Women's Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism

Verta Taylor and Leila J. Rupp

THE RISE OF cultural feminism within the U.S. women's movement, according to the current feminist orthodoxy, spelled the death of radical feminism. Because cultural feminism is based on an esssentialist view of the differences between women and men and advocates separatism and institution building, it has, say its critics, led feminists to retreat from politics to "life-style." Alice Echols, the most prominent critic of cultural feminism, credits Redstockings member Brooke Williams with introducing the term *cultural feminism* in 1975 to describe the depoliticization of radical feminism (Echols 1989, 301). "Cultural feminism is the belief that women will be freed via an alternate women's culture. It . . . has developed at the expense of feminism, even though it calls itself 'radical feminist' " (Williams 1975, 79).[1] Since 1975, denunciations of cultural feminism have become commonplace. From all sides—from socialist feminists, black feminists, postmodern feminists, and especially from radical feminists who reject cultural feminism as a betrayal of their early ideas—come charges that cultural feminism represents the deradicalization and demobilization of the wo-

We are full coauthors and have listed our names in reverse alphabetical order. We would like to thank Phyllis Gorman and Kelly McCormick for helpful discussions of current developments in the Columbus lesbian community; Nancy Whittier, whose contributions to this article are legion; Myra Marx Ferree, Mary Margaret Fonow, Roberta Ash Garner, Susan M. Hartmann, Joan Huber, Carol Mueller, Laurel Richardson, Barbara Ryan, and Beth Schneider, whose comments on earlier drafts were extremely helpful; the participants in the conference "New Theoretical Directions in the Study of the Women's Movement," Aarhus, Denmark, October 28–November 1, 1990, for fruitful discussions of this research; the anonymous reviewers for *Signs,* whose comments helped us immeasurably in the long process of revision; and Kate Tyler for her perceptive editorial work.

[1] Redstockings was a radical feminist action group founded in New York City in 1969. On cultural feminism versus radical feminism, see also Echols 1983a, 1983b, 1984.

[*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1993, vol. 19, no. 1]
 0097-9740/94/1901-0001$01.00

men's movement.[2] In Echols's words, "radical feminism was a political movement dedicated to eliminating the sex-class system, whereas cultural feminism was a countercultural movement aimed at reversing the cultural valuation of the male and the devaluation of the female" (1989, 6).

Implicit in most discussions of cultural feminism is the centrality of lesbianism to the process of depoliticization. The critique of cultural feminism sometimes is a disguised—and within the women's movement more acceptable—attack on lesbian feminism. By *lesbian feminism,* we mean a variety of beliefs and practices based on the core assumption that a connection exists between an erotic and/or emotional commitment to women and political resistance to patriarchal domination. Cultural feminism's three greatest "sins"—essentialism, separatism, and an emphasis on building an alternative culture—are strongly associated with the lesbian feminist communities that grew up in U.S. cities and towns in the 1970s and 1980s. Williams, herself lesbian, identified the development of cultural feminism with the growth of lesbianism; later critics have strengthened this association. Echols sees cultural feminism as growing out of lesbian feminism but modifying it, "so that male values rather than men were vilified and female bonding rather than lesbianism was valorized" (1989, 244). In the context of the 1980s "sex wars"—the struggle over sexual expressiveness and regulation between, on one side, feminists who emphasized the dangers of sexuality and the need to fight pornography as a form of violence against women and, on the other side, those who stressed its pleasures—cultural feminism came to stand for an "antisex" variety of lesbian feminism.[3] Although lesbian voices are among

[2] For a critique of total separatism from a socialist feminist perspective, see Jaggar 1983; for a black feminist critique of the race and class bias of cultural feminism, see hooks 1984; for postmodern critiques, see Alcoff 1988—juxtaposing the cultural feminist and poststructuralist answers to the problem of defining the category of women—and Young 1990—rejecting the ideal of "community" as unable to encompass difference. For attacks on cultural feminism as a betrayal of radical feminism, from a radical feminist perspective, see Atkinson 1984; Willis 1984; and Ringelheim 1985. Other commentaries on cultural feminism can be found in Eisenstein 1983 (she does not use the term *cultural feminism* but warns of reactionary tendencies in what she calls "the new essentialism" [xvii]); Donovan 1985 (she traces cultural feminism to its nineteenth-century roots); and Buechler 1990 (he identifies cultural feminism as a variant of radical feminism).

[3] The "sex wars" became a national issue after the 1982 "Scholar and the Feminist IX" conference at Barnard College, New York City. The conference, which focused on women's sexual autonomy, choice, and pleasure, included speakers who advocated sadomasochism, sexual role-playing, and pornography, provoking an attack by Women against Pornography, Women against Violence against Women, and New York Radical Feminists. See the discussion and bibliography in Vance 1984, 441–53; and see Segal and McIntosh 1993. The two major feminist anthologies associated with the "pro-sex" position (Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson 1983; Vance 1984) both included essays by Alice Echols in which she looked critically at the development of cultural feminism; see Echols 1983b, 1984. See also Echols 1991.

those raised in condemnation of cultural feminism, the boundary in common usage between cultural feminism and lesbian feminism is highly permeable, if it exists at all.

Our goal here is to reposition what has been called "cultural feminism" as one tendency within dynamic and contested contemporary U.S. lesbian feminist communities. By shifting our focus from the ideology of cultural feminism to concrete social movement communities, we make explicit the central role of lesbians in what is often euphemistically called the "women's community" and we emphasize that a movement's culture is more than a formal ideological position.[4] To understand the culture of any group requires attention to the contexts in which it is produced, so we turn our gaze to the communities that give birth to "women's culture."

Lesbian feminist communities in the United States are made up of women with diverse views and experiences. They encompass "cultural feminists"—significantly, this is not a label that any women, as far as we know, apply to themselves—and their critics, as well as "antisex" and "pro-sex" feminists and separatists and antiseparatists. In contrast to critics who view lesbian feminist communities as embodying the evils of cultural feminism, we see the debate over essentialism, separatism, sexuality, and so on taking place within these communities. As Jan Clausen has pointed out, even critics of the racism and Eurocentrism of "the women's community" remain identified with it (1992, 9).

Our intent is not to defend the ideological position that has been described as "cultural feminism" but to change the terms of the debate by focusing on the consequences for feminist activism of lesbian feminist culture and communities. We identify four elements of lesbian feminist culture that promote survival of the women's movement during periods of waning activity: female values, separatism, the primacy of women's relationships, and feminist ritual. The culture of lesbian feminist communities both serves as a base of mobilization for women involved in a wide range of protest activities aimed at political and institutional change and provides continuity from earlier stages of the women's movement to the future flowering of feminism. Rather than depoliticizing the radical feminist attack on the multiple roots of women's oppression, lesbian feminist communities preserve that impulse.

Our argument is shaped by historical analyses of women's culture and by theories of social movement continuity. From a historical perspective, Echols's and others' indictment of cultural feminism is curious, given that women's culture and intimate bonds between women have generally

[4] Our thinking on movement culture is influenced by Rick Fantasia's study of emergent cultures of resistance within the labor movement (1988).

played a benevolent role in the development of the women's movement.[5] As Estelle Freedman explains in her classic article "Separatism as Strategy," the decline of the U.S. women's movement in the 1920s can be partly attributed to the devaluation of women's culture and the decline of separate women's institutions (1979). And Blanche Cook argues persuasively that female networks of love and support were vital to women's political activism in the early twentieth century (1977). Although no monolithic women's culture has developed across lines of race, class, and ethnicity, women involved in a wide array of collective action—from food riots in immigrant neighborhoods, to labor strikes, to protests against the lynching of African-American men, to suffrage demonstrations—have shaped oppositional cultures that sustained their struggles.[6] These women were motivated by what Nancy Cott has distinguished as three forms of consciousness: feminist consciousness, female consciousness, and communal consciousness (1989).[7] The lesbian feminist culture we explore here is such an oppositional culture.

Recent work on social movements by sociologists also points to a positive relationship between the culture of lesbian feminist communities and the persistence of feminist activism. Focusing on the sixties, scholars have documented the role that preexisting organizations and activist networks from earlier rounds of protest played in the emergence of all of the so-called new social movements such as the civil rights, student, and gay

[5] The basic positions on the nature of women's culture and its relationship to feminism are clearly stated in an exchange between Ellen DuBois and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg (DuBois et al. 1980). DuBois defines women's culture as "the broad-based commonality of values, institutions, relationships, and methods of communication, focused on domesticity and morality and particular to late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women" (29). For her, women's culture and feminism stand in a dialectical relationship. In contrast, Smith-Rosenberg questions the use of the term *women's culture* to describe the acceptance of mainstream cultural values and insists that a culture must have "its own autonomous values, identities, symbolic systems, and modes of communication" (58). Eschewing the word *culture,* she argues that feminism cannot develop outside a "female world" in which women create rituals and networks, form primary ties with other women, and develop their own worldview (61).

