

INTRODUCTION

Might it not be better if we asked ourselves what sort of relationships we can set up, invent, multiply or modify through our homosexuality? The problem is not trying to find out the truth about one's sexuality within oneself, but rather, nowadays, trying to use our sexuality to achieve a variety of different types of relationships.

MICHEL FOUCAULT¹

Not long after Michel Foucault, the author of *The History of Sexuality*, spoke about the "use" of "sexuality" to "achieve a variety of different types of relationships," James O'Higgins asked him in a 1982 interview about the "growing tendency in American intellectual circles, particularly among radical feminists, to distinguish between male and female homosexuality." O'Higgins wondered whether it was "worth insisting on the very different physical things that happen in the one encounter and the other." He also noted that "lesbians seem in the main to want from other women what one finds in stable heterosexual relationships: support, affection, long-term commitment." "If this is not the case with male homosexuals," O'Higgins argued, "then the difference may be said to be striking, if not fundamental."²

"All I can do is explode with laughter," Foucault replied, which prompted O'Higgins to ask, "Is the question funny in a way I don't see, or stupid, or both?" Foucault responded, "Well, it is certainly not stupid, but I find it very amusing, perhaps for reasons I couldn't give even if I wanted to. What I will say is that the distinction offered doesn't seem to me convincing, in terms of what I observe in the behavior of lesbian women. Beyond this, one would have to speak about the different pressures experienced by men and women who are coming out or are trying to make a life for themselves as homosexuals. I don't think that radical feminists in other countries are likely to see these questions quite in the way you ascribe to such women in American intellectual circles."³

Four years later, Adrienne Rich addressed the topics of differences and relationships between lesbians and gay men when she added a footnote to

her 1980 essay “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence.” Rich had written in the earlier version,

Lesbians have historically been deprived of a political existence through ‘inclusion’ as female versions of male homosexuality. . . . Part of the history of lesbian existence is, obviously, to be found where lesbians, lacking a coherent female community, have shared a kind of social life and common cause with homosexual men. But this has to be seen against the differences: women’s lack of economic and cultural privilege relative to men; qualitative differences in female and male relationships, for example, the prevalence of anonymous sex and the justification of pederasty among male homosexuals, the pronounced ageism in male homosexual standards of sexual attractiveness, etc. In defining and describing lesbian existence I would hope to move toward a dissociation of lesbian from male homosexual values and allegiances.

In her 1986 footnote, however, Rich changed her position, announcing, “I now think we have much to learn both from the uniquely female aspects of lesbian existence and from the complex ‘gay’ identity we share with gay men.”⁴

By 1990, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in *Epistemology of the Closet*, was observing a “refreshed sense that lesbians and gay men may share important though contested aspects of one another’s histories, cultures, identities, politics, and destinies.” Referring to “the many ways in which male and female homosexual identities had in fact been constructed through and in relation to each other over the last century—by the variously homophobic discourses of professional expertise, but also and just as actively by many lesbians and gay men,” Sedgwick argued that “there can’t be an *a priori* decision about how far it will make sense to conceptualize lesbian and gay male identities together. Or separately.”⁵

Four years later, Joan Nestle dedicated *Sister and Brother: Lesbians and Gay Men Write about Their Lives Together*, a collection that she coedited with John Preston, “to all the lesbians and gay men who honored each other with their love.” Preston wrote that the idea for the book had emerged when two friends “asked each other why the recent burst in lesbian and gay publishing didn’t reflect the reality of their lives: that most gay men and lesbians had, in fact, warm and often powerful relationships with one another.”⁶

As I think about the paths that I have taken to and through this book, I remember that each time I encountered these passages my interest was piqued. What they suggested to me was that lesbians and gay men paradoxically have used *same-sex* sexualities to set up, invent, multiply, and modify *cross-sex* relationships. *City of Sisterly and Brotherly Loves* offers a case study

of, an extended meditation on, and a series of tableaux concerned with this phenomenon. Challenging the tendency to conceive of lesbians and gay men as either entirely distinct or completely conjoined, I examine the history of their relationships. I argue that lesbian and gay history, for better and for worse, has much to teach us about the past, present, and future of relationships between what we tendentiously call “the sexes.”

