

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

Great Events from History: LGBTQ Events is a new, updated version of a reference work originally published in 2006. This new edition not only provides new articles but also includes hundreds of updates and new bibliographical citations relevant to older articles. This set, like its predecessor, chronicles important historical events from around the world that have identified, defined, and legally established the rights of gays, lesbians, bisexuals, queers, and transsexual, transgender, intersex, and asexual persons. In editorially defining the content of this two-volume set, we adopted the thinking expressed by historian Jonathan Ned Katz in the preface to the revised edition (1992) of his edited collection *Gay American History: Lesbians and Gay Men in the U.S.A.*:

... the major terms defining our object of study, "homosexual" and "heterosexual," applied to a past society, may obscure the very different ways in which same-sex and different-sex pleasures were organized and constructed under different social conditions. Our modern concepts, applied uncritically to the past, simply project our present social organization of eroticism, procreation, and gender onto that past, distorting our ability to see it as it was to those who lived it. Applied to the past, "homosexuality" and "heterosexuality" may deny the difference of past and present, and may deny us a subtle, sophisticated sense of historical diversity.

Our chronology thus begins in the mid-nineteenth century, when German journalist Karl Maria Kertbeny, an advocate for the repeal of sodomy laws, coined the terms "homosexual" and "heterosexual."

We also have attempted to select events that help to mark the definition of "gender," the emergence of social, cultural, and political movements, and the

struggles to gain civil rights. In some cases, one event represents and offers discussion of many. For example, the article on Illinois becoming the first state to abolish its laws against consensual homosexual acts in 1961 also discusses the effect of this action on other states. In particular, essays also include "see also" cross-references to related articles within the set. By following these "see also" suggestions, readers can often gain a surprisingly thorough sense of common themes and significant historical developments. Readers can also often gain a more thorough sense of the many secondary sources relevant to articles that share the same basic focus or themes.

ESSAY LENGTH AND FORMAT

This set, devoted to the history of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual, intersex, asexual, and queer persons (LGBTQ) joins other titles in Salem Press's *Great Events from History* sets. As in the chronological references to worldwide events in Salem's other history sets, we have approached the discussion of each historical event with a uniform essay format. Each essay, which has an average length of 3,000 words, prominently displays the following:

- *Date or date range* of the event;
- *Brief summary* of the event and its significance;
- *Also known as* where appropriate;
- *Locale* of the event;
- *Categories*, or type of event covered, including Arts, Government and Politics, HIV-AIDS, Race and Ethnicity, Science, Sports, and Trans-gender and Transsexuality;
- *Key Figures* of the event, with birth and death dates, and brief descriptor.

Great Events From History: LGBTQ Events

The text of each essay is divided into the following sections:

- *Summary of Event*: Describes the event chronologically and includes discussion to place the event in context;
- *Significance*: Describes the event's historical impact, influence, and significance;
- *Byline*: Name of the contributor who wrote the essay;
- *Further Reading*: Sources for further study appropriate and accessible to librarians, students, and the general public; includes some Web sites;
- *See Also*: Lists related essays within the LGBTQ set.

SPECIAL FEATURES

These two volumes include more than 150 sidebars with quotations from primary source documents designed to add to the reader's understanding of the topics discussed. Many essays include:

- Extracts from primary source documents such as court decisions, mission statements, and laws, and biographical profiles of individuals who were key to the event;
- Tables and charts;
- Filmography.

More than 100 photographs and other images are included, such as news photos and photographic portraits, book and magazine covers, book title pages, government documents, and movie posters.

Because the set is ordered chronologically, an Alphabetical List of Contents appears in the front matter to both volumes.

The back matter in Volume 2 contains a number of reference tools to help readers further explore LGBTQ history:

- *Annotated Bibliography*, organized by category, directs readers to accessible sources, mainly books, for further study;
- *Chronology* provides a timeline of significant LGBTQ events, from the mid-19th century to 2017.
- *Category Index* provides access to the individual essays through 20 broad areas of interest;
- *Subject Index* provides access to the individual essays and their content through multiple access points.