[6] Scholars of African-American and working-class women, in particular, have rejected the notion of a universal women's culture. But their evidence suggests that various groups of women—enslaved African-American women, mill workers, and working-class housewives—did create "women's cultures," albeit multiple ones that often supported men of their groups. See Hewitt 1985. See Pascoe 1990 for a recent work that attacks the idea that there is a women's culture based on women's values.

[7] Feminist consciousness involves a critique of male supremacy, the will to change it, and the belief that change is possible. (Cott 1989 draws on Gordon 1986, 29, in defining feminist consciousness.) Female consciousness, which Cott bases on Kaplan's (1982) exploration of working-class food protests and strikes, is rooted in women's acceptance of the division of labor by sex. Communal consciousness is based on solidarity with men of the same group. Feminist consciousness is necessarily oppositional, while female and communal consciousness can support the status quo or can lead women to engage in a variety of kinds of protest.

rights movements.[8] These studies illuminate the importance of studying movements in differing stages of mobilization and in various organizational forms. To conceptualize periods of the U.S. women's movement that previously have been overlooked, we draw on the concept of "abeyance stages" in social movements (Taylor 1989b). The term *abeyance* depicts a holding process by which activists sustain protest in a hostile political climate and provide continuity from one stage of mobilization to another. Abeyance functions through organizations that allow members to build their lives around political activity. Such groups ensure the survival of a visionary core of the movement, develop a strategy or project for realizing the movement's vision, and allow activists to claim an identity that opposes the dominant order. We see lesbian feminist communities as fulfilling this function for the radical branch of the women's movement in the 1980s and early 1990s.

The argument we develop here is based on preliminary research for a larger study of lesbian feminist communities and on our own extensive participation in the Columbus, Ohio, lesbian feminist community. Although we use published movement writings, formal and informal interviews with members of various communities, and participant observation in Columbus and at national events, we see this article as less an empirical study than a conceptual piece.[9] Our perspective is, of course, shaped by our identities as white, middle-class, academic lesbians immersed in the issues we discuss. But we try to use our experience to reproduce for nonparticipants the flavor of involvement in a lesbian feminist community. Much of what we report will be familiar to other participants, even those from quite different communities. Columbus is a noncoastal but urban community where developments in New York, Washington, D.C., Boston, San Francisco, and Los Angeles are played out later and on a

[8] For a discussion of "new social movements," see Klandermans and Tarrow 1988. On the civil rights movement, see Morris 1984; McAdam 1988. On the New Left, see Gittlin 1987; Isserman 1987; Whalen and Flacks 1987; and Hayden 1988. On the gay rights movement, see D'Emilio 1983.

[9] Written sources include books, periodicals, and narratives by community members, and newsletters, position papers, and other documents from lesbian feminist organizations. We also have made use of twenty-one in-depth, open-ended interviews with informants from Provincetown, Boston, and the rural Berkshire region of western Massachusetts; Portland, Maine; Washington, D.C.; New York City; St. Petersburg, Fla.; Columbus, Yellow Springs, Cleveland, and Cincinnati, Ohio; Minneapolis; Chicago; Denver; and Atlanta, conducted between 1987 and 1989, mostly by Nancy E. Whittier (1988) but also by Verta Taylor (Taylor and Whittier 1992). In addition, we have both been a part of the lesbian feminist community in Columbus since the late 1970s, have attended national events such as conferences, cultural events, and marches in Washington, D.C., and have over the past fifteen years interviewed informally lesbian feminists in a variety of communities across the country. All of these interviews were conducted with the understanding that quotations would not be attributed to named individuals.

smaller scale. In that sense, Columbus both reflects national trends and typifies smaller communities that have been less studied by feminist scholars.[10]

Lesbian feminist communities: A movement in abeyance

The late 1960s and early 1970s brought the full flowering of both the liberal and radical branches of the women's movement. Radical feminism—which is what concerns us here—emerged as women within the civil rights movement and the New Left (the antiwar and student movements) began to apply a leftist analysis to their own situation as women. In contrast to "politicos" who thought that a socialist revolution would automatically liberate women, radical feminists blamed both capitalism and male supremacy for women's oppression and conceptualized women as a "sex class." With its use of consciousness-raising and dramatic "zap actions" designed to expose sexist practices, radical feminism had a profound effect on both leftist politicos and liberal feminists. But increasingly the concept of a sex class foundered on differences of race, class, and sexuality among women (Spelman 1988; Gordon 1991).

No issue proved more volatile than sexuality. The surfacing of the "lesbian question" in both the liberal and radical branches of the women's movement resulted in part from the gay/lesbian liberation movement emerging in the late sixties and paved the way for the emergence of lesbian feminist groups such as Radicalesbians in 1970 and The Furies in 1971. As more women came out as lesbians within the radical branch of the women's movement, radical feminism and lesbian feminism became conflated. Small groups that were motivated by the radical feminist vision and composed primarily of lesbians sprang up in a variety of locations, including, by the 1980s, smaller communities, especially those with major colleges and universities.

Since the 1970s, feminists who view fundamental change as necessary to the eradication of male domination have faced an increasingly unfriendly social milieu. The civil rights movement and New Left, which gave birth to the radical branch of the women's movement, began to ebb in the 1970s, while the gay liberation movement was, like the other sixties movements, more congenial for men than for women. As liberal feminism became more institutionalized, explicit antifeminism emerged

[10] Columbus is the largest city in Ohio, the state capital, and the home of the largest university campus in the country, Ohio State University. The lesbian feminist community is overwhelmingly, although not exclusively, white and middle class, with a large proportion of students and professionals. Most scholarship on the women's movement focuses on developments in large cities. See, e.g., Freeman 1975; Cassell 1977; Wolf 1979; Echols 1989; Staggenborg 1991; Ryan 1992. A notable exception is Krieger 1983.

in the late 1970s as a major foundation of the ultraconservative New Right; the election of President Ronald Reagan reflected the influence of that countermovement. The early 1980s saw the failure of the Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and increasing challenges to reproductive freedom. That, and complacency among some young women who saw no further need for feminism, prompted the media gleefully to proclaim the death of feminism.[11] The heyday of the contemporary women's movement gave way, by the early 1980s, to a period of abeyance. Most recently, the media-fanned attack by conservatives on "political correctness" and multiculturalism has targeted radical feminism. Given all this, what critics of cultural feminism have portrayed as deradicalization can be viewed instead as survival in a climate of backlash and declining opportunities.[12]

Since 1980, the women's rights branch of the women's movement, forming policy networks at the national and local levels, has gained influence in such traditional arenas as electoral politics, academic institutions, and the professions (Boles 1991). At the same time, the alternative institutions founded by early radical feminists—including rape crisis centers, battered women's shelters, bookstores, newspapers, publishing and recording companies, recovery groups, support groups concerned with health and identity issues, spirituality groups, restaurants and coffeehouses, and other women-owned businesses—have increasingly come to be driven by the commitment of lesbians and women in the process of coming out. Women find in this world a social context supportive of lesbian relationships and identity that was unavailable in early feminist organizations or in the predominantly male gay liberation movement. This is not to say that feminist counterinstitutions are solely the preserve of lesbians. The commonly used term *women's community* emphasizes access for all women even if feminist institutions fail to include women of every race, class, and sexual identity. Nevertheless, the base of mobilization of the "women's community" stems primarily from interpersonal networks and organizational ties in the lesbian world.[13]

[11] See, e.g., Bolotin 1982; Friedan 1985; Davis 1989; Ebeling 1990.

[12] On the institutionalization of liberal feminism, see Gelb and Palley 1982; Mueller 1987; Buechler 1990; Katzenstein 1990; Schlozman 1990; Davis 1991. On the climate of antifeminism, see Luker 1984; Ferree and Hess 1985; Mansbridge 1986; Chafetz and Dworkin 1987; Taylor 1989a; Matthews and De Hart 1990; Faludi 1991. For examples of the attack on "political correctness," see Charon 1992, which focuses on what she calls "rad-fems"; D'Souza 1991; and Taylor 1991. On the radical branch, see Hole and Levine 1971; Freeman 1975; Evans 1979; Ferree and Hess 1985; Echols 1989; Ryan 1989; Buechler 1990; Castro 1990; Davis 1991; Taylor and Whittier 1993.

[13] The concept of "social movement community" comes from Buechler 1990; literature documenting the nature of lesbian feminist communities includes Barnhart 1975; Ponse 1978; Lewis 1979; Wolf 1979; Krieger 1983; Lockard 1986; Phelan 1989; Cavin 1990; Esterberg 1990; Zimmerman 1990; Penelope 1992.