My fascination with this subject began when I was an undergraduate student at Wesleyan University in the early 1980s. Intellectually inspired by both radical lesbian feminism and gay liberation and intimately involved with both women and men, I began to see relationships between lesbians and gay men as offering exciting opportunities for thinking in new ways about relationships between the sexes. By the late 1980s, I was working with both lesbians and gay men on the March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights, in the AIDS activist group MASS ACT OUT, and as the coordinating editor of *Gay Community News* in Boston. Intrigued by the alliances and divisions between lesbians and gay men that I witnessed and experienced, I wanted to learn more about their history. In 1989, when I moved to Philadelphia to begin graduate work at the University of Pennsylvania, and in the early 1990s, when I joined ACT UP (AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power) and Queer Action in Philadelphia, I witnessed and experienced a new set of relationships between lesbians and gay men. When it was time to select a topic for extended research, I chose the history of heterosocial relationships between lesbians and gay men.

I had first encountered the term “heterosocial” in Carroll Smith-Rosenberg’s 1975 essay, “The Female World of Love and Ritual.” Discussing bonds between women in the nineteenth century, Smith-Rosenberg writes that the “heterosocial” and “homosocial” worlds of women were “complementary.” Building on Smith-Rosenberg’s work, Kathy Peiss argues that “the complex passage from Victorian culture to modernism involved, among many other changes, a redefinition of gender relations, what might be termed the shift from homosocial to heterosocial culture.”⁷ Thinking about this shift, I realized that twentieth-century women and men have transformed the world of relationships between the sexes. Convinced that changing configurations of same-sex and cross-sex relationships were implicated in some of the most profound transformations of the century; determined to avoid the assumption that the only cross-sex relationships worth considering are sexual and heterosexual ones; committed to placing relationships between lesbians and gay men at the center, rather than the margins, of analysis; and interested in exploring the ways that lesbians and gay men both reproduced and subverted dominant heterosocial paradigms, I embarked on my project.⁸

Before beginning my primary research and writing, I looked to the best

books on U.S. lesbian and gay history to see what assistance they might offer. Jonathan Katz's documentary collections, *Gay American History* and *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*, John D'Emilio's work on political movements, *Sexual Politics*, *Sexual Communities*, Martin Duberman's collection of documents and essays, *About Time*, and Allan Bérubé's analysis of World War Two, *Coming Out under Fire*, were immensely helpful, providing me with first-rate studies of lesbians and gay men. But these books focused on topics other than the history of relationships between the sexes.⁹ As my work proceeded, Lillian Faderman's survey, *Odd Girls and Twilight Lovers*, Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Madeline Davis's study of Buffalo lesbians, *Boots of Leather, Slippers of Gold*, and George Chauncey's analysis of New York City gay men, *Gay New York*, were published, offering extraordinary insights into same-sex sexual cultures. But although these books acknowledged or demonstrated that lesbian and gay worlds overlapped, they were primarily single-sex studies, and with the exceptions of Esther Newton's *Cherry Grove*, *Fire Island* and Duberman's *Stonewall*, no new historical monographs took up questions about relationships between lesbians and gay men.¹⁰ A number of studies from disciplines other than history and historical anthropology explored related topics, offering provocative theories and insights about sex, gender, and sexuality.¹¹ But insofar as they rarely set their analyses in particular historical times and places or focused on processes of historical change, their usefulness for my project was limited.¹²

In the initial stages of my work, I made several choices that shaped what followed: I decided to focus first on organized political movements, in Philadelphia, in the period :From the 1940s to the 1970s. Why organized political movements? D'Emilio's study of national "homophile" activism successfully challenged the myth that the lesbian and gay movement began with the 1969 Stonewall riots in New York City, but I knew that local studies often reveal dimensions of history missed in national or transnational surveys. And apart from Duberman's *Stonewall*, none of the published local histories examined times and places where organized lesbian and gay political movements existed.

