ignore what is happening in hopes that everything will muddle along, and we will not have to think about it, I am afraid that inertia will win out.

I would submit that it is the responsibility of thinking people to take action, and drastic action, to help move humanity into a new way of thinking. But I am not optimistic that this will happen quickly enough to avoid catastrophe, because thinking people have, like I myself have done in the past, allowed

ourselves to be intimidated into silence and censored ourselves in making a direct challenge to the old order.

It is time in human history, I would suggest, when we need a new moral imperative to arise, similar in approach to the rise of the anti-slavery movement in the early 19th century. For thousands of years slavery existed as a fundamental institution in human economic systems. Though some individuals objected, there was no basic question about slavery in the world moral order. The Bible justified slavery, as did the Koran, as did the sacred writings of practically every other established human moral system.

And yet, despite all this authority of the moral order, a new militant ideology of abolitionism emerged between 1800 and 1830. And here is what is so amazing: it rose precisely in the center of power of the world slave system. First in Britain, the world's largest transporter and seller of slaves. It was British ships on which the majority of people were wrenched from their homes in Africa, and transported to the slave auction blocks in the Americas. And second, it rose in the United States. Now it probably would have arisen in Latin America as well, except that the Latin Americans made the imminently sensible decision that slavery was a contradiction to freedom, and so in their independence movements they called for the end of slavery as a central part of the end of colonialism.

In the new United States, similar calls were made. Thomas Paine, Sam Hancock, even Thomas Jefferson, recognized the fundamental incongruity between calling for freedom for themselves while holding other human beings as slaves. And so they tried to do what other independence movements later accomplished. But they ran up against a basic reality that prevented logic from prevailing. And this was the reality that slavery was so central to the economy of the Southern colonies, that the persons in control could not free themselves from it. And so the delegates to the Continental Congress from South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia, made it very clear that they would not agree to participate in this revolt against the British Empire if slavery were threatened. They would choose to deny independence for themselves before they would give up their slaves.

And so, a crucial decision was made in the Continental Congress in 1776 to make this compromise. Objections to slavery that Jefferson had written into the first draft of the Declaration of Independence were marked out, and the United States was founded as a slave republic. It was this basic

contradiction, between slavery and freedom, that shaped the next nine decades of American history. It took generations of agitation, and basic changes in public opinion, plus a civil war that took the lives of over 620,000 people before they could get to the point of ending slavery.

And all of this never would have happened without the abolitionist movement. The earlier anti-slavery voices were based on reasoned arguments, calmly pointing out that slavery was holding back human progress, that it was bad for the slaves and bad for the masters. And you know what, this rational line of reasoning had very little impact on society.

It was not until the emergence of a new generation of militant abolitionists emerged in the 1830s that things began to change. This was represented by the founding of the newspaper THE LIBERATOR. Its editor was William Lloyd Garrison. And his most famous critique of plans for gradual emancipation over several decades, was to say that was like pulling babies out of a fire, slowly. Be patient, don't rush things so much, while the babies burned. No, Garrison said, action is needed immediately. Right now. There is no prevarication, there is no time to wait, there is no compromise. Garrison's most famous statement: "I will not compromise, ... and I will be heard" [GET EXACT WORDS].

How did Garrison get to this position? More importantly, how did he gain a mass movement of followers to call for this drastic change? After hundreds of years of articulation of rational arguments against slavery, how did Garrison manage to change a rational argument into a moral crusade?

The answer is that he and the other new abolitionists wrapped themselves in moral authority by basing his movement for change in the central institution of moral authority in his society: Christianity.

Garrison and the others took on a moral tone. There would be no compromise with slavery because there is no compromise with evil.

Now, this was a pretty amazing stance for Garrison to take. And the reason is because Christianity was a pro-slavery religion. The Bible was filled with quotes where God told the Hebrews to slay their enemies and slaughter the prisoners. But God instructed in the Book of Joshua [GET QUOTES] that they should keep the children alive "so that they shall be your bondsmen. And their descendents shall be your bondsmen forever."

Now the Bible is filled with numerous references like this. When God himself is instructing people to enslave others, how does one go about using the Bible to challenge slavery.

The abolitionists did it by isolating a few rather vague quotes from Jesus, to counter this. It was rather flimsy as an intellectual argument, but you know what, it was enough to inspire a generation of abolitionists to take on a new moral fervor. It was this moral fervor, unwilling to compromise with slavery, that ultimately led to freedom. They did not persuade the majority. Even in 1861 Abraham Lincoln offered the South a constitutional amendment protecting slavery in those States where it already existed. The Southern secessionists rejected Lincoln's offer, because Lincoln was set on ending slavery in the Western Territories, and the Southerners wanted to expand. So the war came. And the Civil War itself is what ended slavery, everywhere, even though that was not Lincoln's intent. But Lincoln was not in control of events, and so by 1865 he came to support the abolition of slavery everywhere, which he did not support in 1861.

Am I saying that it will require a civil war to make change now? I sincerely hope not, but I do know that there will be strong and determined opposition to change. The only way that change will occur, I am convinced, is for a moral change to happen in public opinion. The moral change is more important than rational change. So, for example, when abolitionists started using Christianity as the basis for their moral crusade, Southerners confidently brought out the Bible verses to show that God approved of slavery. And they did it again and again. The verses supporting slavery were right there in the Bible, but it did not matter. The abolitionists did not retreat.

The reason they did not retreat is because they had a new moral idea, that slavery is morally wrong. And they based a new attack on slavery from that supposition.

Today, there are many attacks on the old ideas. Lots of people are criticizing this part or that part of the old view. Look at just the challenge to the Bible alone. In choosing the Bible, I am not meaning to suggest the other old sacred texts are better. The Koran, the Hindu texts, and many others, all reflect the old ideas. Some critics attack one of these sacred texts from the perspective of the other, but that misses the point that both of them are reflective of the old mindset.

There are, however, two things missing in these attacks. First, there has been no new moral order composed that will be offered as a replacement. Until that is done, the criticism will not be successful, because criticism is not enough by itself. People need something positive to believe in. A certain portion of people are rational, and they base their decisions on reasoned arguments. They think about the pros and cons, and then reach a decision. This is not the way the majority of human beings think. The majority reaches a decision based on emotional factors. A moral alternative needs to be presented to people.

Second, though there have been many criticisms of the old ideas, no one has brought them all together into one combined whole. Look at the major critics of the old establishment:

1. Anti-slavery, which was successful in agitating social order so much that slavery was abolished in the British Empire in 1832, in the United States in 1865, and in Brazil in the 1870s [GET DATE].
2. The Women's movement, which was successful in getting votes for women recognized as part of democratic government by the early 1900s, and in most democracies a declaration of equal rights for women is now part of their constitutions. However, the determined opposition to the Equal Rights Amendment in the USA during the 1970s and 1980s shows the difficulty of making these changes.
3. The birth control movement, led for so many years by Margaret Sanger.
4. Women's reproductive rights movement, resulting in the victory of Roe v. Wade.
5. The gay and lesbian rights movement.
6. The sexual revolution of the 1960s and 1970s, which was cut short by the emergence of AIDS and other sexually transmitted infections in the 1980s. The anti-sexual movement very effectively used these diseases as a means of continuing the old ideas.
7. The population control movement.
8. The ecological movement
9. Transgender rights movement
10. Animal rights movement
11. Childrens rights movement

Though humane treatment of animals and children has been widely accepted into the modern moral order, I would suggest it is these two movements which have been least accepted as principles. And I would suggest that they both are key to a new moral reformulation.

Now, these eleven movements are all questioning the old establishment, it is true. But what do they have to do with each other? What do animal rights have to do with women's reproductive rights? In fact, on some issues they seem even to be on opposite sides. In the 1980s a segment of feminist thought spent more time attacking sado-masochism, pornography, and sex with children, than they did attacking the institutions of power that were oppressing women. Feminists have dramatically changed their attitude on transgender people, but most feminists remain opposed to these other issues. There are valid historical reasons why they have done so, but other reasons why their opposition needs to be rethought. There are gay men who are sexist, racist, and anti-abortion. There are masculinist gay men who put down transgender people. And there are transgender people, both MTF and FTM, who mock and put down femininity. There are anti-colonialists who oppose population control programs. Practically every adult does not want to question the legal power of parents over children's rights. And how many of you have ever once questioned the moral right that you have to slaughter and eat an animal, like a cow or a pig, that never hurt anyone?

I suggest that you visit a slaughterhouse, to see the horror that goes on every day in the world, to supply the food that you eat. I did, and it changed my life. When I was a child I remember sitting in front of the television, watching a cartoon advertisement of Frosty Morn Weiners, showing pigs happily dancing into the factory singing "I want to be a Frosty Morn Weiner, that is what I really want to be, And if I were a Frosty Morn Weiner...." And somehow I have never managed to remember what that last line was. But in that cartoon, with the pigs so gleefully dancing into the Frosty Morn factory, and coming out the other side as equally happy dancing packages of hotdogs, lies a big fat lie. This is symptomatic of the lies that I and every other child watching TV was given, and continues to be given, to insulate us from the truth. Because, when I later went to visit a slaughterhouse, I saw a much different situation. Pigs are very intelligent animals, and as they were unloaded from the trucks at the door of the slaughterhouse they knew exactly what was about to happen to them. And they were screaming bloody murder.

Please take a moment to think about the reality that occurs, every time you walk into MacDonalds to order a hamburger, that somewhere nearby a cow is being dragged by metal clamps attached to its two hind legs, and the chains are pulled up, stretching the entire weight onto the cows back legs

and snapping the tendons as the heavy body is lifted upward onto the assembly line. And as the cow is hanging there upside down, in terror and pain, it sees the approaching whirling metal saw blade that slices part of its neck open so that the blood can drain from the body. And as the cow is dying, its last visions blurred by the blood dripping across its face, it sees the human employees of this factory of death non-challently walking about, doing their jobs in perfect willful ignorance of the agony and pain that they are inflicting.

If you want to understand how German people in the 1940s could take a job working at a concentration camp and not be aware of the moral implications of what they did, go and talk to someone who works in a slaughterhouse. I wish we would reverse the order of that word, because house of slaughter is a very accurate name for those places.

The point that I am making, before any one of us jumps up to assert that my group is more oppressed than yours, and your oppression has to wait to be addressed because mine comes first, is a faulty way of thinking. If we will acknowledge the truth, we will have to agree that, in one way or another, not one of us are innocent in the moral corruption that infuses our daily life.

You see that I am aiming for a standing ovation by beginning my analysis, in attacking and alienating everybody. I am Mr. Popular.

By this time I think you have figured out that I am not on the verge of announcing my candidacy for political office. But what I am trying to do is to awaken you to a new moral urgency, to apply to your own personal life. I am trying to awaken you to go out and talk to your relatives and your co-workers and your friends and neighbors, and to awaken a new moral urgency in them as well.

But here is the problem. Awakening people to the moral urgency of one issue is not enough. Let's face it, there are not enough transgender people to get the majority of people to care one whit about transgender rights. Hell, there are not enough feminists to convince the majority of American voters to pass an Equal Rights Amendment, and women are over 50% of the population. Go figure.

Everybody who cares about one of each of these eleven movements has some reason not to support the other. There is this difference and that

difference, and it all seems hopeless to unite. The very idea of merging these eleven disparate movements into one moral view seems not only impossible, but ridiculous.

In spite of the apparent contradictions, though, I want to suggest that these eleven movements are not only connected, but that these subjects are central to the way human history has unfolded in the last several thousand years. What I want to help you to see, is that every one of them is somehow related to the issue of sex.

Now, I am an academic who studies sex. I have been studying the role of sex in human cultures for thirty years. You may think that, with that kind of job, and doing it for thirty years, I am definitely suffering from sex on the brain. That may be true, but I still want to suggest that the issue of sex, in one form or another, is somehow at the very center not only in these movements, but also that sex is central—not marginal—to the major issues facing humanity today. I want to suggest that sex is at the center of conceptual changes that are currently taking place in human thinking.

But here is the problem. The problem is that we may miss this opportunity because we do not recognize the extent of the fundamental changes that are enveloping the world, and we ourselves remain mired in the old ways of thinking. Maybe it takes a crazy academic, who has been studying and pondering over these issues for so long, to see the connections.

To explain all this, the first thing I have to do is to lay out the nature of the most fundamental changes in human history, from ancient times to the present. Then, after seeing the present in that context, then I will come back and do a review of the history of the LGBTQ movement in the last century. I want to explain WHY the movement for sexual rights emerged in the 20th century, and WHY we are so crucial for the future of the earth in the 21st century.

OK, now let us begin. I have a question: What is the beginning date for human history?

Give me a date. How many thousands of years ago?

Fundamentalist Christians insist from a literal reading of the Bible, that God created humans 6,000 years ago. In a sense they are very correct, because that is the date at which much of the world we know today began.

Historians traditionally say that history begins with writing, which I think makes about as much sense as saying your trip to this conference today began when you got out of your car to enter this building. Your walking from the parking lot to the door was of a different character than your drive, but if we only analyze the part when you were walking then we miss out on the reality of what happened from the time you woke up this morning with the intent to come to Plummer Park.

Historians say that history begins with writing. Well, writing only occurs in societies that have a hierarchy, and a ruler, and need to keep records of taxes paid. So defining history as beginning with writing, is sort of like automobile companies saying we are only going to teach history since the invention of the automobile. We want to sell cars, so we don't want to talk about all that time that human beings got along without cars, and walked everywhere.