THE CONTRIBUTORS

Salem Press extends its appreciation to all who have been involved in the development and production of this work, especially the original editorial board -- Lillian Faderman, Horacio Roque Ramírez, Yolanda Retter, Stuart Timmons, and Eric C. Wat – and Robert C. Evans, editor of the revised edition. Thanks also to consultant Karl E. Bryant. Essays were written by academic specialists and independent scholars, whose expert contributions made this interdisciplinary project possible. Their names and affiliations appear in the front matter of this volume.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

The original edition of this *Great Events From History: Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Events* was published in 2006. In the nearly 12 years since then, much has changed in the study of “queer” history and culture. One key change concerns the way the field is now identified. The original volume focused, as its title indicated, on gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender events. The present edition is devoted to LGBTQ events, to include queer, and that acronym could very easily have been lengthened to LGBTTTQIA, to include transvestite, transsexual, intersex, and asexual persons. But even that would not accommodate all the various kinds of identities that are now, often, designated simply as queer -- a term that suggests something outside the traditional heterosexual binary way of thinking. Until queer communities decide on a simpler way of designating themselves, we have chosen, for the time being, to use LGBTQ as the title of this new edition, and throughout the text.

Far more has changed since 2006, however, than terms alone. Perhaps no other decade has seen a more rapid advance in the recognition and rights of LGBTQ people than the last ten or so years. Queers are now far more visible - and far more accepted - in the western world than has ever been the case in modern history. LGBTQ rights, of course, are not yet legally protected worldwide, nor is LGBTQ culture welcomed in many places across the globe, including in the supposedly

more tolerant west. But if the developments of the past decade are any indication, the future is likely to result in even greater liberalization of attitudes and laws than has already occurred.

Preparing the second, revised edition of this book involved, first, a thorough updating of the bibliographical entries that appeared in the first edition. Limitations of space have made it impossible to include every (or even most) of the new sources that have become available since 2006. Much, however, has been added, and readers are advised to follow the links suggested at the end of each article. These will often lead them to many other relevant sources than the ones contained in any single essay.

Another important addition to the second version of this book has been the inclusion of twenty-five or so completely new articles. Although these new articles extend the original volumes' coverage to the present day, many of them discuss important events that occurred before 2006, when the first edition was published. Taken together, these new articles demonstrate just how much progress has been made in the rights of LGBTQ people, as well as how much progress remains to be made.

The Publisher's Note to this edition gives a clear, detailed sense of the purposes of these volumes as well as how they can be most profitably used.

Robert C. Evans
November, 2017

pejones.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/JBYLH_PublicOpinionTrans.pdf

Martin, Christina. “Quinnipiac Poll: Jenner’s Gender Doesn’t Change Many Opinions on Transgenders.” Politicspa.com. June 24, 2015. Available at <http://www.politicspa.com/quinnipiac-poll-jenners-gender-doesnt-change-many-opinions-on-transgenders/67227/>

Miller, Korin. “This Is How the Majority of America Really Feels About Caitlyn Jenner.” Womenshealthmag.com. June 9, 2015. Available at <http://www.womenshealthmag.com/life/impact-of-caitlyn-jenner-transgender-acceptance>.

Mooney, Carla. *Caitlyn Jenner*. New York: Rosen, 2016.

Robinson, Wills. “From Growing Breasts, Surgery in Denmark and Cross Dressing in Public to Marrying

Kris and Building a Reality Empire as a Man: How Bruce Backed Out of 1980s Sex Change Plan to Transform Himself into ‘Heather.’” Dailymail.com. Available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3055315/From-female-hormones-thoughts-Denmark-sex-exchange-cross-dressing-public-marrying-Kris-Bruce-Jenner-nearly-transitioned-1980s-planned-return-Aunt-Heather-children.html>

Witkin, Rachel. “After Caitlyn Jenner Story, Poll Finds Majority Have No Moral Issue With Transgender People.” Thenewcivilrightsmovement.com Available at http://www.thenewcivilrightsmovement.com/rachelwitkin/most_americans_think_that_it_s_acceptable_for_people_to_be_transgender_poll

THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT LEGALIZES SAME-SEX MARRIAGE

2015

In a 5-4 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court held that same-sex couples had the same right to legal marriage as heterosexuals enjoyed.

DATE: June 26, 2015

ALSO KNOWN AS: *Obergefell vs. Hodges*

LOCALE: Washington, D.C.