I focused on organized politics for three additional reasons. First, I had been involved in several movements, was interested in learning more about them, and hoped that a historical study might prove useful for my own work, and the work of others, in ongoing struggles. Second, movement activists often produce documents and publications, and often remain publicly visible, which I hoped would make for rich research possibilities. Third, I was convinced that organized movements, and particularly those in which people work collectively in sustained ways to promote justice and equality, have been key agents of historical change. In none of these areas was I disappointed.

Although researching the movement required that I travel around the country to examine the papers and publications of several major activists, help organize the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgendered Archives of Philadelphia to make use of its collections, and rely on the Freedom of Information Act to gain access to government documents, all of this aided my understanding. Moreover, as my work proceeded, I realized that the history of relations between lesbians and gay men was a crucial part of the history of lesbian and gay political movements and vice versa. Parts 3 and 4, which cover the years from 1960 to 1972, developed out of this stage of my work.

After learning a great deal about organized politics, I decided to explore the period immediately before the local movement developed, the 1940s and 1950s. I did this to see whether I could gain a better sense of what conditions helped precipitate the emergence of the movement and what differences it made to have a political movement on the local scene. To focus my work, I concentrated on public debates and discussions and specifically on representations of same-sex sexualities in print culture. Scholars in lesbian and gay studies have argued for years about the influence of medical, legal, religious, and literary texts on same-sex desires, behaviors, identities, communities, and movements.¹³ But there has been little work published on local print culture and I was convinced that this was an important area to consider. I also suspected that thinking about local print culture would help me understand local political culture, in part because I would learn about the dominant cultural forces against which the movement later struggled, but also because, by reading dominant cultural texts carefully, I would find traces of how lesbians and gay men resisted these forces in the absence of a local movement.

Here, too, there were more than just historiographic reasons for my decision. I had worked as a journalist, writer, and editor, and loved reading newspapers, magazines, and journals. From a research standpoint, I knew that printed texts are much more likely to survive and be available than other kinds of sources. And I was convinced that print culture mattered—that it exercised powerful influence in mid-twentieth-century US. culture. Here, too, I was not disappointed. Although doing research on local print culture in a city whose newspapers are not indexed was difficult, the rewards were well worth the labor. Moreover, I soon realized that the history of relations between lesbians and gay men was very much shaped by local print culture and vice versa. Local print culture represented lesbians and gay men in different but related ways and this influenced and was influenced by the ways that lesbians and gay men represented one another. Part 2 is the result of this dimension of my work.

Long before I finished these chapters, I knew that I wanted to broaden

my conception of politics beyond organized movements and public culture. After D'Emilio's study of the national homophile movement was published in 1983, much of the next generation of scholarship concentrated on everyday political resistance and the politics of everyday life. Chauncey, for example, writes that "the history of gay resistance must be understood to extend beyond formal political organizing to include the strategies of everyday resistance that men devised in order to claim space for themselves in the midst of a hostile society." He explains that "the full panoply of tactics gay men devised for communicating, claiming space, and affirming themselves . . . proved to be remarkably successful in the generations before a more formal gay political movement developed." Kennedy and Davis, discussing lesbians who "forged a culture for survival and resistance under difficult conditions," argue that "these were signs of a movement in its prepolitical stage." Noting that "the personal *is* political," they explain that they use the term "prepolitical" "to make distinctions between different kinds of resistance." Highlighting the importance of everyday strategies, they conclude that "both the homophile movement and gay liberation had their roots in the working-class culture of bars and house parties."¹⁴