Why does the curriculum of practically every university require students to learn about the history of the last 6,000 years, but not before? Why do the historians and the fundamentalist Christians insist so loudly that we should only cover the last 6,000 years? Why do they teach so strongly that God created human beings 6,000 years ago, when there is so much evidence for human existence far far longer than that?

As an anthropologist I would argue that the beginning date for human history is the beginning date of the existence of human beings as a species. We know from archaeological evidence that proto-hominids branched off from the apes over a million years ago, but the emergence of the species *Homo sapiens* dates to about 200,000 years ago. For the vast majority of that time, *Homo sapiens* lived as hunter-gatherers.

People lived in small bands, moving about gathering wild plants and hunting wild animals. Each band consisted of a wide network of kinfolk, from about 15 people to as large as a hundred or so, survived as a unit, sharing food and interacting in pretty much egalitarian societies. People had rather loose sexual pairings, that might last for a long time or a short time, but they were not so important as the identification with the band. People lived not in separate families, but as part of the band. As they moved around in search of food, they survived or not, as members of a band. Individual bonds were strongest between mothers and their children. But, if a woman was able to convince a man to stay with her for at least 7 or 8 years, then she had a

major advantage in raising her child.

The most prestigious person in a band was the shaman, who was:

1. teacher of the young
2. religious leader
3. medical doctor
4. therapist

A good shaman had to know much knowledge, and to be a good shaman had to be totally devoted to the welfare of the band. If a shaman had an offspring, that would take so much of their time that they would not have time to do all this. Therefore, shamans tended to be persons who did not reproduce. Who do you think were often the individuals who did not reproduce?

Animism: the world's oldest religion everything that exists has a spirit
Since everything comes from the spirit world, those persons who are unique and different from the norm means the spirits must have paid particular attention to making that person different.

In particular, an androgynous person is considered to have BOTH the spirit of a man and the spirit of a woman combined into one unique individual of great spiritual power.

TWO SPIRIT person a femme male is not "less than a man" but "more than a man"

A masculine female is not a weird freak of nature, but a special creation of the spirits.

We know that humans started migrating out of Africa about 70,000 years ago. And a central place that humans perfected their hunting techniques were on the steppes of Central Asia. From there about 40,000 years ago humans spread east to Europe and west to Asia. By 35,000 ya they had reached Siberia in the north and Indonesia and the Philippines in the south. From there, the southern branch spread by outrigger canoe to the islands of the Pacific and the northern branch spread by land, and maybe by boat as well, from Alaska and down into the Americas.

In all these areas, the traditional cultures had the idea that transgender people were especially spiritually blessed. What I have found in my research, that I first started with American Indians in the early 1980s, and reported in my book *THE SPIRIT AND THE FLESH* is that this idea was extremely

widespread , not only across North America, but from Alaskan Natives to the Indians of Chile in South America.

And then, I found out that similar traditions existed in Southeast Asia. I went to Indonesia in 1987-88, and found isolated cultures where transgender people hold high status. And in the Philippines. And then I went to Thailand.

Most people know that Thailand is a place where transgendered people are very accepted. Bangkok, and the beaches of Pattaya and Phuket are famous for their wild gay nightclub scenes. But most people mistakenly think Thailand's gay acceptance is a recent urban phenomenon.

This image is not accurate. For the last five years I have been living much of my time in a tiny village of 450 people in Northeast Thailand, near the border of Laos. The Isan people here are among the least Western influenced of any part of Southeast Asia. I can say that I have never visited anywhere, where GLBTQ people are more genuinely accepted than in the small villages of Isan. Why is this?

1. Because Thailand is one of the few places in the world that was never subjected to European or EuroAmerican imperialism. The Europeans brought their erotophobia and their homophobia with them everywhere they went. The British were particularly thorough in indoctrinating their subjects into thinking of homosexuality as a sin and a crime. They left a legacy of sodomy laws that still hobble former British colonies. If you look across the map of the world today and see the nations with the most severe laws against homosexuality, you can be almost assured it was a former British colony. How else do we explain why places as diverse as Malaysia, Zimbabwe, Iran, Uganda, India, and Jamaica would be united in being so oppressive to their homosexual populations?

2. The other thing that is different about Thailand is that its religion is Buddhism. Buddhism does not have this strange notion that homosexuality is sinful, and without that, the entire character of childrearing and social interactions from birth to death changes. I just published an article on homophobia in Malaysia, in the March 2009 issue of the journal NEBULA at <http://nobleworld.biz> I talk about the punishment for homosexual acts in the Malaysian law, which is 20 years in prison and 20 to 30 lashes with a whip. I have seen the lashing that is given as this punishment, and the word whipping does not convey the brutality of what happens. [describe lashings] Thailand and Malaysia, geographical neighbors to each other, are really not that different culturally. How can we explain such widely variant reactions,

from wild gay parties in Pattaya to lashings in Kuala Lumpur? The main difference, besides the imperialist heritage, is religion. Because Buddhism does not see homosexuality as a sin, versus Islam does. Governmental authorities in Malaysia justify their barbarity by quoting the Koran and say that homosexuality is a sin that is worse than murder. Think about that statement: worse than murder. How is the act of affection, or even just the simple juxtaposition of one person's body against another, for the purpose of pleasure, morally worse than the act of killing another human being? Well, one part of that equation is because murder is not considered such a bad thing. After all, the Prophet Mohammed himself participated in many battles, and even in personally killing prisoners after they were captured. And the Christian Bible is no less gory than the Koran, with page after page of the Bible devoted to orders from God for the Hebrews to slay their enemies, to slaughter entire cities of captives, including men, women, old people, and children. Human beings can bring themselves to engage in all kinds of acts of murder when they can claim that the word of God told them to do such behaviours.

So, the more research that I do, in the more parts of the world, the more firmly I am convinced that religion is at the core of a society's attitudes toward homosexuality.

Thailand, in short, is what the world would look like if there had been no imperialism or no expansion of the Middleeastern religions (specifically, Christianity and Islam). But the great irony is that today, homophobia is spreading to Thailand. It is spreading there mainly from the influence of America and the Middle East. First, with Thai educated classes who came to the USA to study at American colleges. The most homophobic people I have met in Thailand are psychologists who were educated in the US before 1974. Second, it spread due to America movies, which until a few years ago were unrelentingly homophobic.

Third, it is now spreading in Thailand due to Christian missionary groups, that are crawling all over the Thai countryside, from top to bottom. Thailand has freedom of religion, and the government does not inhibit anyone.

Mormons in their white shirts and ties, Fundamentalist Protestants distributing copies of the Bible, and Catholic priests all untiringly proselytize their version of Christianity.

At the very same time, Muslims are moving into the cities, as they already expanded into Malaysia and Indonesia and took over those countries, so now they are doing in Thailand, Russia, Europe and the Americas.

Thailand is just the opposite as America. In the USA, the more progay places are the big cities, while the small towns are the most homophobic. In Thailand, the isolated small villages are the remnant holdouts against the homophobic onslaught that is beating at the gates.

So, you may want to ask, after describing so many thousands of years when transgender people were highly venerated religious leaders, during that 98% of our history when humans lived in hunter-gatherer bands, and when homosexuality was not stigmatized but was just accepted as a part of reality, a part of the way the world is. How, then, did the world come to be so completely messed up?

THE DISEMPOWERMENT OF ANIMALS

The answer is our attitude toward animals.

In hunter gatherer times, humans had an extremely respectful attitude toward animals. Animal spirits were prominent in religion. Anyone who has ever seen a Northwest Coast Indian totem pole knows that the animal totems were the very symbol of a family. Even the doorways to their houses were often carved in the form of the vagina of an animal totem, that they entered into the protective womb of the great animal mother at the end of every day.

As early humans moved out into new unfamiliar lands, always in search of food, to strengthen themselves for this scary effort, they turned to the development of spirituality as a means of spiritual assistance. The first spirits they turned to were the spirits of the animals they hunted. That is why their religion is called ANIMISM. Far from considering humans as superior, they saw themselves at the mercy of the animal's spirit. They gave ceremonies to the animal spirit, thanking it for allowing itself to be killed for human consumption. They begged the pardon of the animal when they had to kill it. They would never waste the meat, skin or bones of the animal. Everything was utilized. No animal was killed any more than necessary for human survival. The concept of recreational hunting, for people to go out and kill animals for mere sport, would be considered barbaric by huntergatherers.

But then something happened, first in the Middle East, beginning about 10,000 years ago and then in Central Asia, and then independently. That humans first started herding animals for food. Gradually this evolved into using the labor of animals for human benefit. What we so demurely refer to as "the domestication of animals" really is nothing more than animal

slavery. This trend reached its culmination with the domestication of the camel and the horse 6,000 years ago. It was these two events that revolutionized human history. How could humans consider animals their equal when they would ride about on top of the animal?

Even today, when cowboys prepare a young horse, or a captured wild horse, for riding, they call it “breaking the horse.” That is, they have to literally break the spirit of the horse, to get it to accept the indignity of having a human sit on its back and force it to move around by jerking on a metal harness in its mouth. I know all you SandMs are getting all excited by this, but let me tell you the process of breaking a horse is brutal.

Yet, we humans ceremonialize these cruelties, taunting animals from the way we treat them from bullfights in Spain to rodeos in Wyoming.

What are all these ceremonies about? They represent the disempowerment of animals. And so, there is just enough of a chance for the animal to sometimes get in a few good attacks, just to keep the human contestants on their toes, but the odds are stacked against the animal. Only one bull is in the ring at a time, remember.

Quote Genesis: and God made the beasts of the field. And God made man to have dominion over all the beasts and every thing that crawleth upon the earth.

FROM TOTEM TO BEAST

And the animals fought back. My own father, growing up on a farm in North Carolina, was severely injured when he was kicked by a mule when he was trying to get it to plow. It is no accident that the phrase “stubborn as a mule” became so common. It was a mere human twist on the resistance that any thinking sentient being would give to being forced to labor against its will for the benefit of its master. I myself was once thrown from a horse in Indonesia, and one time when I was in Egypt a camel tried to throw me. Not succeeding in that, once I was safely on the ground the camel spit on me. That was the last time I ever tried to ride an animal. It was only years later that I realized, in both instances, I fully deserved all of that.

With herding peoples it was not only that they brutalized themselves because they could not force animals without doing so. But they also soon realized that they could increase their number of animal slaves most easily by stealing more of them from their neighbors. So, in sharp contrast to hunter-

gathering bands, who tend to avoid conflict by moving apart, herding peoples started attacking their neighbors to gain ever larger herds of animals. Bigger numbers meant more success, so those who embarked on the herding ways combined into larger units. Bands became tribes, tribes became chiefdoms, and chiefdoms, in some areas became states.

AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION

The areas where the first states emerged were in river valleys. The fertile soil was ideal for the growth of plants. At some points, independently in different parts of the world, people discovered how to plant seeds and grow plants from scratch. Now, instead of gathering wild plants and hunting wild animals, humans in these areas brought both the resources of growing large numbers of edible plants in a concentrated area, and the resources of using animal labor, to bring about the agricultural revolution about 6,000 years ago.

So, when Christian Fundamentalists say that humans were created by God 6,000 years ago, in a sense they are correct. Because the species that emerged by exploiting the animals and the plants, was truly a new creation. The agricultural revolution was truly a revolution. If capturing and exploiting the labor of animals was good, then why not do the same thing to other humans? And so, growing out of animal slavery was a new institution that emerged: human slavery.

THE DISEMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN AND GIRLS

Central to animist religions were ceremonies emphasizing the special powers of women. Two in particular:

1. The power of menstruation: reflecting the totally amazing ability of a female to bleed and not die. So menstruation is central to ceremony
2. The power to give birth: Birth is ceremonialized. Enter a house through a door that is carved as the vagina of a female animal totem.

And so, in the new view, these two great markers of female power are completely removed from ceremony. No longer when a young girl starts her first bleeding, everybody drops everything in order to have a puberty dance. And everybody dances, in honor of her special power.

[so I would like to hear some testimony of reclaiming of spiritual power by a female-bodied-born person. Tell us what you imagine it would feel like to you if you were told all during your childhood to watch with great

anticipation at the beginning of your first blood, to mark your emergence and your magical transformation from girl to woman.

And then I want you to tell us what it feels like that you did not have that ceremony of transformation. What did it feel like when you were not even told that your body would do this thing.

And now, at last, they even took away the power of birth from woman. How could they do that? By something so completely ridiculous, something that went so totally opposite all experience of life, that said females give birth, and that was by having the first being be a male. And so the original birthgiving was taken away from woman and given to man.

Now obviously, no one has ever seen a man give birth, so the only way that a man can be the birthgiver is not by anything natural, but only by that which is supernatural. And thus is born the idea of a deity. A creator.

THE DISEMPOWERMENT OF BOYS

In band societies, there is a strong sense of the interdependence of the generations. There is an exchange: “you take care of me now, and I will take care of you when you are old.” [Cherokee 7 year old girl said this to her mother when the woman was cross with her]

So, once a woman is enslaved, then that enslaves young girls as well. Children legally become the property of the father, who can do with them as he will.

But there is a special need to make the boy into property. The property of the father. Where the boy must mind the father no matter what, just as the man must mind the deity no matter what.

And what story most directly reflects this new ownership of the son by the father? The story of Abraham following the order of god to kill his only son. Now this story is presented in Genesis as how horrid for Abraham that he would have to kill his own son.