The history of the Columbus community illustrates developments at the national level and provides a model of the kinds of institutions, organizations, and events that undergird the lesbian feminist community.[14] The radical branch of the women's movement in Columbus emerged in 1970 out of Women's Liberation at Ohio State University, made up of women from the civil rights and New Left movements. This group fought for changes on campus, including the establishment of a women's studies program. In 1971, it sponsored a consciousness-raising group that gave birth to the Women's Action Collective, an off-campus umbrella organization that became the heart of the women's community. The collective sheltered a variety of groups, including Women Against Rape, the Women's Co-op Garage, Lesbian Peer Support, Single Mothers' Support Group, *Womansong* newspaper, and Fan the Flames Feminist Book Collective. A large proportion of early Women's Action Collective members were lesbian; more members came out throughout the 1970s until the collective was almost entirely lesbian. Outside the Women's Action Collective, women in Columbus formed Central Ohio Lesbians; the Women's Music Union, which produced feminist concerts; and Feminists in Self-Defense Training, which grew in part out of the self-defense workshops sponsored by Women Against Rape. Heterosexual women found the local chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW) a haven for radical feminist activity; in what became a local cause célèbre, five NOW members were arrested in 1979 for spray-painting antirape slogans on a freeway sound barrier covered with misogynist graffiti.

By the late 1970s, Women Against Rape had come to dominate the Women's Action Collective, largely as a result of a major grant from the National Institute for Mental Health for a community rape prevention project. This grant, which paid indirect costs to the collective, funded a paid staff and the rental of a house in the university area for offices, meeting rooms, and a bookstore. As Women Against Rape expanded its operations and grew in size, a number of other original collective groups dissolved. At the same time, the late seventies and early eighties witnessed the start of a variety of short-lived feminist organizations and two enduring ones, the Child Assault Prevention project (spawned by Women Against Rape) and Women's Outreach to Women, a twelve-step recovery group. But in the increasingly antifeminist climate of the early 1980s, both members and funds began to disappear. The end of the grant that

[14] This discussion is heavily indebted to Whittier 1991. In addition, we draw on other unpublished research on Columbus, including Haller 1984; Matteson 1989; Dill 1991; Wilkey 1991; Gorman 1992; McCormick 1992. Finally, our account is shaped by our own involvement, since both of us were peripheral members of the Women's Action Collective and have attended meetings, marches, demonstrations, concerts, and community conferences for the past fifteen years.

had catapulted Women Against Rape to local (and national) prominence had dire effects on the entire community. When the Women's Action Collective found itself devoting more time to maintaining the house than to engaging in political activity, its remaining members moved to a smaller space in 1983 and a year later disbanded the collective.

But these changes meant abeyance and not death for the lesbian feminist community. Women Against Rape and Fan the Flames Feminist Book Collective (which moved from the Ohio State campus area to a downtown location and, in early 1993, to a neighborhood with a relatively high lesbian population) survived the death of their parent organization and continue to thrive, as has Women's Outreach to Women, which sponsors groups for incest survivors as well as for women recovering from substance abuse. The Child Assault Prevention project developed into the National Assault Prevention Center, based in Columbus, and the Women's Music Union continued to produce feminist concerts until 1990. In 1990, a revived Take Back the Night march to protest violence against women (an annual event in the late 1970s) led to the establishment of an on-going Take Back the Night organization. A lesbian support group, Sisters of Lavender, continues; a Lesbian Business Association publishes a local lesbian newsletter titled *The Word Is Out!*; lesbian mothers and lesbians hoping to bear children have formed a group called Momazons that has launched a national newsletter; and members of the lesbian feminist community have moved into pro-choice and lesbian/gay community organizations. Stonewall Union, for example, central Ohio's gay/lesbian advocacy group, has had lesbian feminists as president, executive director, and head of its antiviolence project in the 1990s.

What this history suggests is that the lesbian feminist community is characterized by a shifting core. In Columbus, the nucleus of the community moved from the university women's liberation group, to the university-area Women's Action Collective, to the more focused Women Against Rape and Women's Outreach to Women; perhaps Take Back the Night is in the process of becoming a new core. The organizations and the personnel have changed, but the basic character of lesbian feminist culture has remained. Thus the demise of a radical feminist organization may represent less the "death" of radical feminism than a movement of members and resources to a new local movement core.

In a climate of increasing political opposition, decreasing funding, and lower levels of mobilization, the Columbus community never lost sight of its political goals. Rape prevention workshops, which might have become a depoliticized community service, continued to interpret rape as a "pillar of patriarchy" and to advocate strategies to prevent rape as a means of knocking out one support of the system (Community Action Strategies to Stop Rape 1978). Even the growth of the recovery movement and a turn

to feminist spirituality, associated by critics of cultural feminism with a sacrifice of politics for life-style, did not depoliticize the community. Lesbian feminists devoted to recovery from incest or substance abuse, for example, argued the political ramifications of their work (Direen 1991). And when the Women's Action Collective newsletter appeared in the fall of 1982 with a new title, *Womoon Rising,* whose explanation was suffused with references to matriarchy and spirituality, the change met with resistance from collective members who insisted that a "Womoon . . . certainly doesn't sound like a political activist" (*Womoon Rising* 1982). The newsletter ceased publication soon after its change of title; feminist spirituality may have sparked heated debates, but it never replaced politics in the Columbus community.

The culture of lesbian feminist communities

Lesbian feminist communities do show signs of the essentialism, separatism, and "life-style politics" that cultural feminism's critics view as anathema to radical feminism. But a closer examination of the ideas, separatist strategies, primary relationships, and symbolic practices of community members reveals that these elements of lesbian feminist culture are what sustain and nourish feminist activism.

Female values

The question of whether women are fundamentally different from men is central throughout the women's movement. Although a variety of individuals and groups assert the existence of "female values," this position is closely associated with contemporary lesbian feminists, who are more forthright than earlier feminists in proclaiming the superiority of women's values over men's. This is also the aspect of cultural feminism that is most disputed, in part because the notion of universal female values sits uneasily with the recognition of differences among women.

Critics of cultural feminism denounce belief in female values as essentialist, that is, based on biological determinism. According to Linda Alcoff, "cultural feminism is the ideology of a female nature or female essence reappropriated by feminists in an effort to revalidate undervalued female attributes" (1988, 408). Some lesbian feminists do see female values as linked to women's biological capacity to reproduce, but others take a social constructionist position and attribute differences between female and male values to differences in women's and men's socialization and prescribed roles. Explanations aside, belief in fundamental differences between female and male values permeates lesbian feminist communities. Indeed, this emphasis on difference serves to justify the existence of a "women's community."

Lesbian feminists find support for the belief in female values in a large body of scholarly and popular writing that valorizes egalitarianism, collectivism, an ethic of care, respect for knowledge derived from experience, pacifism, and cooperation as female traits. In contrast, an emphasis on hierarchy, oppressive individualism, an ethic of individual rights, abstraction, violence, and competition are denounced as male. Not all such works are written by lesbian women or by women who would identify with the lesbian feminist community, but they set forth positions embraced by lesbian feminists.[15]

On one end of the female values continuum lies Mary Daly's later work, which dismisses men as death-dealing necrophiliacs draining female energy, both figuratively and literally, in order to stay alive (Daly 1978, 1984; Daly and Caputi 1987). Audre Lorde, in an open letter to Daly, criticizes what she sees as Daly's assumption that all women suffer the same oppression and calls for recognition of the creative function of differences among women (Lorde 1984a). In a spoof of arguments such as Daly's, Margot Sims's *On the Necessity of Bestializing the Human Female* purports to prove that women and men belong to different species (1982). The biological underpinnings of Daly's work, or of Adrienne Rich's early work on motherhood, fuel the charge of essentialism hurled by cultural feminism's critics (Rich 1976).

But an essentialist view of female values is only one perspective. To move to the other end of the continuum, Patricia Hill Collins, whose work is influential in the academic sector of the lesbian feminist community, draws parallels between the standpoints of African-American and white feminists, suggesting that both share values that are different from, and superior to, those of the dominant white male culture (1989, 1990). Although this is a social constructionist argument, to critics of cultural feminism it might still smack of an unwarranted emphasis on difference between women and men, or at least between women and white men.

Exposed to these intellectual debates through books, periodicals, and women's studies classes, lesbian feminists often find support for their belief in superior female values. As one community member explained, "We've been acculturated into two cultures, the male and the female culture. And luckily we've been able to preserve the ways of nurturing by being in this alternative culture."[16] Even women who intellectually reject the notion of male and female difference are apt to use *male* as a term of derision. It is common in the Columbus community to hear everything from controlling and aggressive behavior to impersonal relationships and

[15] See, e.g., Walker 1974; Rich 1976; Chodorow 1978; Daly 1978, 1984; Dworkin 1981; Gilligan 1982; Cavin 1985; Johnson 1987; MacKinnon 1987.

[16] Interview conducted by Nancy Whittier, August 1987, Stockbridge, Mass.

hierarchical organizational structures characterized in casual conversation as "male." Our point here is that while most lesbian feminists do not embrace biological explanations of sex differences, such drawing of boundaries between male and female values promotes the kind of oppositional consciousness necessary for organizing one's life around feminism.

Separatism

Lesbian feminist communities advocate both separatism as strategy and separatism as goal, but it is total separation from men as an end in itself that has proven most controversial and that has given the impression that radical feminism has evolved into a politics of identity.[17] Some groups have attempted to withdraw from all aspects of male control by forming rural self-sufficient communes, but these are the exception. Sally Gearhart glorifies such communities in her popular fiction, which portrays separatist communities of women fighting the death-dealing patriarchy with extraordinary and distinctively female mental and physical powers (1978, 1991). Critics of such total separatism point to the race and class bias inherent in the assumption that women want to and can separate from men in this way (Jaggar 1983; hooks 1984).