I found these approaches compelling, but I was troubled by the implications that everyday resistance was not "political" in its own right and that "political" resistance followed "prepolitical" resistance in a linear historical process. I also encountered scholarship that suggested that everyday resistance not only inspired, supported, and sustained organized movements, but also worked at odds with them. Activists often encountered opposition and apathy in the communities that they purported to represent, and community members often encountered opposition and apathy in the movements that purported to represent them. Newton argues that "gay liberation's fundamental premise, that gay people must openly declare their sexual preference, was a direct challenge not only to the dominant society but also to the old gay survival methods." She also suggests that whereas "camp culture" in Cherry Grove emphasized "gender reversal, theatrical parody, and heightened sensation," lesbian and gay movement culture was "more influenced by the democratic earnestness of the Declaration of Independence and Walt Whitman." Newton concludes that Cherry Grovers were "determined to ignore" the lesbian and gay movement because "for any resort to become politically active works against a fundamental dichotomy in industrial life between leisure time and work time." According to Newton, in a world divided into "the 'male' public sphere, the domain of work and political action, and the supposedly private 'female' sphere of home, family life, and sexuality," Grovers struggled in the latter.¹⁵ As I began pursuing this line of inquiry, I realized that because I had chosen a time and place with ample

evidence of both everyday resistance and organized movement politics, I had a unique opportunity to explore dynamic relationships between the two. Soon I saw that the history of these dynamic relationships was itself intertwined with the history of relationships between lesbians and gay men. Lesbians and gay men moved in different but related ways between the realms of everyday resistance, public culture, and organized movement politics.

As was the case with the other dimensions of my project, there were additional reasons for pursuing this one. I knew as an activist about the support, interest, opposition, and apathy that movements can encounter in their communities; and I knew as a member of several communities about the ways that organized movements can succeed and fail in representing those communities. As an activist working in the conservative 1980s and 1990s, I knew that micropolitical resistance can sustain and support macropolitical struggles even in the worst of times but can undermine efforts to build powerful organized movements even in the best of times. I hoped that working in this area would help me think about how everyday resistance and organized political movements could work together more effectively. From a research standpoint, my work on movement documents and print culture provided me with evidence of everyday resistance, but the 45 oral history interviews that I conducted—19 with lesbians, 24 with gay men, and 2 with straights—proved even more valuable. Although researching everyday life is more difficult than researching organized movements and print culture, here, too, I was pleased with what I learned. Part 1, which covers the full period from 1945 to 1972, derives from this work.

Why Philadelphia? As I designed my project, I had a strong sense that the field of North American lesbian and gay history had moved into a stage in which local studies were building on earlier national scholarship. I supported this move in part because finely textured local studies can reveal things that national and transnational studies cannot and in part because local studies offer intriguing possibilities for doing antinationalist and nonnationalist scholarship.¹⁶ I also liked the idea of doing a local study because I had strong attachments to place—to Shrub Oak, New York, where I grew up; to Middletown, Connecticut, where I went to college; and to Greater Boston, Massachusetts, where I lived for several years after that.

Feeling very much part of a cohort of lesbian and gay history scholars who were dividing up the map of the United States and Canada, I chose Philadelphia, where I was then living. Most published work in lesbian and gay history focused on New York City and San Francisco, which were known to have large and visible lesbian and gay communities, but I wondered about other major cities. When I began my research, Philadelphia was probably North America's biggest city *without* a reputation for a sizable lesbian and

gay community. I wondered what I would find there and how this would compare to what others were finding elsewhere.

Although in many ways it made sense for me to research Philadelphia, in one particular way I worried at the outset that it did not: I did not like Philadelphia very much. Concerned about what this would mean for my work, I was partially relieved when I read about a study that revealed that Philadelphia had an unusually large percentage of residents who claimed that they would rather live elsewhere. Convinced by this that I had become a Philadelphian, I commenced my study. In the process of doing it, and with the fresh appreciation that developed after I left the city in 1996, I came to respect, admire, and like Philadelphia much more.