But think about this same story from the perspective of Isaac, the son.

Here is the beautiful boy, playing and enjoying the day, but then as he travels with his father, and he asks his father where is the sacrificial lamb?

And Abraham answers that god will provide.

But then as they travel on further, it gradually dawns on Isaac that he himself is the sacrifice to god. That is, he realizes that his father is so devoted to this evil deity that the deity will persuade the gullible Abraham to go so far as to do an insane act of murdering this beautiful boy. Just as a test of loyalty to god, nothing more, nothing really necessary for survival. Just a test.

And so, by this means, even boys, the boy who will himself later become a man, is enslaved.

You see, all of this is absolutely necessary, because the agrarian system needs the labor of all in, child as well as adult, in order to survive.

Children lose the right to control their own body because it is necessary for labor.

For this child enslavement system to work, the father has to have total power and control, first over the wife and daughters

But how can he establish dominion and control over the son?

Because boys are a problem. They've got all those strong testosterone chemicals bouncing all through their body at puberty.

How can you possibly control them?

There is only one way, and that is to go straight for the one thing that most defines a pubescent boy. What does a pubescent boy want to do more than any one thing? Why of course, it is so obvious, he wants to shoot his sperm.

Now if the miraculous thing about a female is that she can produce a new birth, then the most miraculous thing about a male is that he can just by the power of his mind make a part of his body stand at attention on its own.

And then with just a little stimulation can shoot ejaculate out and make it spurt, sometimes across the room. And within one ejaculate is a whole village of little proto-people. Amazing.

And so the most effective way to gain dominion and control over boys is to condemn their ejaculate as "wasting seed"

What a horrid concept.

That is like saying that singing is wasting your voice.

Because the amazing testicles can produce so much sperm, there really is no wastage at all.

But what is wasted is the freedom to enjoy that ejaculate to the fullest.

How do you enslave children?

You cloak it in the idea that wasting seed

Make them feel guilty about something so central, so important to their bodily need, and you teach lies: that children are nonsexual, that children are innocent, that sex is sinful.

And this is how you control them, and make them do what you say, which is labor for you,.

THE DISEMPOWERMENT OF MEN

Once you have control of boys, then it is only a matter of time before you can even enslave adult men.

In

With the emergence of these new institutions, that had never appeared before, kingdoms were founded by the rise of a new dominant military class. Gone were the egalitarian societies of hunter gatherers. Now we see human beings divided into the elite ruling class and the slaves at the bottom. Upon the earth appeared something that only a few thousand years before would have been completely unpredictable for the small numbers of Homo sapiens in their small hunter gatherer bands. Now began the dawn of civilization.

The agricultural revolution was, then, the first great change in human history.

Not only did a new way of living emerge in these revolutionary agrarian societies, but new ways of thinking emerged as well. How did human beings justify their exploitation of animals, plants, and other humans? How can people possibly justify exploiting other beings—both animal and human—to their benefit? How can they justify attacking others and stealing what is not theirs?

The answer, which I suggested earlier, is religion.

In animist religion, everything is equal. Everything has a spirit, and your and my spirit is considered no more spiritually worthy than the spirit of anything else. When you eat a meal, you thank the spirit of the plant that you are eating, you thank the spirit of the animal that willingly gave itself up in pity for you, to show its compassion for allowing you to survive.

But the new agrarian value system that emerged could not continue thinking like this. Society was no longer egalitarian, and neither could religion be egalitarian. And so was born the idea that a deity existed, and this deity created man in his own image. And because the deity created everything in the world, then when you eat a meal, you do not give thanks to the plants and the animals that you are eating. Instead, you give thanks to this new creation, who was addressed as the Creator.

So now, in the agrarian cultures, the religions that emerged said that the Creator was responsible for all things. And guess what, the Creator created all the animals for the benefit of human beings. And now appeared an idea that had never existed in animism, in that 98% of the existence of Homo sapiens, but now emerged as part of the agrarian mindset.

*** [GET BIBLE QUOTES]

Quote Genesis: “And the Lord God created all the beasts of the fields, and the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and gave humans dominion OVER them”

And then the new religion made itself the opposite in every way to the animist spirituality. One thing that animists usually consider quite sacred is the act of birth. The ability of a woman to draw new life from within herself was considered to be one of the most spiritually significant events of all time. And now the new religion had to deny that spiritual power of women, and did so even if it had to turn logic on its head. And so it said that the first human was created by God, a male god at that. And this male god then created a woman for the benefit of the man, to be “his helpmate” how nice, by bringing a human being to life from the rib of the man.

Wow. Anthropologists have tabulated about 3,800 different religions that are known to have existed in the world. And I have read the creation stories of quite a number of those religions. And let me tell you that this story of the creation of woman from the rib of a man is literally one of the weirdest of all of them.

But central to the creation story in the Book of Genesis is the character of Canaan. He is the son of Ham, who was cursed by Noah for Ham seeing Noah’s nakedness. For this great crime of seeing his father naked, Ham is cursed by his father. But, interestingly, Noah does not curse Ham himself, but Ham’s son Canaan, and all of Canaan’s descendants.

Now why, you might ask, is this story so central to the Book of Genesis? Because the Book of Genesis is a historical justification for the Hebrews to conquer the lands of a people called the Canaanites. What is the great evil that the Canaanites have done, besides the terrible misfortune of having been descended from the unfortunate son of Ham? According to the Book of Deuteronomy, and the Book of Joshua, that were later joined with the Book of Genesis, the great sin of the Canaanites were that they do not worship God.

What did the Canaanites worship? According to the scanty evidence that exists, the Canaanites were animists like almost all other peoples of the world at that time, and also they were worshippers of a female goddess. That is, rather than see the creator of humans as being a male god, they worshipped the idea of the goddess as the first mother. The goddess was so

highly respected that any male who was feminine was considered to be showing evidence of the sacred femininity within himself. The idea of the sacred transgender priest was evident.

I do not have time to go into this more, but if you want to learn about this subject I highly recommend a book by Randy Conner, BLOSSOM OF BONE: RECLAIMING THE SACRED IN HOMOSEXUALITY. (Harper San Francisco)

So, the Hebrews did everything they could to put themselves in contrast to the Canaanites. First, they prohibited anyone from crossdressing in the clothes of the “opposite” sex. Second, They prohibited any man from shaving his beard or plucking it out as the transgender goddess worshipping priests did. Third, they commanded every adult must get married to a person of the opposite sex. They also prohibited any man who was a dwarf or who was deformed from being a priest. And they declared that a man to lie with a man as with a woman, to be an abomination.

By the way, these sacred books also justified slavery in a major way. On page after page of the Book of Joshua in particular, there are detailed instructions by God that the Hebrews should attack such and such place, slaughter everyone, and take their possessions. But, sometimes God tells the Hebrews to keep the children alive so that “they can be your bondsmen forever.” However, on other pages, God changes his mind and tells the victorious Hebrew warriors to kill all the young boys, and only keep the girls as their sexual slaves.

Now, out of all the 3,800 religions that have existed in human history, why in the 21st century, should we even be spending any time at all discussing the beliefs of this particular religion? After all, this was only the religion of one tiny group of people in the eastern Mediterranean. In fact, we really would probably not even know much about this particular religion except for a historical accident that occurred two thousand years later.

Skip forward to the 3rd century of the current era, and I want to mention the most crucial person who changed Western religion more than any other person. That crucial person was, of course, a man named Constantine. Now, Constantine was the most powerful man in the Mediterranean region at the time, in his position as Emperor of Rome. By the historical accident that his mother converted to a religion that was an offshoot of this Hebrew religion,

an offshoot that was so controversial that even the majority of the Hebrews disavowed it, Constantine changed world history when he declared himself a convert to Christianity. If he had not done that, and if his successor emperors had not declared Christianity to be the State religion of the Roman Empire, I doubt that people today would know any more about Christianity than we do about Zoroastrianism or any number of other religions of that era.

What was so crucial about Emperor Constantine was that he was the founder of the Roman Catholic Church. This church sanctified Latin, the language of the Romans, and made Sunday the day of worship, which was the day of the Roman SUN god Apollo. Who was Constantine's personal deity in the Roman pantheon. Constantine established an institution that basically was a continuation of the Roman Empire, and has continued to exert its power in the world right up to the present, with its capital in the city of Rome. With its grand ceremonialism and regal robes that are modeled directly on the Roman Emperor, Pope Benedict today is only the last in a line of ersatz emperors leading directly back to Emperor Constantine. After all, they don't call it the ROMAN Catholic Church for nothing.

Skip forward another four centuries and another offshoot of this same religion makes its mark upon the page with the teachings of Mohammed. Building upon the Hebrew deity, and recognizing Jesus and other Christian traditions, Mohammed built a religion Islam around the idea of submission to the law of God. In fact, the word "Islam" means "submission." Taking everything from the ancient books of Genesis, including the story of God's destruction of Sodom, Mohammed continued the taboos against homosexuality and crossdressing. The fact that the followers of Islam and the followers of Christianity have engaged in over a thousand years of wars, is of no more significance than that the Roman Catholics, the Eastern Orthodox, and the Protestants have engaged in a similar history of wars and conflicts.

PARALLEL EXPANSION OF CHRISTIANITY AND ISLAM

The salient fact that we need to understand today is that all of these religions grew out of an expansionist militaristic past that reaches across history from the Hebrews attacks on the Canaanites to the Christians attacks killing millions of Native Americans, to the Islamic Jihads against Buddhists in South Asia and Southeast Asia. Buddhism began in India, but it is largely absent from India today because of the thousands perhaps millions of Buddhists who were slaughtered by the expansion of Islam. Countless

mosques in India are built on the ruins of Buddhist temples, just as countless Catholic cathedrals in Mexico are built on the ruins of Mayan, Toltec, and Aztec temples. The largest Buddhist temple in the world is the huge pyramid of Borobudur in Java. In the 1970s a Muslim group set explosives on it and destroyed much of it. In the 1990s the Islamic Taliban government of Afghanistan blew up the largest statues of the Buddha in the world. This is not an exception, but is the trend throughout the last several two thousand years of the expansion of the sibling religions of Christianity and Islam.

Flash forward again to the year 1800. If we look back on the bloody history of Homo sapiens during this time, countless kingdoms had been founded by competing gangs of thugs, each using religion to justify their slaughter of their enemies. Great empires had risen and fallen. Instability was the rule. But, in the basic form of the way human beings lived, nothing much really had changed since the agricultural revolution.

The wealthiest man in the world in 1800 was King George III of Great Britain. When he wanted to get around, he had basically no more options than Emperor Constantine had. If he wanted to travel on the water, he had to same basic kind of sailing ship as the Romans had. If he wanted to travel on land, same exact options as Constantine: he could walk, he could be carried by other humans, or he could ride in a carriage pulled by animals. Except for spring-wound clocks, and the ability to shoot someone with a firearm, his great wealth afforded him not much more options in life than what Constantine could do. And Constantine had better medical care than King George did, what with all the purging and bleeding that was done by medical doctors of his time.

HIGH INFANT MORTALITY

The doctors were powerless against the plagues and diseases that ransacked human populations of those times. The global population was less than one billion. Population could not grow because of the huge numbers of babies and young children died before reaching age five. Many of these deaths were the result of diseases jumping species. When humans enslaved animals, and lived in close proximity on a farm, lots of animal germs, not to mention the constant working with the animals' manure which was everywhere, bombarded the human immune system. High infant mortality was the result. I call it "the revenge of the domesticated animals." Of course we see this in our own era, from HIV viruses jumping from monkeys to humans, bird flu, swine flu, etc. etc. The deaths continue and yet no one ever says that maybe

we might just consider what we have done to animals these past 6,000 years to have anything at all to do with current events.

But of course medical doctors at the time had no clue to these realities. Disease was explained as the will of god, rather than the will of microbes, because they did not even know what microbes were. The most famous doctors in Britain in the early 1800s were the quacks who came up with the theory, based on no scientific research at all, that the cause of many diseases was masturbation. From blindness to stunted growth, much of the concern of the 19th century medical establishment was about how to curb masturbation among the young. Even as late as the 1880s a man named Sylvester Graham invented a cracker that he named after himself and sold to parents on the basis that it would remove the desire of their sons and daughters to masturbate. Think about that the next time you eat a Graham Cracker. Another man became extremely wealthy after he started marketing his specially treated flakes of corn as an inhibitor of masturbation. His name was John Kellogg.

AGRARIAN SOCIETIES NEED TO REPRODUCE

Why were people so deeply, deeply concerned about preventing masturbation?

Why were there laws against birth control?

Why were there sodomy laws?

Why were there laws against abortion?

Why were there condemnations of all of these things in the Christian Bible?

Why, there was even a prohibition for a husband and wife to engage in intercourse when the wife was bleeding during menstruation. Why did that simple act rate a label of “abomination” ?

What do all those acts have in common?

Every one of those sexual acts has one thing in common: they are not reproductive.

Why would society at the time so severely condemn such diverse acts, in scripture, in law, and from every bloody pulpit in all levels of society?

Let me suggest that, from the time of the ancient Hebrews to the 19th century, these severe sanctions were in place because they were a violation

of one of the main requirements of an agricultural society: the need to reproduce.

Why do agricultural societies need to reproduce so heavily?