In general, however, the lesbian feminist community endorses temporally and spatially limited separatism. The Columbus Women's Action Collective statement of philosophy asserted plainly that "the work of the women's movement must be done by women. Our own growth can only be fostered by solving our problems among women."[18] Often men, and even male children over a very young age, are explicitly excluded from participation in groups and events. Some early lesbian feminist communes included male children but barred them from decision making and social events on the grounds that "male energy" violates women's space.[19] This tradition continues at the annual Michigan Womyn's Music Festival in Hart, Michigan, where male children over the age of three are not permitted in the festival area but must stay at a separate camp. Men were not permitted to attend any sessions at the National Lesbian Conference in Atlanta in 1991 (Stevens 1991). In Columbus, the annual Take Back the Night march welcomes men at the kickoff rally but permits only women to march, a source of ongoing controversy. Supporters of this policy maintain that women gain a liberating sense of power specifically from separating from men for the march, reclaiming the right to walk the streets at night with no vestiges of male "protection."

[17] On separatism, see Frye 1983; Hoagland and Penelope 1988.

[18] Women's Action Collective "Statement of Philosophy," adopted by consensus May 21, 1974, in the personal papers of Teri Wehausen, Columbus, Ohio.

[19] Interview conducted by Verta Taylor, April 1989, Columbus, Ohio.

The importance of such limited separatism is asserted even by critics of total separation from men and boys. Lesbian women of color, working-class lesbian women, and Jewish lesbian women with an interest in working politically within their own racial, class, and ethnic communities argue for separate space to organize and express solidarity apart both from men and from lesbian women who are white or middle-class or Christian.[20] The very structure of the National Women's Studies Association embodies separatism as strategy: caucuses for women of color, lesbian women, Jewish women, and working-class and poor women reflect women's different and competing interests. The need for this kind of organizing within the lesbian feminist community was illustrated at the National Lesbian Conference in Atlanta, at which women of color caucused separately in an attempt to make the conference deal more directly with issues of racism (Sharon, Elliott, and Latham 1991). Separatism in the lesbian feminist community has come to mean organizing around one's identity.

Separately organized caucuses or groups may, then, work politically with women of different interests or with men. Although some lesbian feminist groups, especially in the early years of the community, refused to work at all with heterosexual women, coalitions across the lines of both sexual identity and gender are increasingly common. Barbara Epstein argues that lesbian feminists have played a significant role in mixed-gender nonviolent direct action since the mid-1970s because the lesbian feminist movement has matured and succeeded in creating space for lesbianism within the broader radical community (1991).[21] Many participants in lesbian communities consider the women's movement their primary allegiance but work actively in movements for gay and lesbian rights, AIDS education and advocacy, Latin American solidarity, environmental causes, peace, animal rights, reproductive freedom, and labor unions, and movements against racism, apartheid, and nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, separatist events and caucuses remain important for women who are disenchanted with the politics of the mainstream; separatism is a means of both drawing sustenance and maintaining feminist identity.

The primacy of women's relationships

Lesbian feminist communities view heterosexuality as an institution of patriarchal control and lesbian relationships as a means of subverting male domination. Relationships between women are considered not only personal affairs but also political acts, as captured in the often-repeated

[20] See, for a variety of perspectives, Beck 1980; Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981; Hull, Scott, and Smith 1982; Smith 1983; Bulkin, Pratt, and Smith 1984; Lorde 1984a, 1984b; Anzaldúa 1990; Trujillo 1991.

[21] See also Cavin 1990; Whittier 1991; and Gorman 1992.

slogan, "Feminism is the theory and lesbianism is the practice."[22] The statement of philosophy of the Columbus Women's Action Collective, for example, defined lesbianism as a challenge to male domination.[23] It was no accident that the coming out of a large number of radical feminists in Columbus coincided with the founding of the Women's Action Collective and Women Against Rape. That lesbian women were central in the antirape movement undoubtedly shaped the feminist analysis of rape as an act representing one end of the continuum of what Susan Cavin calls "heterosex" (1985).

For some community members, lesbianism is defined by overriding identification with women and by resistance to patriarchy rather than by sexual attraction to or involvement with women. As one woman put it, lesbianism is "an attempt to stop doing what you were taught—hating women."[24] Rich's classic article "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" introduced the notion of the "lesbian continuum," which embraces women who resist male control but are not sexual with women (1980). Earlier writers had also accepted what were originally known in the movement as "political lesbians." Ti-Grace Atkinson, for example, denounced married women who engaged in sexual relations with women as "collaborators" and praised women who had never had sex with women but who lived a total commitment to the women's movement as "lesbians in the political sense" (1973, 12). More recently, Marilyn Frye, in an address to the 1990 National Women's Studies Association conference titled "Do You Have to Be a Lesbian to Be a Feminist?" equated lesbianism with rebellion against patriarchal institutions. Frye was willing to imagine truly radical feminist women—what she called "Virgins" in the archaic sense of autonomous women—in erotic relationships with men, but she insisted that they would be exceptional (1990).

Lesbian feminist communities indeed include some women who are oriented toward women emotionally and politically but not sexually; they are sometimes referred to as "political dykes" or "heterodykes" (Clausen 1990; Smeller 1992; Bart 1993). Some are women in the process of coming out, and some are "going in," or moving from lesbian to heterosexual relationships. For example, singer and political activist Holly Near explains in her autobiography that she continues to call herself lesbian even though she is sometimes heterosexually active

[22] This statement is attributed to Ti-Grace Atkinson in Koedt 1973. Echols points out that Sidney Abbott and Barbara Love record the original version of this remark quite differently: in 1970, Atkinson addressed the lesbian group Daughters of Bilitis in New York and commented that "Feminism is a theory; but Lesbianism is a practice" (Abbott and Love 1972, 117; Echols 1989, 238). In any case, the phrase has been widely quoted within lesbian feminist communities.

[23] Women's Action Collective "Statement of Philosophy."

[24] Interview conducted by Nancy Whittier, September 1987, Washington, D.C.

because of the importance of lesbian feminism as a political identity (1990). In the same vein, a feminist support group sprang up in 1989 at Ohio State University for "Lesbians Who Just Happen to Be in Relationships with Politically Correct Men." What is significant is that lesbian identity is so salient to involvement in the women's community that even women who are not, or no longer, involved sexually with women claim such an identity.

Most lesbians are, of course, erotically attracted to other women, and a strong current within the community criticizes those who downplay sexuality. The popularity of lesbian sex expert JoAnn Loulan, who spoke to a large and enthusiastic audience in Columbus in 1991, signals that the erotic aspects of lesbian relationships have not been completely submerged (Loulan 1990). The "sex wars" of the early 1980s have spawned an assertively sexual style on the part of some members of the lesbian feminist community (Stein 1989; Echols 1991). Advocates of sexual expressiveness, including champions of "butch-femme" roles and sadomasochism (S/M), challenge the less sexual style of what S/M practitioners call "vanilla lesbians" and denounce any notion of "politically correct" sex (see, e.g., Califia 1981; Dimen 1984). The lines are explicitly drawn by the very titles of the periodicals associated with each camp: *off our backs,* the classic radical feminist newspaper, now confronts the magazine *On Our Backs* with its sexual "bad girl" style. But the role of politics in structuring relationships is undisputed, even for those who emphasize sexual pleasure over the use of (hetero)sexuality as a means of social control of women. The defense of S/M, for example, argues the superiority of sexual interactions and relationships that explicitly play with power (Califia 1979, 1980; Samois 1979).[25]

In other words, the lesbian feminist community includes both women who emphasize relationships between women as a form of political resistance and women who stress the sexual pleasures of lesbianism. The sex wars are fought within the community over who best deserves the label "feminist." Although advocates of lesbian S/M and associated sexual practices experience exclusion from some community events, the nature of lesbian sexuality is contested openly at community conferences and in movement publications (Califia 1981). Even smaller communities have been affected by the national debate. In Columbus, when a gay bar placed ads featuring S/M imagery in a local gay/lesbian publication, lesbian members of Columbus's women's S/M group, Briar Rose, came to blows, metaphorically, with antipornography lesbian feminists offended by the depiction of what they perceived as violence.[26]

[25] For the opposing position, see Linden et al. 1982.
[26] Interview conducted by Leila Rupp, May 1992, Columbus, Ohio.

Although lesbian feminist communities are riven by conflict over the nature and proper expression of lesbian sexuality, relationships hold communities together. Highly committed activists tend to form partnerships with each other because, as one woman noted, otherwise "there's too much political conflict."[27] Political organizing, meetings, and conferences become occasions for meeting potential lovers or for spending time with a partner. Even an academic women's studies conference can provide a safe place to show affection in public. Women's relationships often structure their entire social worlds. Within the community, lesbian couples or groups of single and paired lesbian women construct family-like ties with one another, together celebrating holidays, birthdays, commitment ceremonies, births, and anniversaries. Former lovers are often part of lesbian networks, at least in smaller communities like Columbus. In contrast to the New Left in the 1960s, where women no longer in relationships with male leaders often found themselves marginalized in the movement, lesbian feminists' tendency to remain friends with their ex-lovers provides stability in the lesbian world (Pearlman 1987; Epstein 1991, 181–82).