Although I selected Philadelphia at an early stage, only later did I set my work into an urban studies framework, exploring the ways that lesbians and gay men affected the city and the ways that the city affected lesbians and gay men. In addition to learning more about urban studies, this involved examining Philadelphia history, politics, and geography, and thinking more about what was distinctive about Philadelphia and what was not. As I worked in this area, I wondered about the ways that Philadelphia's many appellations—City of Brotherly Love, Holy Experiment, Quaker City, Birthplace of the Nation, Workshop of the World, City of Neighborhoods, City of Homes, and Private City—could be linked with lesbian and gay history. I was also curious about the relevance for lesbian and gay history of Philadelphia's oft-celebrated traditions of religious toleration, sex egalitarianism, and racial/ethnic multiculturalism, all of which are said to be rooted in founder William Penn's seventeenth-century Quaker vision.¹⁷ Meanwhile, I encountered helpful new mapping technologies and provocative new scholarship on contemporary lesbian and gay geographies, which led me to organize part I's discussion of everyday resistance around different types of urban environments.¹⁸

Why 1945 to 1972? This period long fascinated me, partly because of the powerful roles that social movements played in these years. Given the fact that historians often begin to write about an era approximately 20 years after the era is over, I also thought it would be interesting to take part in the process whereby the recent past becomes history. Born in 1963, I have many memories of the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, but not of earlier decades. To me, the years between 1945 and 1972 seem profoundly similar to, yet different from, the years I remember well. This period shaped my world and the historian in me wants to understand more about how this past influenced my present.

Some of my reasons for focusing on these years were more particular to lesbian and gay history and Philadelphia history. Despite the rich scholarship

on the pre-Stonewall era, the prevailing view continues to insist that lesbian and gay history began with the New York City riots of 1969, and this makes pre-1969 scholarship especially important. That said, I also thought it would be interesting to cross the Stonewall divide, to explore what differences the riots made by examining the period immediately following them. Another reason for focusing on the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s was that, to the extent that much lesbian and gay historical research has depended upon oral history, opportunities for learning from lesbians and gay men who remember these decades will decline and then disappear with time. I decided to begin with 1945 because of D'Emilio and Bérubé's convincing arguments that a new era in lesbian and gay history began with the conclusion of World War II.¹⁹ I chose 1972 as my endpoint for three main reasons. First, I recognized that the kind of research that I needed to conduct for the pre-1972 era, which involved pursuing every document that I could find, would be impossible for the post-1972 era, which experienced a lesbian and gay information explosion. Second, I have many memories of the years after 1972 and found that they unproductively complicated my ability to think historically about this period. And third, Philadelphia's first "gay pride" parade, which took place in the summer of 1972, provided me with a way to weave together many of my narrative threads.

I have a number of different audiences in mind for this book: lesbian and gay Philadelphians, lesbians and gay men, Philadelphians, activists, students, historians, and scholars in sex, gender, and sexuality studies. Although my work has been shaped by the interpretive frameworks described above, at times I play the role of the documentarian, offering passages designed to enable readers to pursue their own interests and reach their own conclusions. I follow the conventional historian's practice of using the past tense when referring to materials that I am using as evidence *from* the past and the present tense when referring to materials that I am using as scholarship *about* the past. Because I regard my narrators (my oral history sources) as experts looking back on the past, I use the present tense for their statements. I have edited the oral history narratives for purposes of clarity, which several narrators asked me to do.

While all of the texts that I discuss are representations, I want to call attention to the fact that the oral history narratives were produced 20–60 years after the period under consideration and were created in dialogue with me—a Euro-American, Jewish, middle-class, academic, activist gay man. Before beginning each interview, I described the nature of my project and offered to answer questions about my work, politics, and life. In several cases, narrators asked a question that led me to reveal that I identified as gay (which the others probably assumed) and that I had a history of sexual

relationships with both women and men (which the others probably did not assume).²⁰

Although the people whom I discuss did not necessarily use the terms “lesbian” and “gay” in the period under study (most narrators say that they commonly used the term “gay” for both women and men before the 1970s), I call the men “gay” and the women “lesbian.” In a project concerned primarily with cross-sex relationships, it seemed best to use terms that distinguished between the sexes, even though this risked reinstating the very differences and relationships that I try to historicize. I asked the narrators to decide whether they wanted me to use their real names or pseudonyms. If they requested the latter, I had them choose alternative names. Pseudonyms are placed in quotation marks the first time they are used.