CATEGORIES: Laws, acts, and legal history; civil rights

KEY FIGURES

Richard Hodges Director, Ohio Department of Health
James Obergefell (b. 1966), Ohio realtor and IT consultant, petitioner in *Obergefell vs. Hodges*



The crowd assembled in front of the Supreme Court of the United States in Washington, DC on Friday, June 26, 2015, a half-hour before the Court would hand down its decision in Obergefell v. Hodges, ruling that bans on same-sex marriage violate the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

(Courtesy of Mattpopovich via Wikimedia Commons)

John Roberts (b. 1955), Chief Justice of the United States, who wrote the dissenting opinion disputing the Supreme Court’s right to determine whether same-sex marriage should be legal throughout the United States

Anthony M. Kennedy (b. 1936), Supreme Court justice who wrote the majority opinion legalizing same-sex marriage

SUMMARY OF EVENT

Obergefell v. Hodges actually involved the consolidation of a number of similar cases brought by same-sex individuals against various government entities in several individual states. On January 23, 2012, April DeBoer and Jane Rowse sued the state of Michigan, which allowed only heterosexual couples to adopt children. On the advice of a judge, their suit evolved into a larger argument asserting the legal right for same-sex couples to marry. On March 21, 2014, the judge ruled in the plaintiffs’ favor, finding Michigan’s prohibition against same-sex marriages unconstitutional.

In July 2013, a long-time couple from Ohio, Jim Obergefell and John Arthur, were married in Maryland, but when Ohio refused to recognize their union, they quickly filed suit against their home state, arguing that just as Ohio recognized valid out-of-state heterosexual marriages, so it should recognize their recent union in

Obergefell v. Hodges (2003)

Justice Kennedy delivered the opinion of the Court: Four principles and traditions demonstrate that the reasons marriage is fundamental under the Constitution apply with equal force to same-sex couples. The first premise of this Court's relevant precedents is that the right to personal choice regarding marriage is inherent in the concept of individual autonomy. . . . Decisions about marriage are among the most intimate that an individual can make. . . . This is true for all persons, whatever their sexual orientation.

A second principle in this Court's jurisprudence is that the right to marry is fundamental because it supports a two-person union unlike any other in its importance to the committed individuals. The intimate association protected by this right was central to *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which held the Constitution protects the right of married couples to use contraception. . . . Same-sex couples have the same right as opposite-sex couples to enjoy intimate association, a right extending beyond mere freedom from laws making same-sex intimacy a criminal offense. . . .

A third basis for protecting the right to marry is that it safeguards children and families and thus draws meaning from related rights of childrearing, procreation, and education. . . . Without the recognition, stability, and predictability marriage offers, children suffer the stigma of knowing their families are somehow lesser. They also suffer the significant material costs of being raised by unmarried parents, relegated to a more difficult and uncertain family life. The marriage laws at issue thus harm and humiliate the children of same-sex couples. . . . This does not mean that the right to marry is less meaningful for those who do not or cannot have children. Precedent protects the right of a married couple not to procreate, so the right to marry cannot be conditioned on the capacity or commitment to procreate.

Finally, this Court's cases and the Nation's traditions make clear that marriage is a keystone of the Nation's social order. . . . States have contributed to the fundamental character of marriage by placing it at the center of

many facets of the legal and social order. There is no difference between same- and opposite-sex couples with respect to this principle, yet same-sex couples are denied the constellation of benefits that the States have linked to marriage and are assigned to an instability many opposite-sex couples would find intolerable. It is demeaning to lock same-sex couples out of a central institution of the Nation's society, for they too may aspire to the transcendent purposes of marriage. The limitation of marriage to opposite-sex couples may long have

seemed natural and just, but its inconsistency with the central meaning of the fundamental right to marry is now manifest. . . .

The Fourteenth Amendment requires States to recognize same-sex marriages validly performed out of State. Since same-sex couples may now exercise the fundamental right to marry in all States, there is no lawful basis for a State to refuse to recognize a lawful same-sex marriage performed in another State on the ground of its same-sex character.

Maryland. Arthur was terminally ill and wanted Obergefell to be his legal surviving spouse. Although local officials agreed, the state attorney general argued in favor of Ohio's prohibition of same-sex marriage. Initial rulings favored the arguments of Obergefell and Arthur (as well as other plaintiffs who had joined the case). On October 22, Arthur died. Ohio moved to dismiss the case. but ultimately, on December 23, the court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. Other, similar cases – in Ohio, Kentucky, and Tennessee – ended in 2014 with judges consistently ruling in favor of the plaintiffs. Same-sex marriage, which was already widely legal in many states, was now increasingly being acknowledged as legal by some U.S. judges. In all, six judges had found state prohibitions on same-sex marriage unconstitutional.

However, later in 2014, officials in the states of Ohio, Michigan, Tennessee, and Kentucky appealed these rulings and, in November of that year, two of three judges for the Sixth District Court ruled in favor of Ohio's claims, citing a 1972 Supreme Court precedent and also indicting that approval of same-sex marriage should come from each state's voters, not from judges. Plaintiffs in the various cases appealed this ruling to the U.S. Supreme Court, which agreed, in early 2015, to hear the consolidated cases. Many "friend of the court" briefs were filed in favor of the plaintiffs, whose position was also supported by the U.S. Justice Department.