Lesbian feminist communities make explicit—and sexual—the ties that bind women. The contemporary antifeminist charge that one "has to be a lesbian to be a feminist" is in an odd way an acknowledgment of the central role that lesbians play in the contemporary women's movement and that women with primary bonds to other women played in earlier stages of feminism.[28] It is no coincidence that self-identified "gay women" who reject the label "lesbian" often associate it with feminism and political activism.[29] Women's relationships are especially crucial to the maintenance of the women's movement when mass support for feminism ebbs; such bonds tie together groups of women who are unlikely to find acceptance for their relationships outside the movement. Furthermore, lesbian feminist communities provide fertile ground for recruiting young lesbian women into feminism. Thus, the relationship between activism and woman-bonding (lesbian or otherwise) is a symbiotic one: women with primary commitments to other women find support within the women's movement and, in turn, pour their energies into it.

Feminist ritual

Among lesbian feminists, both public and private rituals are important vehicles for constructing feminist models of community and expressing new conceptions of gender. Public rituals are local or national cultural

[27] Interview conducted by Verta Taylor, May 1987, Columbus, Ohio.
[28] See Faderman 1981, 1991; Rupp 1989a, 1989b; Lützen 1990.
[29] Interviews conducted by Verta Taylor and Leila Rupp, April 1992, Columbus, Ohio.

events such as concerts, films, poetry readings, exhibitions, plays, and conferences. Most prominent nationally is the annual Michigan Womyn's Music Festival, a five-day celebration that attracts several thousand women for musical performances, workshops, support groups, political strategy sessions, "healing circles," and the sale of woman-made crafts, clothing, and other goods. The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) conference is another annual cultural event; it goes far beyond the usual parameters of an academic conference by providing a forum for feminist performances and by featuring open and often highly charged debate over issues central to the women's movement.[30] Dozens of specialized national and regional conferences and festivals take place each year. Other local events, such as antiviolence marches and pro-choice rallies, occur in much the same way in different communities. Publicity in national publications and participation in national demonstrations foster a common culture of protest across the country; chants and songs, for example, spread from one community to another. Lesbian feminist events in Columbus mirror those in both larger and smaller communities. The Women's Action Collective for many years sponsored an annual Famous Feminist Day to raise money and educate the community about feminist foremothers; Stonewall Union or Women's Outreach to Women bring nationally known performers to town (as the Women's Music Union did until 1990); the Lesbian Business Association puts on an annual Ohio Lesbian Festival; and Take Back the Night continues to sponsor an annual march and rally.

What is known among contemporary feminists as "women's culture"—women's music, literature, and art—plays a central role in recruiting women and raising their feminist consciousness.[31] Musicians such as Meg Christian, Near, and Sweet Honey in the Rock, as well as dozens of other feminist performers, have introduced issues as well as songs to communities across the country. For example, in Columbus as in other areas, Near introduced the lesbian feminist community to sign language interpretation of concerts. Now no feminist—or even mainstream—event is without such interpretation for the hearing impaired. Likewise, Christian brought discussion of alcoholism and the recovery movement to the Columbus community by performing such songs as "Turning It Over" and talking of the Alcoholism Center for Women in Los Angeles. And Sweet Honey in the Rock exposed Columbus audiences composed primarily of white women to an Afrocentric perspective and African-American history and culture. Women in local communities read many of

[30] The issue of racism within the organization blew apart the twelfth annual NWSA conference, "Feminist Education: Calling the Question," held in Akron, Ohio, June 20–24, 1990. See Ruby, Elliott, and Douglas 1990.

[31] Zimmerman 1990 analyzes the impact of lesbian fiction on the development of the lesbian community.

the same lesbian novels and poetry and listen to the same music. At the 1979 gay/lesbian march in Washington, women at the rally joined in to sing and sign when lesbian performers came on stage, while gay men in the crowd, lacking such unifying rituals, seemed to wonder how all of the women knew the words.

Private ritual or the politicization of everyday life is, in many respects, the hallmark of the lesbian feminist community and the most damning aspect of cultural feminism in the eyes of its critics. Through the tenet that "the personal is political," every aspect of life—where one lives, what one eats, how one dresses—can become an expression of politics (Hanisch 1978). The sale at feminist bookstores, conferences, concerts, and festivals of feminist T-shirts, jewelry (especially labryses), books, music, and bumper stickers means that women can adorn and surround themselves with their politics.

The most significant displays challenge conventional standards of gender behavior that subordinate women. In the early years of lesbian feminism, comfortable, practical, less "feminine" styles of dress, unshaved legs and armpits, and extremely short hair were de rigueur. Although flannel shirts, jeans, and boots are no longer a uniform, the dominant mode of presentation is still unisex or what Holly Devor has termed a deliberate "gender blending" (1989). In the Columbus community, attire at cultural events has changed markedly over the past fifteen years. What was once a fairly monolithic crowd has become more diverse. Although most women remain "gender blended," some appear in leather and mohawks and some in skirts, lipstick, and long hair. At one feminist event, billed as "Girls Just Want to Have Fun," members of the community participated in a fashion show, albeit one that included political commentary on style. The use of the term *girls* (previously anathema), the emphasis on fun rather than serious politics, the reference to a mainstream popular song (Cyndi Lauper's "Girls Just Want to Have Fun") rather than women's music, and attention to clothing, including traditional women's attire, all marked this event as a new departure for the community.

Such changes in self-presentation are in part a consequence of the sex wars and in part an expression of the preferences of working-class women, women of color, and young women. "Antifeminine" styles associated with the downplaying of sexuality are under attack from advocates of sexual expressiveness who sometimes adopt fashions associated with the sex trade (Stein 1989). "Pro-sex" lesbian feminists sport high-heeled shoes, short skirts, low-cut tops, and other items of clothing denounced by "antisex" lesbian feminists as the paraphernalia of oppression. In addition, some working-class women and women of color criticize the "politically correct" styles of the dominant faction as an imperialist

imposition of white, middle-class standards. And young lesbian feminist women have brought their own ideas on fashion and self-presentation, including the grunge and punk styles, to the community.

The intensity of the debate over cultural expression is an indication of the significance of ritual for distinguishing who is and is not a feminist—just as lesbian women historically have developed cultural codes to identify one another while remaining "hidden" to the mainstream culture that stigmatized them (see, e.g., Faderman 1991). Feminist ritual reaffirms commitment to the community and openly embraces resistance to the dominant society. Thus, what Echols and other critics of cultural feminism have denounced as a "profoundly individualistic" retreat to life-style has political consequences (Echols 1989, 251).

Conclusion: The political functions of lesbian feminist communities

Our reconsideration of cultural feminism in the context of lesbian feminist communities suggests a number of interpretations that run counter to the standard view. First, cultural feminism, as it has been defined by its critics, represents just one ideological position within lesbian feminist communities. Second, these communities have forged a rich and complex resistance culture and style of politics that nourishes rather than betrays the radical feminist vision. Third, the dynamics of lesbian feminist communities are shaped at least in part by the politics of the Right that dominated the period of abeyance or maintenance in which the women's movement found itself in the 1980s. And, finally, the lesbian feminist community intersects with many contemporary struggles for political and institutional change and carries a feminist legacy that will shape the future of the women's movement itself.

In our earlier collaborative work on the U.S. women's rights movement in the period from 1945 to the 1960s, we argued that a small group of white, well-educated, economically privileged old women, primarily recruited to the women's movement during the suffrage struggle, greatly influenced the resurgent liberal branch of the women's movement. We showed that the women's rights movement that hung on in the doldrum years provided activist networks, the ultimately unifying goal of the Equal Rights Amendment, and a feminist identity that maintained a focus on women's subordination. Yet this group of committed feminists sustained their vision in a homogeneous community that did not and could not attract women of color, working-class women, or young women. Although the women's movement that blossomed in the 1960s differed in fundamental ways from the more limited women's rights movement that preceded it, the legacy, both positive and negative, of that early activism lingered (Rupp and Taylor 1987).