The book is divided into four parts. Part 1, “Everyday Geographies 1945–1972,” explores convergences and divergences in lesbian and gay cultures. Chapter 1 focuses on residential neighborhoods. Chapter 2 examines commercial establishments, including bars, clubs, and restaurants. Chapter 3 focuses on public space, including parks, streets, and parades. In these chapters, I point out that there were significant differences between the sexes; between racial, ethnic, and class groups; and between types of space. For example, lesbians relied more heavily on strategies of public invisibility and more often socialized in the “private” sphere. These differences affected relationships between lesbians and gay men. For example, gay men tended to be more visible to lesbians than lesbians were to gay men. But in spite of these differences, lesbians and gay men concentrated in the same three neighborhoods (Center City, West Philadelphia, and Germantown/Mount Airy) and developed everyday cultures that overlapped. While lesbian and gay geographies partially diverged and partially converged, they together transformed the twentieth-century metropolis and their history together reveals much about the sexing and gendering of urban worlds.

Part 2, “Public Cultures, 1945–1960,” examines textual representations of female and male same-sex sexualities before the rise of the local lesbian and gay movement. While the vast majority of these texts focused on male sexualities, I resist fully reproducing this focus by devoting significant attention to the references to female sexualities that did appear and by considering the implications of these representations for both sexes. Chapter 4 provides a survey of popular, legal, and medical publications, focusing on narratives of gay murders, sex crimes, and sexual psychopathologies. Chapter 5 examines debates about the naming of the Walt Whitman Bridge. Chapter 6 focuses on conflicts surrounding coffeehouses.

In these chapters, I argue that same-sex sexuality was a major theme in local print culture, that female and male same-sex sexualities were treated

differently, and that discussions of same-sex sexualities tended to focus on male sexualities or derive claims about female sexualities from male counterparts. This section shows that dominant discourse responded to the existence of the vibrant lesbian and gay cultures discussed in part 1 but offered partial, distorted, and generally negative depictions of them. Constructing gay men as public and visible actors and lesbians as private and invisible objects, public discourse influenced lesbian and gay relationships by creating conditions for particular kinds of alliances, identifications, antagonisms, and conflicts between lesbians and gay men. For example, partly because public discourse concentrated on male same-sex sexualities, lesbians more often confronted public invisibility whereas gay men more often confronted negative visibility. Partly because of the public focus on gay men, lesbians simultaneously experienced greater identification and greater conflict with gay men than gay men did with lesbians. Offering a case study of relationships between everyday community culture and public print culture, part 2 shows how these relationships were sexed and gendered for all women and men.

Part 3, "Political Movements, 1960–1969," explores relationships between lesbians and gay men in homophile groups. Here I place everyday practices and dominant cultural representations in the background and bring political activism to the fore. Chapter 7 discusses the founding of the organized lesbian and gay movement in Philadelphia after an unprecedented police raid on a political meeting in 1960. Chapter 8 examines the strategy of heterosocial respectability used by lesbians and gay men in the Mattachine Society of Philadelphia and the Janus Society between 1960 and 1963. Chapter 9 concentrates on two new strategies that emerged between 1963 and 1967: militant respectability, which was employed by allied lesbians and gay men in East Coast Homophile Organizations, and sexual liberationism, which was employed by gay men in the Janus Society. Chapter 10 focuses on the rise of militant respectability, as practiced by the Philadelphia chapter of the Daughters of Bilitis and the Homophile Action League, and the fall of sexual liberationism, as practiced by the Janus Society, between 1967 and 1969. In each of these chapters (and in the chapters of part 4), I focus on synchronic lesbian and gay developments to highlight their conjunctions and disjunctions.