Think about the contrasts with hunter-gatherers. When you live as part of a band of kin, not everyone needs to reproduce. In fact, if there are too many children at any one time, then there is great danger that the adults will not be able to gather and hunt enough food, and everyone will starve to death. Hunting is notoriously unpredictable, and if there is too high a ratio of food consuming children and old people to food producing adults, then the entire band can perish. So, it is actually better for the band if a certain portion of adults do NOT reproduce. When they get old they are taken care of by the young in general, because the band operates as one unit. The adults take care of the children and the elderly as a group. That is how people survive. Band peoples have extremely strong loyalties to the band and they feel a strong need to support everyone equally. A person without children is at no disadvantage.

THE FAMILY REPLACES THE BAND

But once society becomes agricultural, plots of land are divided up. Each family owns their own land, or is assigned land by a landowner and they work the land as a peasant, a serf or a slave. The land is only so big, and the food can only support so many people, so as the kids grow up, they are forced to leave. In agricultural societies this is not a problem, because the chiefdom, kingdom, state, or empire is in constant need of soldiers.

Agricultural societies are in almost constant warfare with their neighbors, as they strive to gain more land. So the young men are siphoned off to become soldiers in the royal army, sailors in the navy or merchant marine, officials in the government, or artisans in the crafts trades.

So, after each generation, people leave, and a large extended family is prevented from arising. The band is replaced by the family.

It is in the context of an agricultural society that “the family” emerges as the basic unit of society. Parents, children, and grandparents are about all that is left of the way most humans have lived as part of a larger band.

This is part of the revolutionary change that happened in the agricultural revolution.

NEED FOR LOTS OF CHILDREN AS LABORERS

But ironically, as family complexity went down, the numbers of children go up. Why do agriculturalists need lots of children. Two reasons:

1. As laborers in the fields. [explain why]

Hunter gatherers tend to be very indulgent with their children. Childhood is seen as a time to learn and to have fun. Their sexuality is not restricted and hunter gatherer children are often involved in sex play from young ages [if a child is upset about something, the way you make them feel better is to rub their genitals. After all, nothing feels better than that]

[. Anthropologist George Devereux in 1920s reported a great object of fun was for the band to get together and cheer on their favorite contestant as Mohave teenage boys engaged in masturbation contests]

Sex is seen positively, both entertaining and deeply spiritual “body with body, and soul with soul” at the same time]

In contrast, agriculturalists tend to be very strict with their children.

They need to emphasize total obedience because child labor is crucial to the economic survival of the nuclear family. My both my grandmother and my grandfather told me how they were forced to work in the fields from age six, and if they did not work hard enough, they were beaten. Beatings and physical punishment are common “spare the rod and spoil the child”

[it was only when I became an adult that my father admitted to me how much he hated whipping me when I did the least infraction, because he felt that it was what a good father should do, and how all his relatives on the farm kept telling him that it was good for me, and especially when they started recognizing that I was a little sissy boy and so it was especially important to “toughen me up to be a real man” I don’t think I ever had such an emotional day in my adult life, as the day that my father apologized to me for all the beatings he gave me when I was a child. I had no choice but to forgive him, because it is what his father did to him, and the only way he knew]

NEED LOTS OF CHILDREN TO PROVIDE CARE IN OLD AGE

2. The second reason agriculturalists need lots of offspring is because as you get old you need someone to take care of you. When there is high infant mortality, you better have lots of offspring so that you can be certain there will be at least one alive by the time you are old. An anthropologist in India in the 1940s did a study of mortality and figured out statistically that if an average parent wanted to have one child alive by the time they were age 60 they would need to have between 5 to 6 children. Then he did a survey of the

local villages and found that the average number of children per family was 5 and a half.

When I was doing my research in Java, interviewing elderly farmers, one phrase kept popping up. When I asked them why they had so many children, they said “your children are your wealth.” In an agricultural society, that is literally true.

In this kind of society, anyone who did not have children was in deep deep trouble when they got old. Such a person would provide for themselves until they could no longer work, and then they simply starved to death. A person without children would be pitied as a social tragedy.

American farm families needed even more children, because they lived in an expansionist society that was continually trying to conquer the Indians and expand across the continent.

In the year 1790 the United States government conducted its first census of the new nation’s population. If you will tabulate the statistics of forty year old women in America in 1790 from this census, you will discover that the average number of children that were listed for them was NINE.

Now, if you consider that each of those women probably had several other offspring who had died before the census was conducted, I think you will see how many times those women were pregnant.

Life for the average adult female in early America involved almost constant cycles of pregnancy and birth. Unlike today, the lifespan for women in 1790 was significantly lower than it was for men, because so many women died in childbirth.

If it was so dangerous to their health, why did women have so many children?

The answer is that reproduction was crucial to the way an agrarian society operates. Women were indoctrinated from early childhood that their natural role was to be constant baby-making machines.

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

But then, in the 19th century, something extraordinary happened. Another sea change in human history occurred, bringing about as an extraordinary change as the agricultural revolution. The 19th century began a new way of

life, and this was the industrial revolution. From the invention of the steam engine to the development of the automobile and the airplane, the method of production and transportation shifted from animal power (though we still measure an engine's strength by calling it "horsepower") and human muscle (usually the forced labor of children and slaves). Even agriculture itself was mechanized, from Eli Whitney's cotton gin, to Cyrus McCormick's reaper. In 1790, over 95% of Americans lived in rural areas. By 1920, over half of Americans lived in urban areas. Today, we are over 95% urban. The percentages are exactly reversed.

Modern Americans live nothing like our ancestors. The change from agricultural to industrial, the second great turning point in human history, was just as drastic as the first great change from hunter-gatherer to agricultural. But the difference is that while it took the agricultural revolution a few thousand years to evolve, the industrial revolution has now spread around the world in less than two centuries. Over half of humanity is now urban. Most of that industrial revolution has impacted the majority of the world within the last eighty years, within one lifetime.

The big problem facing humanity is that most people have continued to look at life as agriculturalists do. Every person alive in the world today knows that the world is changing rapidly. But most people have no context for understanding this change. And so they fear it. They want to fall back on certainties that will give them sure and simple answers to the problems that face them in life. Completely befuddled by ever more rapid changes year after year, they need simple answers. Everything I need to know I can get from one book. Anything that is new and unfamiliar is the product of the devil.

Human beings are ill prepared, emotionally and intellectually, to deal with such drastic change.

THE NEXT BIG CHANGE OCCURRED IN THE 1860s THE SANITATION REVOLUTION

With the discovery of germ theory

New systems of sanitation: sewers, clean drinking water, sanitation in hospitals, etc.

What happened, over the following decades as a result, is a DRASTIC decline in childhood mortality. Suddenly, after thousands of years of rather static population ups and downs, the new sanitation systems plus medical advances meant population started skyrocketing.

last great famine occurred in the Irish potato famine of the 1840 and 1850s.
POPULATION EXPLOSION [SHOW GRAPHS]

Even with the colossal World War of the 1910s, population continued to climb. It took all of human history from ancient times to 1830 for world population to reach one billion. And then in only one century, from 1830 to 1930, the number of people doubled.

But now, what has happened in the last eighty years is a completely astounding event, that the entire previous history of Homo sapiens would never have predicted. In only eighty years, one person's lifetime, human population has mushroomed from two billion to 6.7 billion.

This is completely unprecedented in all of human history.

The population increases 10,000 people every HOUR.

Think about that. EVERY HOUR 24 hours per day, 7 days per week,

COMPUTER – INTERNET REVOLUTION

And now, still another fundamental shift has occurred in human history.

The industrial revolution brought vast changes in production and transportation.

Now we have a communication and knowledge revolution based on the computer and the internet.

This is bringing dizzying change to human interactions, in ways that we are only very dimly beginning to realize. How will people interact when they can connect with someone having shared interests halfway around the world. How will knowledge change when whole libraries from across the world are becoming available online?

So, in the last century, we have been hit with

1. industrial revolution
2. population revolution
3. internet revolution

And how many new inventions are on the horizon, that in five to ten years are going to make our computers today look like the Wright Brothers plane versus a jumbo jet.

How will humanity possibly adapt to these new conditions?

The answer is clear: not very well

To give just one example: how many times do we still hear the Catholic Church today pronounce in most solemn tones that “the only purpose of sex is reproduction” ONLY did they say?

That is an agriculturalist mindset speaking.

They are so imprisoned within that mindset that they cannot see the immorality of their actions when they try to discourage condom use.

Fact:: condoms prevent HIV transmission. Not 100% but well over 90%.

So, why is not the whole world screaming from the rooftops at the ridiculousness of their statements.

Why, when I say in my lectures that the Catholic Church has blood on its hands, in the number of people who have died needlessly, am I told that I am too extreme, too hostile, too unreasonable

One Dean at USC called me on the carpet for “insulting students’ religion”

Why did a journalist in Afghanistan stand convicted of “insulting Islam” when he dared to suggest that women should have unrestricted freedom of movement in that country.

Editorials I wrote at a website were removed two weeks ago because I am “too extreme”

THE REACTION AGAINST THE AGRARIAN MORALITY

The reason for all of this “controversy” is because I am daring to speak out and to say that the old agriculturalist morality is, in the current world, immoral.

For the last half century we have articulated a protest against the old standards. We are part of a century of challenge to the agricultural mindset. This century of protest began with Margaret Sanger, one of the most influential persons of the 20th century. When she went to jail for teaching young women about birth control, she started a movement that eventually led to the repeal of laws that prohibited birth control information being even distributed by medical personnel. And we say we live in a country that values freedom of speech and freedom of thought. What a joke.

Thank goodness Margaret Sanger lived to a ripe old age, long enough to convince the American Medical Association to reverse its position and advocate for birth control.

And then the next change was the challenge on the old ideas about masturbation. Not only did medical research reveal that masturbation did NOT in fact cause any of the diseases that doctors previously said it did, but new medical studies revealed that elderly men who had had regular orgasms in their adolescence were actually much healthier than those who did not have regular orgasms.

Knowing this medical fact, why am I considered extreme when I give lectures to my students saying that parents ought to be regularly encouraging their sons to masturbate. “OK, Johnny, dear, now go and finish your homework, and don’t forget to jack off before you go to sleep. I will be checking your bedsheets tomorrow..”

And then one after another challenge was presented to the old ideas, BAM Margaret Mead in the 1920 revealed in the best selling anthropology book of that era COMING OF AGE IN SAMOA, that young people in some cultures are quite psychologically balanced when they do not have to repress their sexual feelings

BAM Alfred Kinsey in 1947 SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN MALE and 1952 SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN FEMALE.

Showed how very common samesex behavior and other variations are even in a repressed society like 1940s USA.

BAM the birth control pill changes the face of sex for millions of women [it was Margaret Sanger behind that invention]

BAM Hugh Hefner brings the sexual revolution into the open with PLAYBOY

BAM the gay and lesbian rights movement burst on the scene by being birthed here in Los Angeles in 1950.

And BAM BAM BAM the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 60s

And BAM the womens movement in the 1960s and 1970s

And BAM the counterculture and the Vietnam War protests by the late 1960s

BAM the 1973 Roe v. Wade

By 1973, when the American Psychiatric Association voted to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders,

The old agricultural mindset was completely shook up.

The fact is that the 1960s sexual revolution was becoming commonplace by the 1970s. And that was just too much for the agricultural mindset to take.

COUNTER-REVOLUTION 1978 PROTECT THE FAMILY

So in the mid 1970s the counterattack began, and the target was feminism. The battle was over the Equal Rights Amendment, and by 1978 it was clear that the ERA would not be passed. It just died.

Emboldened with this victory, the Right Wing stepped up the attack on two issues:

1. Abortion rights
2. Gay and Lesbian rights
3. Childhood sexuality

These issues were the last holdouts in the battles that had already been lost against masturbation, birth control, and heterosexual liberation. Now, they were determined not to lose on these final two issues.

That is why womens reproductive rights and gay and lesbian rights (which had not yet accepted the rights of transgender people to be free. In fact, a feminist author Janice Raymond wrote a book THE TRANSSEXUAL EMPIRE that viciously attacked trans people.

But this was nothing compared to the sledgehammer that hit the gay community in 1978, with Anita Bryant SAVE OUR CHILDREN campaign..

And ever since then the gay rights movement has been on the defensive. It most specifically went into a rapid retreat on the issue of childhood sexuality. In regrouping and circling the wagons, the gay movement attempted to save its own skin by handing over the whole issue of childhood sexuality to the right wing. Lesbian and gay leaders fell all over each other condemning intergenerational sex, whether consensual or not, by proclaiming loudly "I'm not a pedophile." Despite the determined opposition of Betty Friedan and some other feminist pioneers, after the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment, feminists seemed to turn in on themselves, and a new generation of feminists found it more important to attack pornography, s and m, and the North American ManBoyLove Association NAMBLA than to attack the Right Wing opponents of feminism. A new generation of academic researchers, though initially focused on real and valid cases of horrible child abuse, now jumped on the bandwagon to begin a witchhunt based on flimsy or no evidence at all, now claimed to have discovered a severe epidemic of child sexual abuse, that even though disproved in one sensationalistic court case after another, from the McMartin Preschool case to many others, took the media by storm.

A spike in STDs and especially the rise of herpes infections gave the Right Wing more “I told you so” power.

And in 1980 the absolute political brilliance of Ronald Reagan put this movement together with Cold Warriors and economic conservatives and opposition to feminism to construct a majority victory of the Republican Party. Reagan’s coalition was pure brilliance, for a person to cobble together opposition to sexual liberation with opposition to the Soviet Union (whose leaders were about as far from sexual liberation as it was possible to get) and economic conservatives (what does lowering taxes have to do with opposition to abortion? Somehow Reagan made it all make sense, and for that he deserves a place in political science textbooks.