In the same way, lesbian feminist communities both sustain the women involved in them now and also have consequences for the next round of mass feminist activism. Perhaps a new wave of the women's movement is already taking shape; witness the ground swell of outrage at Anita Hill's treatment in the U.S. Senate confirmation hearings for Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas in October 1991 and the huge turnout for the pro-choice march on Washington, D.C., in April 1992. Since the presidential election of 1992 and the passage of antigay/lesbian legislation in Colorado, the National Organization for Women has decided to make lesbian and gay rights a priority in the 1990s.[32]

Our discussion of the culture of lesbian feminist communities has emphasized how belief in female difference, the practice of limited or total separatism, belief in the primacy of women's relationships, and the practice of feminist ritual create a world apart from the mainstream in which women can claim feminism as a political identity. At the same time, of course, the ideas and practices of lesbian feminist communities can exclude potential participants. Most heterosexual feminists may not find the lesbian world congenial. The association of feminism and lesbianism, as several scholars have found, alienates some young heterosexual women from feminist identification.[33] Our experience suggests that there is, even among older women, a widespread sense of the "lesbianization" of the women's movement. The revelation by Patricia Ireland, president of the National Organization for Women, that she lives with a "female companion" undoubtedly reinforced that perception (Minkowitz 1992). One feminist quoted in the Washington *Post* commented on the public view of NOW as "a gay front group" (*off our backs* 1992a). Participants at the 1992 NOW conference report that it had the feel of a lesbian conference.[34] The 1992 Bloomington (Indiana) Women's Music Festival offered a workshop on "Networking for Straight Women in a Lesbian World."[35] At the local level, one lesbian-affirming heterosexual Columbus woman went to a local NOW meeting with a profeminist male friend involved in a men against rape group and reported feeling completely unwelcome because of her association with a man.[36] Equally as important, the dominance of white, middle-class, Christian women creates barriers to the achievement of a truly multicultural lesbian feminist community despite the ongoing community dialogue about race, class, ethnic, and other differences. As Judit Moschkovich, a Jewish Latina, put it, the

[32] Communication from Jo Reger, Columbus, Ohio, 1992.
[33] See Schneider 1986, 1988; Dill 1989; Kamen 1991.
[34] Interview conducted by Verta Taylor and Leila Rupp, February 1992, Columbus, Ohio.
[35] Communication from Suzanne Staggenborg, Bloomington, Ind., 1992.
[36] Interview conducted by Verta Taylor, May 1992, Columbus, Ohio.

assumption that she should reject her Latin culture means accepting "the American culture of French Fries and Hamburgers (or soyburgers), American music on the radio (even if it's American women's music on a feminist radio show), not kissing and hugging every time you greet someone" (Moschkovich 1981).

Our point is not that the lesbian feminist community is a pure expression of radical feminism. Rather, we want to highlight its political and transformative functions. A wide variety of struggles have been influenced by the involvement of lesbian feminists or by ideas and practices characteristic of the community (Whittier 1991, esp. chap. 7). Direct action movements concerned with peace and other issues have adopted from the lesbian feminist community a view of revolution as an ongoing process of personal and social transformation, an emphasis on egalitarianism and consensus decision making, an orientation toward spirituality, and a commitment to shaping present action according to the values desired in an ideal future world (Epstein 1991; *off our backs* 1992b). Similarly, the ongoing dialogue in the lesbian feminist community about diversity has carried over into the gay/lesbian movement, and the radical feminist analysis of rape shapes the struggle against antigay/lesbian violence (Vaid 1991). Further, the AIDS movement has been driven by the radical feminist definition of control of one's body and access to health care as political issues (Hamilton 1991). Lesbians also have played a leading role in the development of the recovery movement for survivors of incest (Galst 1991). In short, lesbian feminist cultures of resistance have had political impact not only by sheltering battle-weary feminists but also by influencing the course of other social movements.

Finally, lesbian feminist communities affect a younger generation of women who hold the future of the women's movement in their hands. In our research on women's rights activists of the 1940s and 1950s, we found these women longing for "young blood" but unwilling to accept the new ideas and new strategies that young women brought with them (Rupp and Taylor 1987). An aging generation of activists may always long for fresh recruits who will be drawn to their cause but will not change anything about their movement; such an inclination, in part, lies behind the cultural clash between Meg Christian fans and Madonna devotees within the lesbian feminist community (Echols 1991; Yollin 1991; Starr 1992; Stein 1993). The next round of the women's movement is likely to take a different course, but it will not be untouched by the collective processes, consciousness, and practices of lesbian feminism. One of the major mechanisms of transmittal is women's studies, which mobilizes young women who identify as feminists (Dill 1991; Houppert 1991; Kamen 1991).

Some young activists identify themselves as a "third wave" of feminism, thus making a connection to the first two waves and at the same time claiming responsibility for a new resurgence. "I am not a postfeminism feminist. I am the Third Wave," writes Rebecca Walker, a student at Yale University and a contributing editor to *Ms.* (Walker 1992, 41).[37] Already we can see elements of change and continuity in the activities of a new generation. Young lesbians attracted to the gay/lesbian protest group Queer Nation, for example, reject the tradition of nonviolence and female pacifism when they adopt the "Queers bash back" response to violence against lesbians and gay men. At the same time, the formation of women's caucuses in Queer Nation and the AIDS activism group ACT-UP echoes the struggles of earlier generations of women within male-dominated organizations (Faderman 1991; Hamilton 1991; Yollin 1991). Lesbians engaging in direct action tactics are transforming the face of activism. In Columbus, female Queer Nation members, in a protest reminiscent of the early radical feminist zap actions, have engaged in kiss-ins at local shopping centers and the city zoo as a means of challenging heterosexual privilege. The Lesbian Avengers, founded in New York City in 1992, engage in "creative activism: loud, bold, sexy, silly, fierce, tasty and dramatic" ("Dyke Manifesto" 1993). In their first action, they marched into a Queens, N.Y., school board meeting to the tune of "When the Dykes Come Marching In" and handed out lavender balloons inscribed "Ask about Lesbian Lives" to first graders to protest the board's refusal to allow a multicultural curriculum that included discussion of lesbians and gay men ("Dyke Manifesto" 1993; Jule and Marin 1993).

In the climate of the 1980s and early 1990s, then, the culture of lesbian feminist communities has not just served to comfort, protect, and console activists in retreat. It also has nourished women involved in myriad protests, both within and outside the women's movement, whose vision of feminist transformation goes beyond political and economic structures to a broad redefinition of social values. Rather than squelching mobilization, we see lesbian feminist communities as sustaining the radical feminist tradition and bequeathing a legacy, however imperfect, to feminists of the future.

Department of Sociology (Taylor)
Department of History (Rupp)
Ohio State University

[37] At the American Sociological Association meetings in Cincinnati, August 23–27, 1991, a group of women issued a call for an ad hoc discussion of "third wave feminism." See also Kamen 1991.

References

Abbott, Sidney, and Barbara Love. 1972. *Sappho Was a Right-on Woman: A Liberated View of Lesbianism.* New York: Stein & Day.

Alcoff, Linda. 1988. "Cultural Feminism versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 13(3):405–36.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1990. *Making Face, Making Soul—Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color.* San Francisco: Aunt Lute.

Atkinson, Ti-Grace. 1973. "Lesbianism and Feminism." In *Amazon Expedition: A Lesbian Feminist Anthology,* ed. Phyllis Birkby et al., 11–14. New York: Times Change Press.

———. 1984. "Le nationalisme feminin." *Nouvelles questions feministes* 6–7: 35–54.

Barnhart, Elizabeth. 1975. "Friends and Lovers in a Lesbian Counterculture Community." In *Old Family, New Family,* ed. N. Glazer-Malbin, 90–115. New York: Van Nostrand.

Bart, Pauline B. 1993. "Protean Woman: The Liquidity of Female Sexuality and the Tenaciousness of Lesbian Identity." In *Heterosexuality: A Feminism and Psychology Reader,* ed. Sue Wilkinson and Celia Kitzinger, 246–52. London: Sage.

Beck, Evelyn Torton. 1980. *Nice Jewish Girls: A Lesbian Anthology.* Watertown, Mass.: Persephone.

Boles, Janet K. 1991. "Form Follows Function: The Evolution of Feminist Strategies." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 515 (May): 38–49.

Bolotin, Susan. 1982. "Voices from the Post-Feminist Generation." *New York Times Magazine,* October 17, 28–31+.

Buechler, Steven M. 1990. *Women's Movements in the United States.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Bulkin, Elly, Minnie Bruce Pratt, and Barbara Smith. 1984. *Yours in Struggle: Three Feminist Perspectives on Anti-Semitism and Racism.* Brooklyn, N.Y.: Long Haul Press.

Califia, Pat. 1979. "A Secret Side of Lesbian Sexuality." *Advocate,* December 27, 19–23.

———. 1980. *Sapphistry: The Book of Lesbian Sexuality.* Tallahassee, Fla.: Naiad.

———. 1981. "Feminism and Sadomasochism." *Heresies* 12:30–34.

Cassell, Joan. 1977. *A Group Called Women: Sisterhood and Symbolism in the Feminist Movement.* New York: McKay.

Castro, Ginette. 1990. *American Feminism: A Contemporary History.* New York: New York University Press.

Cavin, Susan. 1985. *Lesbian Origins.* San Francisco: Ism Press.

———. 1990. "The Invisible Army of Women: Lesbian Social Protests, 1969–1988." In *Women and Social Protest,* ed. Guida West and Rhoda Lois Blumberg, 321–32. New York: Oxford University Press.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman, and Anthony Gary Dworkin. 1987. "In the Face of Threat: Organized Antifeminism in Comparative Perspective." *Gender and Society* 1(1):33–60.