Documenting the roles that Philadelphia lesbian and gay activists played in organizing conferences, sit-ins, and demonstrations, producing the national movement's most widely circulating publications (the *Ladder* and *Drum*), and bringing a major case before the U.S. Supreme Court, these chapters also reveal the state repression that these activists encountered. Exploring heretofore unexamined traditions of mixed-sex organizing and sexual radicalism in the homophile movement, part 3 examines what lesbians and gay men lost

and gained in the alliances and divisions that they created. I conclude that while lesbians and gay men experienced both conflict and cooperation in their movement work, they shared fundamental assumptions about the nature of differences between women and men. Exploring both links and gaps between strategies of everyday resistance, which often depended upon public invisibility, and strategies of movement activism, which often depended upon public visibility, I also show how relationships between these two types of strategies were sexed and gendered.

Part 4, “Twin Revolutions? 1969–1972,” and the conclusion, “Sexual Pride, Sexual Conservatism,” examine relationships between lesbians and gay men in the new movements of the post-Stonewall era. Chapter 11 discusses the continuing strength of militant respectability, as practiced by the Homophile Action League in 1969–1970. Chapter 12 considers the new strategy of gay liberation as employed by the Gay Liberation Front of 1970–1971. Chapter 13 concentrates on the new strategy of lesbian feminism as used by the Radicalesbians of 1971–1972. The conclusion explores two public demonstrations in the summer of 1972—Philadelphia’s first “gay pride” parade and Philadelphia’s Women’s Strike Day march. In addition to tracing the multiracialization of organized lesbian and gay politics, these chapters show that gay liberationists and lesbian feminists developed parallel agendas that reflected countercultural and radical values, challenged the idea that lesbians and gay men were sexual minorities, and put forward the idea that the potential for same-sex sexual desires was universal. Exploring the influences that gay liberationists and lesbian feminists had upon one another, I resist the tendency to see separation as a sign of isolation. In the end, I argue that while the new strategies differed from one another and from the strategies used by the homophile movement of the 1960s, they, too, reinforced the idea that the sexes were intrinsically different.

In the absence of much published research on relationships between lesbians and gay men in other cities, it is difficult to determine how typical or prototypical Philadelphia was. I would speculate that everyday lesbian and gay cultures overlapped significantly in other North American cities during this period and that local print culture generally focused more on male same-sex sexualities and derived claims about female same-sex sexualities from male counterparts. While I would predict, therefore, that my arguments in parts 1 and 2 will be applicable to other cities, I would speculate that parts 3 and 4 discuss aspects of Philadelphia~ that were more distinctive. Lesbian and gay activists in other cities undoubtedly united and divided; they undoubtedly did so for many of the same reasons and in many of the same ways that Philadelphia’s did; and they undoubtedly embraced some of the same homophile, gay liberationist, and lesbian feminist strategies that were

used by Philadelphians. But research thus far suggests that Philadelphians were in the forefront of heterosocial lesbian and gay activism, lesbian homophile militancy, gay sexual radicalism, multiracial gay liberationism, and African American lesbian feminism. That said, Philadelphia lesbian and gay activists were probably typical in believing that women and men were profoundly different.

Monique Wittig has argued that “the class struggle between women and men . . . is that which resolves the contradictions between the sexes, abolishing them at the same time as it makes them understood.”²¹ *City of Sisterly and Brotherly Loves* suggests that while Philadelphia lesbians and gay men were engaging in other important struggles, they were not furthering the goal of abolishing the sexes. Reviewing the many accomplishments of Philadelphia’s lesbian and gay communities between 1945 and 1972, I am struck most by the ways in which these communities both challenged dominant cultural ideas about sexuality and reinforced dominant cultural ideas about sex. Criticizing the notion that straights were superior to lesbians and gay men, they embraced the notion that women and men were fundamentally different. Playing unique roles in struggles to reimagine, reconstruct, and deconstruct relationships between the sexes, they performed in ways that reproduced these relationships. Subverting the hegemony of heterosexuality, they strengthened the hegemony of sex. This remains the central paradox of lesbian and gay identities.