But that was nothing to what happened in 1981 when a new disease hit gay men.

COUNTER REVOLUTION OF 1980S

Now in the 1980s it was the liberationists who were hit with one shock after another:

BAM Jerry Falwell leads the attack that AIDS is gods curse on homosexuals

(conveniently forgetting to mention the little tidbit of a fact that lesbians had the lowest rates of HIV infection than any other group in the world.

Of course we are not surprised about this today, but at the time people were very surprised that Lesbians had lower HIV infection rates than Catholic priests. But did the American mass media inform people of this little tidbit? Hardly.

BAM Reagan makes a deal with Pope John Paul that the Catholic Church will mobilize workers in John Paul’s native Poland in exchange for the US ceasing all birth control programs and condom distribution all around the world. As a direct result, both birthrates and HIV infection rates start a period of skyrocketing in any part of the world where the Catholic church has a hand in the political pie. Africans are quick to accuse many of genocide, but they flock to kiss the hand of the Pope, even though the Catholic Church is more directly responsible for more deaths in Africa than another other institution of modern times.

BAM Feminist health clinics start being bombed by rapid antiabortionists. Medical doctors who perform abortions are threatened, attacked, or assassinated.

BAM the august justices of the Supreme Court weigh in on the side of moral order and proclaim in 1986, in Bowers v. Hardwick, that “millennia of moral teachings” have proclaimed the moral rightness of sodomy laws.

Well of course those millennia of moral teachings were precisely the time of the dominance of the agricultural mindset, but those legal minds somehow forgot to mention that.

BAM the right wing even wins the war of words. They successfully claimed not only that they were “Saving the Children” (of course no mention of all the little baby dykes and sissy boys who were daily subjected to taunts of faggot and worse),

But also they were “Pro-family”

And the real kicker, that those who wanted to prevent the legalization of womens reproductive rights to control their own bodies, were able to carry off that they were “pro-life.”

So, of course, with that kind of public discourse, it is no surprise that the battlefield was swept with the victories of those who were

Pro-children, pro-family, and pro-life

I mean, who in their right mind would be against children, families, and life itself. He who controls the wording wins the battle.

So, with the defeat of the feminist movement, the gay rights movement, the birth control movement, and the abortion rights movement by the mid 1980s, the war seemed over.

Those gay rights advocates still left standing tried once again to save their skins by becoming as conservative as possible. It was no longer about sexual liberation, but about “gay and lesbian FAMILIES” (as if there were no gay single people), focus shifted to the great revolutionary struggles to “have our rights” to serve in the United States Armed Forces, to be able to get legally married, to have “marriage equality” (that is, to be equal to heterosexual married couples so that both groups of married couples can have special privileges to be subsidized by single people). Now I am not saying we should not try to get rights in those areas, but I am saying that the character of what we were asking for shifted, from sexual liberation in the 1950s and 1960s, to “our equal rights” in the 1980s and 1990s. And we retreated like mad away from anything at all to do with the sexuality of children. Thus, not a word from the gay and lesbian rights movement about lowering the age of consent from the ridiculous age of 18 in California and many other states. I don’t know about you, but I had a whole lot of sex in my life before I turned 18, and I don’t consider myself any the worse for it. Am I the only one who has had that experience? But, what was put in the public discourse about that reality by our leaders? And of course not a word about those thousands of men and some women rotting away in America’s jails at this very moment,

for the “crime” of having willing sex with a young person under a State defined age of consent. No one seemed to raise the issue about the need to question the fact that a person sits in prison for giving a blow job to a seventeen year old boy in California, whereas a another person doing the very same act remains free in New Mexico because there is a different age there.

LESBIAN ACTIVISM

However, just at the moment when things looked the darkest, a generation of gay men rose up in massive revolt at years of runaround and dismissal of their health as one after another sickened and died of AIDS. And you know who motivated them to do that more than anyone else? The people with the least to lose from AIDS, and that was lesbians. When the history of our time is written, historians are going to marvel at why so many lesbians devoted so much of their energy to three movements from which they benefitted so little:

1. Womens reproductive rights. Hello, not too many lesbians needing abortions.
2. Anti-rape programs. Hell, a lot of lesbians I know, if a dude tried to lay a hand on them, they’d smash his face in. And then do a little extraction job between his legs.
3. AIDS. In the 1970s the lesbian movement kept bringing up the issue of health care, and gay men didn’t give it a second thought. That is, until the ones needing healthcare were us. And yet, even after all that time and work, and care and tears that lesbians have devoted to helping gay men get through the horror of AIDS, how many gay men in this room have given time or even donated money to lesbian breast cancer research. More lesbians die from lung cancer than any thing else, and the rate is just about as high with gay men, and yet how many of us take a moment try to educate our younger brothers and sisters about the dangers of smoking chemicalized tobacco.

And so right at the point of greatest defeat, after the hateful and evil Bowers decision, a decision that historians are already treating on a par with the 1857 racist Dred Scott Decision, or the Plessy v. Ferguson decision that legalized segregation or 1903 Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock that legalized the imposition of colonialist controls on Native Americans.

ACT UP

Right at this point ACT UP was born. And out of the frustration and the tiredness, knowing that more silence would in fact equal death, a

groundswell of absolute rage emerged. Activist Larry Kramer spoke for an angry generation when he captivated both our community and the mass media for a change.

By the late 1980s the ground was perculating up with bubbles of gas from deep within the fissures of the suppressed movements of the 1960s

And so, it was not the end of history after all. Many of the smartest activists had given up trying to change politics on the national level, and sensibly began putting their energy and attention on the State and local level.

Especially feminists, who exerted their influence to get ERAs passed on the State level. One by one, the most liberal and populous states started passing State ERA laws. And guess what? Civilization as we know it did not crumble and fall apart as the Moral Majority screamers had claimed.

Likewise, gay and lesbian activists put their time and attention on changing the more liberal states. Many recognized that the conservatives had a lock hold on the heartland, and millions of refugees like me fled Ohio (and have never once gone back there) to refugee to California.

LESBIAN AND GAY RISE IN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

2. the really smart lesbian and gay activists were those who put their energies quietly into ensconsing themselves in the machinery of Democratic Politics. It was by their rising through the ranks within the Democratic Party that did more than anything to activate that party to pay attention to our rights. And we won unprecedented attention when Bill Clinton was elected president. Of course, after his election we learned the limits of party influence when the Republicans called Clinton on his support for gays, and he went running for cover, first in the gays in the military fiasco which gave us the delightful Don't Ask Don't Tell, and then when we really learned how it felt to be the sacrificial lamb when Clinton signed the lovingly-motivated Defense of Marriage Act. What the gay rights movement did to NAMBLA in 1977, Bill Clinton did to the gay rights movement in 1997. Pure karma.

1990S CAPITALISM BECOMES PRO-GAY

The 1990s were marked by two totally unexpected trends.

First, prompted the coming out on the job by millions of lesbians and gay men, now joined in the 1990s by transgender activists, corporate America decided that queers were not such a threat after all. In fact, corporate America responded to this massive coming out by looking for a way to make money off of it. One of the brilliances of American capitalism is that it will try in any way possible to wring a dollar out of any potential market it can. So, in fields as diverse as tourism to real estate, the homophobes learned that

if they hesitated, their less prejudiced competitors would be signing the deal on the dotted line while they were struggling to decide what to do when their Bible was pulling them in one direction while their pocketbook was pulling them in the other.

And of course the movie INDUSTRY and the television COMPANIES were just as money-grubbing as any other part of corporate America, so they were right ready to put on programming as soon as the advertizing commitments were lined up. The result was that, within no time at all Ellen was America's darling, invited into the living rooms of middle America.

The Right Wing kicked and screamed, and so just at the same time as the brave liberal politicians like Bill Clinton were retreating full blast, even going as so far as to lambast US Surgeon General Dr. Joycelynn Elders for saying the simple truth that masturbation can be healthy for kids. She had dared to touch the great taboo subject of youth sexuality, and for that great sin she was fired from her job.

With the TV industry the Right Wing huffed and puffed, and television simply did not care. Because television responds to numbers of viewers, not to political boundaries. The values expressed on television are what American politics would look like if every State were equal in population. But when a State like Wyoming, whose population of 500,000 is smaller than some suburbs of Los Angeles, has the same number of Senators as California, that one fact alone explains why American politics is so provincial. California does not get a fair shake from the US of A.

INTERNET

The second unexpected trend that happened in the 1990s, besides the seismic shift in corporate capitalism to becoming queer friendly, or at least as friendly as the Amway salesman on your front doorstep,

The second great unexpected trend is the most revolutionary invention of our time. And that is the internet. If the invention of the automobile presaged the Interstate Highway System, and the invention of the airplane presaged the airports of every major city, then surely the invention of the computer presaged the internet. One of the decisions of which I am most proud is my 1996 decision to found the INTERNATIONAL GAY AND LESBIAN REVIEW as an entirely online journal. At the time, other professors told me I was crazy and was wasting my time. But now there are scads of online academic journals. And the International Gay and Lesbian Review was the very first, in any field. <http://gaybookreviews.info>

But the internet has revolutionized much more than academia. And nothing is more revolutionized than the area of sex. Have you noticed the debate about pornography lately? No, well neither has anyone else. It is over. With the prominent exception of pornography of youth, that big controversy of the 1970s is as dead as the controversy about interracial dating. That interracial controversy received its death blow when the media happily reported Michael Jackson dating Brooke Shield. Now we know, of course, that white womanhood was in absolutely no danger due to that pairing, but at the time it was a big deal. What was the end of the public discourse on porn? Hard to say, because of the sheer number of naked bodies and body parts being broadcast around the globe once the internet got on the scene.

When any teenager with an internet connection can go online and connect with people anywhere in the world, it is a whole new world from the time when my generation grew up and many of us thought we were the only person in the world to have the attractions that we have. Now, any individual can in a flash find any other individual with not only the general orientation, but the precise turn on that is shared by a select group. To gain evidence of this point, I went onto one of these chatrooms last night. The name gay.com gives a tad of a hint of its general nature. And there is something there, I am not sure of the exact relationship to gay.com but it is called badpuppy.com. Anyway, at gay.com I counted over forty specific chatrooms, including the following: webcam sluts, tall and short, bear and cub, pig in a poke, muscleboys in panties, Black and white men together, Rice and potatoes, beans and potatoes [no it is not a cafeteria] daddy and son, couples for others, small penis, and my personal favorite pissqueens for Jesus.

FURRIES

But gay.com is really conventional in terms of what is out there on the internet. Gay and straight seems really unimaginative, say compared to an entire new sexual orientation that has emerged via the internet. There is a veritable explosion of websites for “furries,” that is, people who get a sexual rush by dressing up in animal costumes. Many of these fantasies are the product of growing up in a culture of Saturday morning cartoon shows. Now, in all truthfulness, I am not quite sure how soon you’re going to find me trolling at one of these sites offering myself as Minnie Mouse looking for Micky, but hey, actually, as an anthropologist, I really should go and do some fieldwork at one of their conventions, they call them “con-FUR-ences”

And all these new trends are growing by leaps and bounds every day. Now if people will get so excited over a picture of someone naked in a little box, imagine what the reaction will be five years from now when a holographic lifesize image will become available.

HOLODECK

Remember in the Star Trek: Next Generation TV series when, to relax, the crew members could create these idealic gardens and historic scenes to provide themselves entertainment. Now, come on, do you really think that is what people will do? First, when this invention initially appears it is going to cost a hell of a lot of money. And what exactly do you think people are going to pay all that money to see? Not idealic gardens and historic scenes, I can tell you that.

I want everyone here to remember that at this time, in 2009, Walter Williams predicted that the internet is bringing us to the beginning of a new era of human history, and this new era is going to be as different from the industrial age, as the industrial age is from the agricultural age, and as the agricultural age is from the age of hunter-gatherers. If we look back at those three momentous revolutions in human history

1. The agricultural revolution
2. The industrial revolution
3. The internet revolution

In terms of its impact on sexuality, the internet revolution has not only ended the debate about pornography, and spawned new identities like Furies, but it is going to have all sorts of other ramifications, that we cannot even begin to predict the outcome. But what I will predict is that the changes coming in terms of sex will make the 1960s sexual revolution look like a Sunday School Picnic.

And, furthermore, I would say that this new sexual revolution cannot come a moment too soon. Why do I say that? For two reasons:

1. Disease: having fun is nice and dandy except for the physical reality that sex is an awfully efficient way for microbes and pathogens to find their little way from one body to another. STDs are the “inconvenient truths” of the sexual revolution.

So, let's say you are a person with HIV, and you are pissed as hell at the ignorant jerk that did not test himself regularly and passed HIV on to you, and you are morally opposed to spreading it to someone else. So, what are your options? You wrap yourself in plastic and head out to the baths, or you go on the internet and you have the time of your life fantasizing riding that cowboy with the big open range, so to speak.

Now, I have a question. Which is the more moral act for you? Pick one:

1. Having cybersex with five hot guys at daddy's little helper.com before falling asleep at your computer screen after your third orgasm got your keyboard all messy?