Charon, Mona. 1992. "Shrill, Leftist Thought Police Still Seek to Govern Nation's Campuses." *Columbus Dispatch,* May 5.
Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender.* Berkeley: University of California Press.
Clausen, Jan. 1990. "My Interesting Condition." *Outlook* 7 (Winter): 10–21.
———. 1992. "A Craving for Community." *Women's Review of Books* 9 (March): 8–9.
Collins, Patricia Hill. 1989. "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought." *Signs* 14(4):745–73.
———. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* Boston: Unwin Hyman.
Community Action Strategies to Stop Rape. 1978. "Freeing Our Lives: A Feminist Analysis of Rape Prevention." Community Action Strategies to Stop Rape, Women Against Rape, Columbus, Ohio.
Cook, Blanche Wiesen. 1977. "Female Support Networks and Political Activism: Lillian Wald, Crystal Eastman, Emma Goldman." *Chrysalis* 3:43–61.
Cott, Nancy F. 1989. "What's in a Name? The Limits of 'Social Feminism'; or, Expanding the Vocabulary of Women's History." *Journal of American History* 76(3):809–29.
Daly, Mary. 1978. *Gyn-Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism.* Boston: Beacon.
———. 1984. *Pure Lust: Elemental Feminist Philosophy.* Boston: Beacon.
Daly, Mary, in cahoots with Jane Caputi. 1987. *Websters' First New Intergalactic Wickedary of the English Language.* Boston: Beacon.
Davis, Flora. 1991. *Moving the Mountain: The Women's Movement in America since 1960.* New York: Simon & Schuster.
Davis, Sally Ogle. 1989. "Is Feminism Dead?" *Los Angeles,* February.
D'Emilio, John. 1983. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the U.S., 1940–1970.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Devor, Holly. 1989. *Gender Blending: Confronting the Limits of Duality.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Dill, Kim. 1989. "Qualified Feminism and Its Influence on College Women's Identification with the Women's Movement." Unpublished manuscript, Columbus, Ohio.
———. 1991. "Feminism in the Nineties: The Influence of Collective Identity and Community on Young Feminist Activists." M.A. thesis, Ohio State University.
Dimen, Muriel. 1984. "Politically Correct? Politically Incorrect?" In Vance 1984, 138–48.
Direen, Brenda. 1991. "The Politics of Recovery." *Feminisms* (newsletter of the Center for Women's Studies, Ohio State University) 4 (March/April): 6–7.
Donovan, Josephine. 1985. *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions of American Feminism.* New York: Ungar.
D'Souza, Dinesh. 1991. *Illiberal Education: The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus.* New York: Free Press.
DuBois, Ellen, Mari Jo Buhle, Temma Kaplan, Gerda Lerner, and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg. 1980. "Politics and Culture in Women's History." *Feminist Studies* 6(1):26–64.

Dworkin, Andrea. 1981. *Pornography: Men Possessing Women.* New York: Perigee.
"Dyke Manifesto." 1993. Flyer handed out at the March on Washington for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Rights and Liberation, April 25, 1993, in possession of the authors.
Ebeling, Kay. 1990. "The Failure of Feminism." *Newsweek* 116 (November 19): 9.
Echols, Alice. 1983a. "Cultural Feminism and the Anti-Pornography Movement." *Social Text* 7:34–53.
———. 1983b. "The New Feminism of Yin and Yang." In Snitow, Stansell, and Thompson 1983, 439–59.
———. 1984. "The Taming of the Id: Feminist Sexual Politics, 1968–83." In Vance 1984, 50–72.
———. 1989. *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967–1975.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
———. 1991. "Justifying Our Love? The Evolution of Lesbianism through Feminism and Gay Male Politics." *Advocate,* March 26, 48–53.
Eisenstein, Hester. 1983. *Contemporary Feminist Thought.* Boston: G. K. Hall.
Epstein, Barbara. 1991. *Political Protest and Cultural Revolution: Nonviolent Direct Action in the 1970s and 1980s.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Esterberg, Kristin Gay. 1990. "Salience and Solidarity: Identity, Correctness, and Conformity in a Lesbian Community." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C., August 11–15.
Evans, Sara. 1979. *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left.* New York: Knopf.
Faderman, Lillian. 1981. *Surpassing the Love of Men.* New York: Morrow.
———. 1991. *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers: A History of Lesbian Life in Twentieth-Century America.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Faludi, Susan. 1991. *Backlash: The Undeclared War against American Women.* New York: Crown.
Fantasia, Rick. 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity: Consciousness, Action, and Contemporary American Workers.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
Ferree, Myra Marx, and Beth B. Hess. 1985. *Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement.* Boston: Twayne.
Freedman, Estelle. 1979. "Separatism as Strategy: Female Institution Building and American Feminism, 1870–1930." *Feminist Studies* 5(3):512–52.
Freeman, Jo. 1975. *The Politics of Women's Liberation.* New York: Longman.
Friedan, Betty. 1985. "How to Get the Women's Movement Moving Again." *New York Times Magazine,* November 3, 26–29+.
Frye, Marilyn. 1983. "Some Reflections on Separatism and Power." In her *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory,* 95–109. Trumansburg, N.Y.: Crossing Press.
———. 1990. "Do You Have to Be a Lesbian to Be a Feminist?" *off our backs* 20 (August/September): 21–23.
Galst, Liz. 1991. "Overcoming Silence." *Advocate,* December 3, 60–63.
Gearhart, Sally Miller. 1978. *The Wanderground: Stories of the Hill Women.* Watertown, Mass.: Persephone.

——— . 1991. "The Chipko." *Ms.* 2 (September–October): 64–69.
Gelb, Joyce, and Marian Lief Palley. 1982. *Women and Public Policy.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Gittlin, Tod. 1987. *The Sixties.* New York: Bantam.
Gordon, Linda. 1986. "What's New in Women's History." In *Feminist Studies/ Critical Studies,* ed. Teresa de Lauretis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
——— . 1991. "On 'Difference.' " *Genders* 10 (Spring): 91–111.
Gorman, Phyllis. 1992. "The Ohio AIDS Movement: Competition and Cooperation between Grassroots Activists and Professionally Sponsored Organizations." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.
Haller, Mary. 1984. "Decline of a Social Movement Organization: The Women's Action Collective." Unpublished manuscript, Columbus, Ohio.
Hamilton, Amy. 1991. "Women in A.I.D.S. Activism." *off our backs* 21 (November): 4–5.
Hanisch, Carol. 1978. "The Personal Is Political." In *Feminist Revolution,* ed. Redstockings of the Women's Liberation Movement, 204–15. New York: Random House.
Hayden, Tom. 1988. *Reunion.* New York: Random House.
Hewitt, Nancy A. 1985. "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood: American Women's History in the 1980s." *Social History* 10(3):299–321.
Hoagland, Sarah Lucia, and Julia Penelope. 1988. *For Lesbians Only: A Separatist Anthology.* London: Onlywomen.
Hole, Judith, and Ellen Levine. 1971. *Rebirth of Feminism.* New York: Quadrangle/New York Times.
hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center.* Boston: South End.
Houppert, Karen. 1991. "Wildflowers among the Ivy: New Campus Radicals." *Ms.* 2 (September/October): 52–58.
Hull, Gloria T., Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith. 1982. *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, but Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies.* Old Westbury, N.Y.: Feminist Press.
Isserman, Maurice. 1987. *If I Had a Hammer: The Death of the Old Left and the Birth of the New Left.* New York: Basic.
Jaggar, Alison M. 1983. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature.* Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld.
Johnson, Sonia. 1987. *Going Out of Our Minds: The Metaphysics of Liberation.* Freedom, Calif.: Crossing Press.
Jule, Ilsa, and Laurie Marin. 1993. "The Lesbian Avengers." *Deneuve,* May/June, 42–44.
Kamen, Paula. 1991. *Feminist Fatale: Voices from the "Twentysomething" Generation Explore the Future of the Women's Movement.* New York: Donald I. Fine.
Kaplan, Temma. 1982. "Female Consciousness and Collective Action: The Case of Barcelona, 1910–1918." *Signs* 7(3):545–66.
Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1990. "Feminism within American Institutions: Unobstrusive Mobilization in the 1980s." *Signs* 16(1):27–54.

Klandermans, Bert, and Sidney Tarrow. 1988. "Mobilization into Social Movements: Synthesizing European and American Approaches." In *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research across Cultures,* ed. Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow, 1–38. International Social Movement Research, vol. 1. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI.

Koedt, Anne. 1973. "Lesbianism and Feminism." In *Radical Feminism,* ed. Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, and Anita Rapone, 246–58. New York: Quadrangle.

Krieger, Susan. 1983. *The Mirror Dance: Identity in a Women's Community.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lewis, Sasha Gregory. 1979. *Sunday's Women.* Boston: Beacon.

Linden, Robin Ruth, Darlene R. Pagano, Diana E. H. Russell, and Susan Leigh Star. 1982. *Against Sadomasochism: A Radical Feminist Analysis.* East Palo Alto, Calif.: Frog in the Well.