Or

2. Going to the local Catholic Church, finding a nice young lady who is a virgin, dating her, getting the approval of her parents and the parish priest, having a beautiful wedding ceremony blessed by a whole bevy of priests and nuns, taking her on a romantic honeymoon, consummating your marriage on your wedding night, impregnating her and infecting both her and the resulting infant with HIV? After all, you have to follow the advice of the Catholic church and not use a condom.

And we all know that the only purpose of sex is reproduction.

Which is the moral, and which is the immoral act in this case?

Least you think this is a ridiculous question, let me tell you that a decade ago I met a young woman from El Salvador who was infected with HIV. The way she got infected was from her husband, whom she suspected of being HIV+ because more than one neighbor in their small town had seen him drunk at parties having unprotected sex with several other women. And yet, when she went to confession to ask the priest what to do, he told her that marriage is a sacred institution and it was her moral duty to bear children for her husband. Even if she got infected with HIV, that was morally better than insisting that her husband wear a condom.

Now, what kind of idiocy suggests that this advice is moral?

Let's call it like it is. It is immoral. It is evil.

And any person or institution, no matter what their title or the name of that institution, is a sick and perverted purveyor of evil.

And they dare to claim that they speak for morality?

OVERPOPULATION

But it is not just AIDS that is a factor now. There is another factor, and that factor is overpopulation.

Remember I said that the 19th century made a sanitation revolution that led to a vast increase in human population, from one billion in 1830, to two billion in 1930. That is, in only a century, the number of humans alive doubled. And yet, in the eighty years since 1930, the sanitation revolution has spread around the world. Cities have installed clean water systems, sewer systems, and antiseptic hospitals have cut way down on infections. Childhood immunizations and medical advances have made so much progress that childhood mortality has plummeted. Some diseases, which have plagued human have been completely eradicated. All this is wonderful and amazing.

And yet, this wonderful progress has a down side. And that is that human numbers have increased from two billion in 1930 to 6.7 billion today. That is, within only eighty years, one person's lifetime, human numbers have exploded like crazy. Add to the vast increase in human numbers, and consider that the number of cows and other domesticated (read enslaved) animals has also increased drastically. There are more cows in the world than there are people. And cows are even more damaging to the environment than people are.

At the rate that human numbers are increasing right now, there are 10,000 more people in the world in the world, every HOUR.

Think about that. 10,000 more people every HOUR
24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year.

No species can increase its numbers so rapidly and fail to affect the environment. Every year, many species of wild animals go extinct. The rate of extinctions is now greater than at any time since the Pleistocene.

At the rate we are cutting down the world's forests, to use more wood for our houses and furniture, our front doors and our tables, our yachts and our art, to burn for a fire to be cosy on those cold winter nights, or to clear more acreage to plant more food for the starving masses of the world, or to make more pasturelands for our cows.

What is for lunch today? Every time you eat a hamburger, you are not only killing a cow, an intelligent sentient being, but you are also cutting down a tree. Just how many trees do you think we can keep cutting down, before we affect the very air that we breathe?

So, what is the moral act in the 21st century?

According to the agricultural mindset, the only moral sexual act is reproductive intercourse, and any other sexual act is immoral.

I would suggest that true morality has flipped over the last century, Our species has gone from a position where it made good sense for a moral code to tell people that they should produce lots of children, To the point today when it is the exact opposite.

So, what does this have to do with LGBT rights?

Absolutely nothing, if you just conceive our movement in terms of rights.

We beg for our rights. Please let us have our rights, its only fair.

Fair, smair. Who cares? Shut up and go home, and stop your whining.

That is basically what the majority of California voters said las November, in Prop 8.

Let me suggest today, that our emergence as a significant social force, as an organized part of society, as emerged just in the nick of time that we might be able to help save humanity.

But we cannot do this if the only thing we are asking for is self-interested rights.

What we need is a very strong and clear message that it is only by society not just TOLERATING us, but actually ENCOURAGING us.

And we have to stop aping heterosexuals by all this talk about FAMILIES.

The fact of the matter is that it is “the family” as it emerged in agricultural economies and agricultural value systems, that is the root of all our trouble.

What we need is not to beg for our rights, but a sense of moral outrages, that we must commit not to reproduce, and try to do our best to convince others not to reproduce.

Moral sex is non-reproductive sex, and reproductive sex is immoral.

It is an exact reversal of the moral and immoral positions.

WHAT IS NEEDED IS A NEW ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT

How can we expect people to change their moral ideas so drastically?
It will be hard. But there is one bright precedent that we can learn from history, and that is on the question of slavery.

In the year 1800, everywhere in the world slavery was justified.

Slavery was universally supported.

The Christian churches were in total agreement that God had ordained slavery, and it was blessed by God. Certainly slavery was supported in a lot more Bible verses

But then, in the early 1800s the Quakers and some other religious groups started speaking with moral fervor

William Lloyd Garrison “I will not equivocate, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard”

In all the time of human history, from 1800 to 1865, they won, slavery ended.

They USED Christianity as their ideology, when the Bible often supported slavery. Southern proslavery side quoted the bible, but the abolitionists used Jesus as the model of liberator.

What is needed is moral outrage, that we are right, that we have moral justice on our side, and that it is a moral imperative that we will win

WHY ARE WE IMPORTANT FOR THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD

My analysis is that the agricultural mindset is what has gotten us in trouble.

When the Right Wing says that they are “protecting the family” they are correct. The family form that they are protecting is the reproductive family of parents and children that works because it reproduces itself generation after generation. But now we have to say that the reproductive family is the problem.

Not only do we not want to join them “in equality” but we want to bring moral opprobrium upon them.

When a Mormon with 8 children tells me that I am immoral for having sex outside of marriage, I reply that HE is immoral for adding 8 more children to this overpopulated world.

But the question is, what models for living do WE present, that are morally superior to the reproductive family? I see five models:

1. THE SINGLE PERSON: This first model is what I see a lot of in the gay community, and I do not like it at all. This person has never had much in the way of serious relationships, does casual sex, and as one gets older those fleeting associations fall away, and the person ends up old and alone. I think gays are typical of so many unattached people in our society. These people usually end up isolated and without much to live for. Some people seem OK, but I have seen others who just kind of fall apart.

2. THE MARRIED COUPLE: This type is someone who has built a life together with a partner. This is great. But the problem is what happens when one of them dies. The other often feels such loss that their health rapidly declines and they also soon die.

3. THE UNCLE OR AUNT: This is a person who in their old age immerses themselves totally into their extended family, devoting their retirement years to helping their siblings children or grandchildren. This is the model of the Native Americans, and the same model I saw among Native Polynesians. My favorite high school teacher, Preston Bentley, just withdrew from the gay community and from society in general, and just gave himself over to his nieces and nephews. And they took care of him until his death.

4. THE SHAMAN: The single person without children who commits herself or himself to helping society as a whole, or commits themselves totally into a “band” or institution. Just like the shaman in the hunter-gatherer band who because of not having children can offer greater benefit for the band as a whole. Today, we can place our self as the teacher, the seer, the one who knows, who has the time to think about the well being of society itself because we are not so focused on rearing children. EX. Jim Kepner, founder of the International Gay and Lesbian Archives. He brought in a board of directors, who sometimes fought like cats and dogs, but were all committed to the collection and to making sure that Jim’s needs were met. I sent a letter to my friends, asking each to commit to \$50 a month, dependably, and we supported him until he could get social security. Later I got USC to give him a free place to live. Jim was always busy, doing his writing. Just before a perforated intestine sent him into the hospital, and where he died three days later, he was planning to start teaching classes in gay history. We were committed to him. But we almost did not get into the hospital to see him. Then Flo Fleischman, who had been ordained as an MCC minister back in the 1970s suddenly

announced “I am Reverend Flo Fleischman, I am Jim’s pastor, and this is Dr. Williams, his personal care consultant.” Without exactly lying, I got brought in as a medical consultant. And Jim’s most devoted friend John OBrien, managed to get in as his driver and caretaker. Later, after Jim died, another hospital worker came to me with his clothes and personal effects, and asked, “Are you Mr. Kepner’s relative?” I gritted my teeth, and lied, and said simply “Yes.” There was no one besides me and John and Flo who was there, so what else was she going to do with the clothes? But as I sat there, seeing John—just crushed at the loss of the man he had worked with so many years, and Flo—what a friend she had been to Jim, and me. The more I thought about the question that the hospital worker asked me, was actually not a lie in the least. We were Jim’s relatives, but not in the nuclear family sense. We were a band, and Jim was the shaman. He was our mentor and our teacher. He was the creator of the Archives, and we were members of the band.

5. THE FOSTER PARENT: The person who does become a parent, but does so not by irresponsibly reproducing but by taking in worthy orphans or kids without adequate parenting, and helping them in “families we choose”. These forms can also help ourself. I had a friend named Philip. Not a wealthy man, but he owned a nice house in the Hollywood Hills, and he had saved and invested well. Very comfortably. Then he developed Parkinson’s Disease, and needed round the clock care. Rather than just hire a professional company, he offered jobs to a group of five young gay men from El Salvador. As his condition worsened, and he became completely incapacitated, each one of them took an 8 hour shift, for 4 days a week. He sent them for medic training. Each of them were illegal immigrants, so they were extremely grateful for the job. They took care of him lovingly, and lived there with him. Rather than institutionalizing himself, or putting himself under an impersonal system, Philip created a “family we choose” Every time I went over there the house was a busy place, with three dogs, the workers, their friends who came and went, and Philip. Parkinsons is not a pretty situation to be in, but Philip accepted his body’s frail and then useless condition. He shook uncontrollably, but he could discuss a weighty subject or just laugh at a joke of one of the Salvadorians. Philip encouraged each of them to invest his paycheck wisely. Two of them sent money back to El Salvador, building a house for his mother that he explained would be there for his own retirement one day. Another supported a large extended family, paying the school costs of 2 neices and a nephew, who he had an explicit agreement with that he would support them and in exchange they

would guarantee to take care of him when he got old. The other two invest their money in a small business, so they will have a future after Philip is gone. They all knew that Philip only had a few years to live, but Philip approached his time with a firm determination to live each day to the fullest. He approached his Parkinson's and his death, without the least bit of self pity. Toward the end, when he would try to talk I could hardly understand him, and the boys would wipe his lips which had uncontrolled drooling. Anyone else in his situation would be pathetic, but Philip was not. When the end came, I was asked to speak at his funeral. The Salvadorians showed up at the Episcopal Church he had attended for years, with his box of ashes, their eyes red from constant crying, it was obvious that Philip had been more than just someone for them to take care of. He had successfully created an adoptive family. They were grateful that he had given them a nice place to live, with a generous income and a bonus when he died. What pissed me off is that Philip wanted his house to go to several charities that he had supported over the years, including the Getty Art Museum (Philip was a connoisseur of the arts par excellence), and the Institute for the Study of Human Resources (on whose board I sat, and therefore had a financial interest in), but several distant relatives swooped in from Missouri, who had not bothered to take the time to care for him when he needed it, and the idiotic court system awarded the house to them over the charities. In my case, I had no time to hire an attorney to fight a lengthy court battle, so the relatives won. But at least Philip had had a good life, and his Salvadorian helpmates had had a good life for almost a decade and had secured their own future. When I gave my talk at his funeral I said that Philip is the model of the created adoptive family.

Another example of the adoptive parent is Hong, a Chinese-Indonesian man that I wrote a chapter about in my book *JAVANESE LIVES: WOMEN AND MEN IN MODERN INDONESIAN SOCIETY*

[tell Hong's story of his boys]

He was the happiest old man I have ever met.

6. THE MONASTIC COMMUNITY:

We need to offer society a way for people to live their lives beyond just the two alternatives of single person and reproductive or adoptive family. This alternative is to have an established institution where they can live their lives its whole course, and then the institution cares for them in their old age.

Two years ago I lived on a Buddhist monastery in north Thailand.

Studies done of happiness find that Buddhist monks are often among the happiest people alive. Why is this? One reason is that Buddhist teachings to

live a simple life free them from “affluenza” of attachment to material goods. Each monk has their one simple small room, their few possessions may be their books, music discs, a disc player, a computer, the pictures on their wall, and a few sets of monastic robes.

Another reason is that they have absolutely no insecurity or question that they will be well cared for in their old age. So much of the stress of modern life, especially the single life, is will you have enough money to retire on. Young monks are always there to care for the elderly monks. To me it is so touching to see a young monk helping an elderly monk to walk. What a nice system. What is crucial is that the monastery will definitely be there as a dependable residence, and also that the monastery will have enough resources to provide for the needs of the old AND young monks.

This works well in Thailand because the monks go on daily alms rounds to get their daily food from the community, and because lay believers donate significant amounts of money in their will.

How can this work in America, without that long tradition?

This is what I am now struggling to figure out. Are there ways in which a monastery can become self supporting economically? How can that occur without the making of money taking over the spiritual, educational and social priorities?

What I do know is that society works best when it has figured out a way to provide dependable support for the elderly. This is what we now are called upon to do, more than anything else, and that is to create institutions that can provide childless persons with a way to live that does not just isolate them as singles. What are the alternatives to the reproductive family?

The reproductive family, based on the agricultural mindset, works well because it keeps the family going from one generation to the next. But the problem is that we cannot keep doing this in an overpopulated world.

We cannot find our way until we have a clear understanding of our history, based on that long road from huntergatherer bands, through agricultural families, and up to the internet.

GAY AND LESBIAN RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES:
A DOCUMENTARY HISTORY

by

Walter L. Williams and Yolanda Retter
[by Greenwood Press 2003]

Part I: The Clash of Religions: Indigenous American versus Middle Eastern Religion

Document 1: Navajo sacredness for Nadleeh.

Document 5: Lakota respect for Two-Spirit People: spirituality and generosity

Document 6: The Bible: Sodom and Gomorrah

Document 7: The Bible: The Abominations of Leviticus

Document 8: The Bible: Ruth and Naomi

Document 9: The Bible: David and Jonathan.

Document 10: The Bible: Jesus.

Document 11: The Bible: Paul.

Document 13: Virginia Sodomy Law (1610)

Document 14: The Execution of Richard Cornish in Virginia (1624-25)

Document 20: Pirates in the Caribbean (1724)

Document 21: Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765)

Document 22: Spanish Priests Condemn Transgendered Yuma Indians (1775)

Document 23: Spanish Colonial Suppression of Sodomites in California (1775-1777)

Part II: Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness: The Development of a Homophile

Identity in the United States, 1775-1950

Document 24: United States Declaration of Independence (1776)

Document 25: United States Constitution and Bill of Rights (1791)

Document 26: Bachelor Friendships of the Nineteenth Century

Document 27: National Women's Rights Convention (1852)
Document 28: Walt Whitman and the Homoerotic Poetry of Democracy (1860)
Document 29: Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution (1868)
Document 30: Walt Whitman Democratic Vistas (1870)
Document 31: Females Passing as Men (1894)
Document 32: Anthony Comstock Seeks to Imprison Inverts (1900)
Ulrichs 1865 speech to German Law Association

Magnus Hirschfeld 1897 began the group that evolved into the world's first
sexuality research center Institute for Sexual Research

Document 34: Society for Human Rights (1924) Henry Gerber

Document 35: The Well of Loneliness (1929) Radcliffe Hall ??

Document 36: Sigmund Freud on Homosexuality (1935)

WORLD WAR II AS A WAR OF LIBERATION FOR HOMOSEXUALS

[see COMING OUT UNDER FIRE by Alan Berube

Document 38: Lesbians in the Women's Army Corps (1945)

Document 39: Psychiatrists Oppose Homosexual Rights Laws (1945)

[right after WWII psychiatry went on as much of a rampage against
homosexuality as we are seeing against childhood sexuality today]

Document 40: Vice Versa, America's first lesbian magazine (1947) Lisa Ben
(Edythe Eide)

Document 41: Vice Versa Predictions (1947)

Harry Hay 1948 a party at USC. He was inspired by a man from Chicago he
met while cruising at Pershing Square downtown when he was 15 years old.

As reported by Stuart Timmons book THE TROUBLE WITH HARRY HAY, Harry said that he was not as excited by the sex with the man as much as he was when the man told him about Henry Gerber . This chance meeting put the idea in Harry's mind that homosexuals could become organized, as a social community and a political force. So in 1948 he decided to organize around the campaign for Henry Wallace, progressive FDR former vice president. To oppose Harry Truman in the Democratic primary, "Bachelors for Wallace"

Document 42: Employment of Homosexuals and Other Sex Perverts (1950)

Harry Hay 1948 a party at USC. He was inspired by a man from Chicago he met while cruising at Pershing Square downtown when he was 15 years old.

As reported by Stuart Timmons book THE TROUBLE WITH HARRY HAY, Harry said that he was not as excited by the sex with the man as much as he was when the man told him about Henry Gerber . This chance meeting put the idea in Harry's mind that homosexuals could become organized, as a social community and a political force. So in 1948 he decided to organize around the campaign for Henry Wallace, progressive FDR former vice president. To oppose Harry Truman in the Democratic primary, "Bachelors for Wallace"

PART III: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties: The Making of a Gay and Lesbian Movement

in the United States, 1950-1977

Document 43: Formation of the Mattachine Society (1950)

Document 44: Mattachine Society Meetings (1950)

Document 45: Mattachine Protests Police Entrapment (1952) Dale Jennings

Document 46: Formation of ONE (1952)

Document 47: Jim Kepner's First Mattachine Meeting (1953)

Document 49: Daughters of Bilitis (1955)

Document 50: Founding of ONE Institute of Homophile Studies (1956)

Document 52: Allen Ginsberg and the Beatniks (1956)

Document 54: Evelyn Hooker Psychological Research (1957)

Document 55: Supreme Court Rules ONE is Not Obscene (1958)

Document 46: Formation of ONE (1952) Dorr Legg [he said we need education and research, as a basis for getting our rights]

Don Slater [he said mass media, pushed ONE Magazine]

[my research, my book OVERCOMING HETEROSEXISM AND HOMOPHOBIA: STRATEGIES THAT WORK] you need both.

Jim Kepner, wrote for ONE Magazine and collected books, which later grew to be the ONE Library.]

From the very beginning, there were splits: Harry Hay, Jim Kepner, said we were a particular type of person, an inborn minority fundamentally different in our core being, and therefore organizable as a political group.

VERSUS others Don Slater, Hal Call, Dale Jennings, who said there is no such thing as “a homosexual” but that our sexuality is socially constructed by society.

That basic disagreement has been with us from the beginning, and right up to the present.

In 1953, Hal Call led a group to take control of Mattachine away from Harry Hay.

Hal was afraid that Harry’s communist background would doom the movement.

Hal wanted a much more broad sexual freedom for everyone.

He felt that making pornography widely available and accepted was the way to spread sexual freedom, with same-sex integrated into other-sex. General orgies.

In San Francisco, he organized the Circle J theatre, and he said attract people who are in the closet to come there for sex, and then give them info and education.

Harry Hay withdrew in bitter defeat, and Hal Call moved Mattachine to San Fran.

So, activism in Los Angeles shifted to ONE.

Document 49: Daughters of Bilitis (1955) Del Martin and Phyllis Lyon their book LESBIAN NATION ? extremely influential.

Document 50: Founding of ONE Institute of Homophile Studies (1956)

Jim Kepner, Dorr Legg, USC Professor Merritt Thompson

They also organized ONE INSTITUTE QUARTERLY

[the world's first academic journal in what we now call LGBTQ Studies]

Document 54: UCLA Professor Evelyn Hooker Psychological Research (1957): showed that homosexuals were not mentally ill. She was connected to ONE, and neighbor 47 year old author Christopher Isherwood and his 15 year old boyfriend Don Barchardy, whose lifelong loving relationship became one of the most famous in mid 20th c.

[On a personal note, let me say how fortunate I feel to have moved to LA precisely at the time when I could meet and become a devotee to all these incredible people. Dorr Legg and Jim Kepner became my mentors, but I was also heavily influenced first by Harry Hay (and thought Hal Call was the devil, but then I met Hal Call and he ended up being another important influence on me). On the academic level, I was heavily influenced by Evelyn

Hooker when I taught at UCLA and Judd Marmor when USC hired me. I also took a USC class from USC Professor John Rechy and met Gore Vidal at USC, both of them turned out novels with sexually liberated characters including hustlers, domination fantasies, and transgender revolutionaries.

Document 55: US Supreme Court Rules ONE is Not Obscene (1958)

By 1960, ONE was at the height of its influence: the nation's leading periodical, a pathbreaking academic journal, influence with prominent researchers [Evelyn Hooker went on to chair a national commission that recommended to the Amer. Psychological Assn to stop treating homosexuals as mentally ill. USC Professor Judd Marmor led a faction of the American Psychiatric Assn to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders] Los Angeles was definitely the center of the burgeoning Homophile Movement. Followed by San Francisco, with Mattachine and DOB. But then it all went to hell in the early 1960s, which shows that progress can be stopped by factionalism.

Document 57: A Homosexual Bill of Rights (1961)

Document 58: Jose Sarria Runs for San Francisco City Council (1961)

Document 59: ACLU Begins Gay Rights Cases (1963)

Document 60: Bayard Rustin, Martin Luther King, and the March on Washington (1963)

The first factional explosion occurred in 1961, when Dorr Legg presented a Homosexual Bill of Rights (1961). Based on the US Bill of Rights. Del Martin gave a speech saying it was too radical, and would cause social reaction. Dorr was very imperious personality, and he put her down very firmly. Del charged that he was sexist, and led a walkout by the women. Next, Jim Kepner and Dorr Legg developed personality differences, not really a difference in policy, and Kepner withdrew. Both of them were not the easiest people to work with (in fact, I would say that ALL of the founders were strong individualists. They would not have done what they did, to rebel against social norms, if they had not been like this.)

He left his library at ONE, but he started another collection of books (Jim was a fanatic book collector, if he had \$10 and had to decide would he eat that day or buy a book and go hungry, he would buy the book. He worked as a taxi driver, so he could read when not driving. A gay bathhouse owner gave him a job at front desk during their off hours so Kepner could read and write.) By late 1970s Kepner built this library into the National Gay Archives. He got a major backer to agree to pay the rent each month for him to rent a building on Hudson St. in Hollywood, but right after he moved in the backer died, and left no provision in his will for Jim. So Jim was in desperate straits. That is when I first came to LA and so I got involved to

help raise money for, and that was part of my motivation in founding the Committee on Lesbian and Gay History for the American Historical Assn, to get professional historians to support the archive. In 1984 I was elected president of the archives. June Mazer was vice president, and we changed the name from National Gay Archives, to International Gay and Lesbian Archives.

Dorr determined to continue building ONE Institute as a research center, even without Kepner and Prof Merritt Thompson who died at this time. But the flashy news shifted to San Francisco, where in 1961 drag queen Jose Sarria made history by being the very first openly gay person to run for political office. Jose Sarria Runs for San Francisco City Council (1961). I would classify Jose the most important gay male of the early 1960s, along with another person of color Bayard Rustin, who was the main organizer of the March on Washington (1963).

Though everyone remembers Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech, it was Rustin who made the whole event happen. Just as he was busiest, segregationist Senator Strom Thurmond of SC made a speech in Congress denouncing Rustin as a sexual pervert. A couple of years before, Rustin was arrested by police in Pasadena for having sex with two blond

teenage boys in the back seat of his car. How could Rustin have violated more social taboos in one automobile back seat is hard to imagine: racial, sexual, age, monogamy, all at once. There was no way to deny that, so the civil rights leaders debated what to do and A. Phillip Randolph and Martin Luther King decided NOT to throw Rustin to the wolves, and they defended him as an important leader in the civil rights movement [in so many later cases, we will see the gay movement consistently sacrificing some of its most dedicated people because of their personal sexual radicalism, and the movement NEVER benefits by that strategy].

One other major advance occurred in 1963, when the ACLU Begins to sponsor Gay Rights Cases in the courts. That incredibly important decision was the direct result of quiet lobbying by Dorr Legg and CSUN Professor Vern Bullough. They convinced first the LA chapter, then worked with Hal Call, Dell Martin and Phyllis Lyon to convince the San Francisco chapter, (showing even though they fought like cats and dogs they could still come back again and work together).

One of the proudest moments in my life was when I invited both Harry Hay and Hal Call to meet in my apartment for dinner. They had not spoken in decades, but they ended up having a substantive discussion about the best strategies to accomplish gay rights. Both ended up admitting that the other

had good points, and that in fact BOTH of their differing strategies were needed. I know for certain that the multiprong approach that I recommended in my book OVERCOMING HETEROSEXISM AND HOMOPHOBIA, was a direct result of being the disciple of several of these founders. Each of them was an important mentor for me, and I feel so lucky to have known them.

Document 62: Frank Kameny Resists Job Firing (1964)

Document 65: Lesbian Activism and The Ladder (1966)

Document 66: Barbara Gittings and Frank Kameny Push the Pentagon (1966)

In 1964, Dorr Legg made a huge accomplishment. For years he had searched for a wealthy benefactor to underwrite the work of ONE Institute. His vision of ONE as the leading Think Tank for our movement was a vision that I absorbed from him, and became my motive for what I did in activism. Finally he succeeded, when a man named Reed Erickson appeared at ONE. Reed had built a business into a string of oil wells and was racking in the money. Reed was a female to male transsexual, who wanted to set up a research center for transsexualism. Dorr and Reed agreed to bring the two together, and that was the real beginning of the GLBT movement.

Though this development was very promising for the future, it spelled trouble for ONE. Dorr decided that ONE should shift entirely to being a research center. Don Slater, who had invested years of work into ONE magazine, disagreed with this strongly. Don and Dorr each had their supporters, and the organization was split right down the middle. Each side was so bullheaded that they could not back down, and a crisis was approaching. Don consulted a lawyer, who suggested that he just physically take ONE's property to another location and continue as before. If I could go back and change history, I think I would go and personally strangle that attorney.

Dorr came into ONE's office on a Monday morning in 1965, turned the key, and walked in to find completely bare rooms. Over the weekend Don Slater and his faction had rented a large Mayflower moving van, and had taken all of ONE's library and office records. Dorr and his faction sued in court, and both sides spent all their time, attention, and money on this court suit. It drained both sides. Eventually, the court decided to split the library down the middle, which made about as much sense as if King Solomon had in fact split the baby down the middle and given half to each claimant.

It was a horrid decision. From this point on, ONE was a shadow of its former self. Dorr tried his best to accomplish things, but it was one

frustrating thing after another. His biggest accomplishment was to bring in Jim Kepner, Wayne Dynes, and Vern Bullough and they edited the multivolume ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HOMOSEXUALITY that was published in 1976. This bibliography laid the basis for much subsequent research, including my 1986 book THE SPIRIT AND THE FLESH.