Lockard, Denyse. 1986. "The Lesbian Community: An Anthropological Approach." In *The Many Faces of Homosexuality,* ed. Evelyn Blackwood, 83–95. New York: Harrington Park.

Lorde, Audre. 1984a. "An Open Letter to Mary Daly." In her *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches,* 66–71. Trumansburg, N.Y.: Crossing Press.

———. 1984b. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." In her *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches,* 110–13. Trumansburg, N.Y.: Crossing Press.

Loulan, JoAnn Gardner. 1990. *The Lesbian Erotic Dance: Butch, Femme, Androgyny, and Other Rhythms.* San Francisco: Spinsters.

Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lützen, Karin. 1990. *Was das Herz begehrt: Liebe und Freundschaft zwischen Frauen.* Hamburg: Ernst Kabel.

McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer.* New York: Oxford University Press.

McCormick, Kelly. 1992. "Moms without Dads: Women Choosing Children." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1987. *Feminism Unmodified: Discourses on Life and Law.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mansbridge, Jane J. 1986. *Why We Lost the ERA.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Matteson, Gretchen. 1989. "The History of the Women's Action Collective, a Successful Social Movement Organization, 1971–1984." Unpublished manuscript, Columbus, Ohio.

Matthews, Donald G., and Jane Sherron De Hart. 1990. *Sex, Gender, and the Politics of ERA: A State and the Nation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Minkowitz, Donna. 1992. "The Newsroom Becomes a Battleground." *Advocate,* May 19, 31–37.

Moraga, Cherríe, and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. 1981. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color.* Watertown, Mass.: Persephone.

Morris, Aldon. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change.* New York: Free Press.

Moschkovich, Judit. 1981. " 'But I Know You, American Woman.' " In Moraga and Anzaldúa 1981, 79–84.

Mueller, Carol McClurg. 1987. "Collective Consciousness, Identity Transformation and the Rise of Women in Public Office in the U.S." In *The Women's Movements of the United States and Western Europe: Consciousness, Political Opportunity and Public Policy,* ed. Mary Fainsod Katzenstein and Carol McClurg Mueller, 89–111. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Near, Holly. 1990. *Fire in the Rain, Singer in the Storm.* New York: Morrow.

off our backs. 1992a. "The News That 'Rocked the Feminist Community.' " *off our backs* 22 (January): 2.

———. 1992b. "Queer Notions." *off our backs,* October, 12–15.

Pascoe, Peggy. 1990. *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874–1939.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Pearlman, Sarah F. 1987. "The Saga of Continuing Clash in Lesbian Community, or Will an Army of Ex-Lovers Fail?" In *Lesbian Psychologies: Explorations and Challenges,* ed. Boston Lesbian Psychologies Collective, 313–26. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Penelope, Julia. 1992. *Call Me Lesbian: Lesbian Lives, Lesbian Theory.* Freedom, Calif.: Crossing Press.

Phelan, Shane. 1989. *Identity Politics: Lesbian Feminism and the Limits of Community.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ponse, Barbara. 1978. *Identities in the Lesbian World: The Social Construction of Self.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.

Rich, Adrienne. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs* 5(4):631–60.

———. 1976. *Of Woman Born.* New York: Norton.

Ringelheim, Joan. 1985. "Women and the Holocaust: A Reconsideration of Research." *Signs* 10(4):741–61.

Ruby, Jennie, Farar Elliott, and Carol Anne Douglas. 1990. "NWSA: Troubles Surface at Conference." *off our backs* 1 (August/September): 10–16.

Rupp, Leila J. 1989a. "Feminism and the Sexual Revolution in the Early Twentieth Century: The Case of Doris Stevens." *Feminist Studies* 15(2):289–309.

———. 1989b. " 'Imagine My Surprise': Women's Relationships in Mid-Twentieth Century America." In *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past,* ed. Martin Bauml Duberman, Martha Vicinus, and George Chauncey, Jr., 395–410. New York: New American Library.

Rupp, Leila J., and Verta Taylor. 1987. *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryan, Barbara. 1989. "Ideological Purity and Feminism: The U.S. Women's Movement from 1966 to 1975." *Gender and Society* 3(2):239–57.

———. 1992. *Feminism and the Women's Movement.* New York: Harper Collins.

Samois. 1979. *What Color Is Your Handkerchief? A Lesbian S/M Sexuality Reader.* Berkeley, Calif.: Samois.

Schlozman, Kay Lehman. 1990. "Representing Women in Washington: Sisterhood and Pressure Politics." In *Women, Politics, and Change,* ed. Louise A. Tilly and Patricia Gurin, 339–82. New York: Sage.

Schneider, Beth. 1986. "Feminist Disclaimers, Stigma, and the Contemporary Women's Movement." Unpublished manuscript, Santa Barbara, Calif.

———. 1988. "Political Generations in the Contemporary Women's Movement." *Sociological Inquiry* 58(1):4–21.
Segal, Lynne, and Mary McIntosh. 1993. *Sex Exposed: Sexuality and the Pornography Debate.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
Sharon, Tanya, Farar Elliott, and Cecile Latham. 1991. "The National Lesbian Conference." *off our backs,* June, 1–4, 18–19.
Sims, Margot. 1982. *On the Necessity of Bestializing the Human Female.* Boston: South End.
Smeller, Michele M. 1992. "Crossing Over: The Negotiation of Sexual Identity in a Social Movement Community." Unpublished manuscript, Columbus, Ohio.
Smith, Barbara. 1983. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology.* New York: Kitchen Table; Women of Color Press.
Snitow, Ann, Christine Stansell, and Sharon Thompson. 1983. *Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality.* New York: Monthly Review Press.
Spelman, Elizabeth V. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought.* Boston: Beacon.
Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1991. *The Pro-Choice Movement.* New York: Oxford University Press.
Starr, Victoria. 1992. "The Changing Tune of Women's Music." *Advocate,* June 2, 68–71.
Stein, Arlene. 1989. "All Dressed Up but No Place to Go? Style Wars and the New Lesbianism." *Out/Look* 1(4):34–42.
———. 1993. *Sisters, Sexperts, Queers: Beyond the Lesbian Nation.* New York: Plume.
Stevens, Robin. 1991. "Style vs. Substance at the National Lesbian Conference." *Out/Look* 14:51–53.
Taylor, John. 1991. "Are You Politically Correct?" *New York,* January 21, 33–40.
Taylor, Verta. 1989a. "The Future of Feminism: A Social Movement Analysis." In *Feminist Frontiers II: Rethinking, Sex, Gender, and Society,* ed. Laurel Richardson and Verta Taylor, 473–90. New York: Random House.
———. 1989b. "Social Movement Continuity: The Women's Movement in Abeyance." *American Sociological Review* 54 (October): 761–75.
Taylor, Verta, and Nancy E. Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." In *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory,* ed. Aldon Morris and Carol Mueller, 104–29. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
———. 1993. "The New Feminist Movement." In *Feminist Frontiers III: Rethinking Sex, Gender, and Society,* ed. Laurel Richardson and Verta Taylor, 533–48. New York: Random House.
Trujillo, Carla. 1991. *Chicana Lesbians: The Girls Our Mothers Warned Us About.* Berkeley: Third Woman.
Vaid, Urvashi. 1991. "Let's Put Our Own House in Order." *Out/Look* 14 (Fall): 55–57.
Vance, Carole S., ed. 1984. *Pleasure and Danger: Exploring Female Sexuality.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
Walker, Alice. 1974. *In Search of Our Mothers' Gardens.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Walker, Rebecca. 1992. "Becoming the Third Wave." *Ms.* 2 (January/February): 39–41.

Whalen, Jack, and Richard Flacks. 1987. *Beyond the Barricades: The Sixties Generation Grows Up*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Whittier, Nancy E. 1988. "The Construction of a Politicized Collective Identity: Ideology and Symbolism in Contemporary Lesbian Feminist Communities." M.A. thesis, Ohio State University.

———. 1991. "Feminists in the 'Post-Feminist' Age: Collective Identity and the Persistence of the Women's Movement." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.

Wilkey, Cindy. 1991. "The Role of Women in Local Radical Organizations." Unpublished manuscript, Columbus, Ohio.

Williams, Brooke. 1978. "The Retreat to Cultural Feminism." In *Feminist Revolution,* ed. Redstockings of the Women's Liberation Movement. New York: Random House.

Willis, Ellen. 1984. "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism." In *The '60's without Apology,* ed. Sonya Sayres, Anders Stephanson, Stanley Aronowitz, and Fredric Jameson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wolf, Deborah Goleman. 1979. *The Lesbian Community.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Womoon Rising. 1982. Columbus, Ohio, Women's Action Collective newsletter. September/October and November/December.

Yollin, Patricia. 1991. "Painting the Town Lavender." *Image* (San Francisco *Examiner*), March 10, 18–29.

Young, Iris Marion. 1990. "The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference." In *Feminism/Postmodernism,* ed. Linda J. Nicholson, 300–323. New York: Routledge.

Zimmerman, Bonnie. 1990. *The Safe Sea of Women: Lesbian Fiction, 1969–1989*. Boston: Beacon.