Meanwhile, Don Slater's group took the name HOMOSEXUAL INFORMATION CENTER, and they did some good things like organizing a protest drive against the US Army's policy to discharge homosexuals. That was the first organized resistance to what we are still facing in the Don't Ask Don't Tell idiocy that somehow is still being enforced in the Obama administration.

But in general, HIC was not that active. Don ended up spending most of his time on a new publication TANGENTS and, ironically, trying to organize the library. The end result was that when a researcher like me wanted to do research, I had to travel back and forth between ONE's library and HIC library. Two small libraries are not as good as one large library. For many years the HIC materials were not even available to readers, and they languished in boxes in the basement of Don Slater's house. When Don died in 1997, John O'Brien, Jim Kepner, Joseph Hawkins, Jim Schneider and a

number of other selfless volunteers did incredible work to save it, because Don's long suffering lover Tony Reyes was so sick of having the house filled to the brim with all these boxes that he was ready to throw the whole collection into a dumpster.

In any case, after this 1965 split, Los Angeles lost its leadership of the gay movement. It was bullheaded factionalism, for which I blame both sides. Hardly any new volunteers came in, who in their right mind would want to join an activist group that was spending all its time and energy fighting another faction. In my opinion, what they should have done is to say, "OK, those who want to work on the magazine can do that, and those who want to work on research and education can do that, and then leave each other alone." But over and over in the history of Los Angeles gay activism we see one organization after another flounder over this exact same kind of factionalism. One side is convinced they are right, and they spend their time trying to push the other side out. Seldom do people say, "Hey, let's support each other in doing both." But in fact, the research shows that there is no one correct way to challenge homophobia, a multiprong strategy is more effective.

I cannot tell you how many times I, as a historian who know the history of our community, have seen one faction trying to push another faction out of

the organization, because ignorant people who do not know our history are determined to have their own way. Almost always, the end result is an organization that is left bloodied and weakened, never to recover.

Volunteer organizations are dependent upon attracting volunteers. People do not want to come into a group of people full of seething resentments and personal vendettas. This has been a great problem in our history, especially here in LA.

We should be the center of the movement. This is where the whole thing began. We have the resources, but the main lacking is cooperation and coordination.

And that includes some scholars who should know better, who have themselves contributed to this ongoing factionalism. There have been recent publications who have lambasted Dorr Legg mercilessly. He was by no means perfect, and he did have an imperious personality that alienated some people. But in terms of concrete accomplishments few names can equal the important contributions that he made to gay rights. He does not deserve the slurs that have been leveled against him, and it saddens me greatly when I read such statements.

Don Slater was always nice to me, and I have no personal vendetta against him in the least. But I think what he did in 1965 was a stab in the

heart of activism in LA. One strong united organization is much more powerful than two small ones, especially if they are fighting each other. In my view, ONE's civil war was a tragedy.

What we find is that after 1965, the center of activism shifted to San Francisco. A major uprising occurred among transgender people in San Francisco at this time that marked that shift. There was a similar resistance at the Black Cat bar in 1967 in Silverlake, but once it was over there was not much direct ongoing influence.

Document 68: PRIDE and The Advocate Magazine (1967)

Document 69: Rev Troy Perry Founds the Metropolitan Community Church (1968)

The two major developments at Los Angeles did contribute in the late 1960s was the founding of a major new periodical emerged in the void left by the decline of ONE magazine. This new magazine was called, THE ADVOCATE. The other major institution was a religious group founded by a young Pentacostal minister who was defrocked when he came out as gay. Rev. Troy Perry has probably been the most nationally important Angelino since that time. Rather than retreat into the closet, he said he would start his own church. Los Angeles gave the world the Metropolitan Community

Church, and the whole notion that one can be Christian and gay at the same time. Even though I personally do not agree with this stance, I still admire Troy as a determined activist who has helped thousands of people and is one of the most accomplished leaders of our community.

The power of a single individual to change history can be seen especially in Washington DC in the late 1960s in the person of Dr. Franklin Kameny. He was an astronomer fired from his job with the space administration by the federal government when they found out he was gay. He personally mounted a challenge to the civil service commission that went right up to the US Supreme court. He lost that case, but he did not give up, and singlehandedly is responsible for the change in policy of the federal government. Frank was lucky to attract an equally dedicated and talented activist in Barbara Gittings. She had joined the Daughters of Bilitis, and for a time became editor of its magazine THE LADDER. However, she got tired of continual criticism from other lesbian activists that she was too radical. So she resigned and joined Frank in DC. She told me things that she would not allow me to put into print when I interviewed her for my book GAY AND LESBIAN RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES, because she was such a nice person she did not want to offend people.

Barbara, Frank and I all were inspired by the civil rights movement, and we did not feel that sitdown strikes or protest marches were “too radical.” That is the way social change occurs, by confrontation and challenge. I feel incredibly lucky to have worked with both of them. Barbara died last year, and Frank is still carrying on his activism in DC. There ought to be a stream of people at his door every day, just going there to tell him thank you for all the things that he and Barbara were able to do.

Now, the point I hope you have gotten by now is that ALL of this happened BEFORE 1969. I am considering joining the National Rifle Association just for the single purpose of packing a pistol so that I can use it if I EVER hear some activist making a speech saying that the gay rights movement began at Stonewall.

BAM. No, it began here, in Los Angeles, with everyday folks like secretary Lisa Ben and landscape architect Dorr Legg, screenwriter Dale Jennings and bill collector Flo Fleischman. And then it spread across the nation by the work of incredible people like librarian Barbara Gittings. Not one of them had any training as an activist at all, yet each one of them changed history.

Now, I am not in any way trying to deny the importance of the Stonewall Riots in New York City (1969). But instead of seeing it as a

beginning I see it as the culmination of two decades of activism and research. As one who has been both an activist and a researcher, I do not see any contradiction in the least.

Document 72: Stonewall Riots in New York City (1969)

Document 73: Gay Liberation Front and Gay Activist Alliance (1970)

Document 77: NOW Endorses Lesbian Rights (1971)

Document 82: National Gay Task Force Founded (1973)

Document 83: Lambda Legal Defense Fund (1973)

Document 84: Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (1973)

Document 85: American Psychiatric Association Vote (1974)

Document 86: Lesbian Child Custody Rights (1974)

Document 87: Lesbians as the Vanguard of Feminism (1975)

Document 88: Municipal Elections Committee in Los Angeles (1976)

What Stonewall did accomplish, though, was not just a riot, but a riot of publicity that hit the newspapers about gay rights as never before. And also a riot of organizing, especially Gay Liberation Front and Gay Activist Alliance (1970). The early 1970s was a golden age of progress. One of the most important developments was due to lesbian organizing within the women's movement. Some in the National Organization for Women wanted to throw lesbians out, as too controversial, but the womens movement made

a historic decision in 1971 not to go that route, when NOW Endorses Lesbian Rights (1971). In 1973, Barbara Gittings, Frank Kameny, and other activists founded the National Gay Task Force, followed by Lambda Legal Defense Fund (1973), Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays (1973), USC Professor Judd Marmor ran for the president of the American Psychiatric Association, with a platform to remove homosexuality from its list of mental disorders. Again, the team of Gittings and Kameny went to work, along with young activists like Don Kilhefner and Morris Kight, to influence the campaign. When the APA Voted (1974) it was a major accomplishment of our history.

By the mid 1970s the movement was on a role. The ACLU and Lambda Legal started winning landmark court cases, including important issues like lesbian Child Custody Rights (1974). Lesbians were coming to the fore as the Vanguard of Feminism (1975). The founding of the Municipal Elections Committee in Los Angeles (1976) represented a quantum move into electoral politics. Activists in San Francisco were becoming prominent in the city Democratic Party machine. Activist Harvey Milk started pushing the envelope still further, with his runs for Supervisor. Each time he lost, but he won a larger percentage. And he did not give up. When he ran for the fourth time he won, and headlines were made.

Not only were these changes on an institutional level, but affecting the broad base of society. The long hair radicalism of the 1960s was now the style of choice for suburban teenagers. American youth were indeed “making love, not war.” And that included gay love. There was a lot of sex. Wild sex, public sex, orgies, celebrating the end of American Puritanism. Disco, the music that emerged out of the gay clubs, was taking the music scene by storm. I remember thinking at the time that American society was moving in exactly the same trajectory that I was moving in my personal life. I was never so happy.

And then, this whole era of progress came crashing to a halt. The crucial defeat, that we did not at the time even realize yet that it was a defeat, was the failure to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. It looked like it was going to happen. Only a couple more state legislatures needed to pass it. But then conservative forces stepped in and prevented it. And also not noticed was a groundswell of resistance that was building in Catholic and fundamentalist Christian groups, to women’s reproductive rights, in reaction to the 1974 US Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*.

We should have been prepared but we weren’t for the freight train that popped up in Miami and was barreling directly toward the heart of all that had been accomplished in the last thirty years. And it came upon the scene,

tellingly, with the slogan SAVE OUR CHILDREN. It was the organization of conservative Christians led by Anita Bryant. Though she attacked progressive causes across the board, from the ERA, abortion, to everything else, it was the specter of gay rights that was central to this movement. It was literally a Backlash.

After her big success in Florida, in persuading voters to repeal Miami's gay rights ordinance, Anita Bryant came to California in 1978 to help Senator John Briggs to get a statewide initiative passed to fire any teacher found to be lesbian or gay. California's experienced activists jumped into battle, and Harvey Milk took leadership to debate Briggs on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (1978). His strong stand is what inspired me to become activist. At that time I was a professor at the University of Cincinnati, and I joined the Greater Cincinnati Gay Coalition, and before I knew it I was head of the organization. Harvey Milk had called for a National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights. The list of demands was almost exactly the list that Dorr Legg had called for in 1961 with his Homosexual Bill of Rights, but that others had said was too radical. I organized a bus to carry people and we had over a hundred show up from Cincinnati. We were all extremely inspired by the march, my

boyfriend came out to his parents right after coming home from the march with me. Their sole reply “Well, we thought so.”

But, the energy of that march was not enough to stop the building fundamentalist juggernaut that was being constructed by Rev. Jerry Falwell against “feminists and gays”

PART IV: Backlash: The Reaction to Gay and Lesbian Progress in the United States,

1977-1987

Document 89: Anita Bryant Defeats Miami Gay Rights Ordinance (1977)

Document 92: Harvey Milk on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (1978)

Document 95: March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights (1979)

In the presidential election of 1980 Ronald Reagan made one of the most brilliant political alliances of US history when he brought in fundamentalist Christians, as the third leg of his previous alliance between cold warriors and economic

Document 101: AIDS Strikes Gay Men (1981)

Document 102: Jerry Falwell Fundraising Letter (1981)

Document 103: Pope John Paul II on Controlling the Body (1981)

Document 111: Armistead Maupin’s Design for Living (1985)

Document 113: Bowers v. Hardwick Sodomy Law Case (1986)

PART VI: Queer America: The Acceptance of Sexual and Gender Diversity

in

the United States, 1987-2000

Document 118: ACT UP (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power) (1987)

Document 119: National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights
(1987)

Document 123: National Coming Out Day (1988)

Document 125: Jewish Rabbi Acceptance of Gay and Lesbian Rights (1989)

Document 126: Queer Nation (1990)

Document 131: Colorado Amendment Two (1992)

Document 132: Oregon Measure 9 (1992)

Document 133: Lesbian Appointed to Federal Government (1993)

Document 134: Lesbians and Gay Men in the Military (1993)

Document 136: Barry Goldwater on Gays in the Military (1993)

Document 137: Hawai'i Same-Sex Marriage Court Case (1993)

Document 134: Lesbians and Gay Men in the Military (1993)

Document 136: Barry Goldwater on Gays in the Military (1993)

Document 137: Hawai'i Same-Sex Marriage Court Case (1993)

Document 138: March on Washington (1993)

In 1993 the United Nations Economic and Social Council admitted the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA) as a NGO. However, when conservative Republican Senator Jesse Helms heard about this, he attacked ILGA because one of its participants was NAMBLA. Following this attack, ILGA responded by expelling NAMBLA. When three other gay groups objected strongly, ILGA responded by expelling three other organizations which objected to this approach. ILGA has applied several times to the United Nations to be reinstated, but each time they have been turned down. [so, in other words, sacrificing the most controversial group is no guarantee of any success.

Walter Williams establishes the INTERNATIONAL GAY AND LESBIAN REVIEW 1996 <http://gaybookreviews.info>

Document 152: Defense of Marriage Act (1996)

Document 153: Galluccio-Holden Adoption Lawsuit (1997)

Document 154: Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (1997)

Document 155: Internet Publication for Gay and Lesbian Rights (1997)

Document 156: Intersex Society of North America (1997)

Document 157: Transgender Liberation (1998)

Document 158: Southern Baptist Convention Condemns Homosexuality (1998)

Document 160: Hawai'i Voters Reject Same-Sex Marriage (1998)

Document 164: Cyberactivism (1999)

Document 166: Overturning State Sodomy Laws (1999)

Document 168: Boy Scouts of America v. Dale (2000)

Document 169: Transgender Rights and the ACLU (2000)

Document 170: Laura Schlessinger Radio Show (2000)

Document 171: Suicide of a Gay Mormon (2000)

Document 173: Millennium March on Washington (2000)

Lawrence v. Texas 2003

Legalization of Marriage: Massachusetts, Canada, Europe, South Africa
CT., BVermont, Maine, NH, NJ?

California Supreme Court ruled but overturned by Prop8