On June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court ruled 5-4 in favor of the plaintiffs. Judge Anthony Kennedy, who wrote the majority opinion, was supported by justices

Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Elena Kagan, and Sonia Sotomayor, all appointed by Democratic presidents. Kennedy, who was now widely regarded as the “swing vote” on an ideologically divided court, had been appointed by Republican President Ronald Reagan. The four dissenters in the case – justices Samuel Alito, John R. Roberts, Antonin Scalia, and Clarence Thomas – had all been appointed by Republican presidents. The ideological division within the court replicated a similar division within the country. Supporters of the decision argued that marriage was a fundamental constitutional right regardless of the gender of the parties involved; opponents of the decision argued that the court was preempting a decision that should properly be left to elected representatives. Supporters of the decision replied, however, that the determination of basic constitutional rights should not be decided by majority opinion.

SIGNIFICANCE

The decision in favor of the plaintiffs in *Obergefell v. Hodges* is probably the most significant ruling in the whole history of legal judgments about the rights of same-sex people in the United States. It affirmed the rapidly growing acceptance of same-sex marriage in the country – acceptance both by courts and, increasingly, by public opinion. Most states at the time of the *Obergefell v. Hodges* ruling already acknowledged the rights of same-sex persons to marry and to have their marriages recognized outside of the states in which they had originally wed. The Supreme Court ruling seemed to affirm the arguments favoring gay marriage that had been increasingly made over the preceding two decades. Gay rights advocates had long contended that marriage was a core constitutional right that should not be denied to same-sex persons. When opponents of gay marriage suggested that they would be willing to accept “civil unions” between gays instead of marriage *per se* (which they associated with religious codes and long-standing cultural traditions), advocates of gay marriage argued that such arrangements would be demeaning and would imply their continuing second-class status as citizens in the U.S. Although the Supreme Court ruling did not silence all arguments against gay marriage, it effectively abolished legal prohibitions. With some notable exceptions, including some Americans who continued to find the majority’s reasoning flawed, most Americans quickly accepted that the issue had now been settled.

In some ways, the Court’s ruling reflected changes in American popular opinion about same-sex marriage

after the turn of the twenty-first century. In 1996, it had been Democratic President Bill Clinton who had signed the so-called “Defense of Marriage Act,” which had defined marriage as a legal relationship between one man and one woman. Throughout the 2000’s, Hillary Clinton (Bill Clinton’s wife) – and herself a candidate for various important government offices, including President – became increasingly accepting of the idea of same-sex marriage. Although at first she had seemed to favor civil unions, in March 2013 she expressed explicit support for marriage equality. In 2014, challenged about the sincerity of her changed opinions, she said “I think we have all evolved, and it’s been one of the fastest, most sweeping transformations.”

Meanwhile Barack Obama, elected president in 2008, underwent a similar evolution. According to Politifact, “Obama, a consistent supporter of civil rights for gay couples, nevertheless said as early as 2004 and through 2008 that he didn’t support same-sex marriage. In 2010, he said he wasn’t prepared to reverse himself.” But by the spring of 2012, he had come out in favor of complete marriage rights for same-sex people. The 2015 Supreme Court ruling, then, ratified a growing consensus in favor of (or at least not vehemently opposed to) same-sex marriage. In 2016, Donald Trump, then Republican presidential candidate, indicated that he considered the matter settled law. In May 2017, a Gallup poll indicated that 64 per cent of Americans surveyed actually approved of same-sex marriage, while 71 per cent thought it should be legal even if some of them objected to it in theory.

—Robert C. Evans

FURTHER READING

- Bowers, Becky. “President Barack Obama’s Shifting Stance on Gay Marriage.” Politifact.com. May 11, 2012. Available at <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2012/may/11/barack-obama/president-barack-obamas-shift-gay-marriage>.
- Cenziper, Debbie and Jim Obergefell. *Love Wins: The Lovers and Lawyers Who Fought the Landmark Case for Marriage Equality*. New York: HarperCollins, 2016.
- Frank, Nathaniel. *Awakening: How Gays and Lesbians Brought Marriage Equality to America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017.
- McCaskill, Nolan D. “Poll: 64 percent of Americans Approve Same-Sex Marriage.” Politico.com. May 15, 2017. Available at <http://www.politico.com/>

story/2017/05/15/poll-same-sex-marriage-america-238393.

Newton, David E. *Same-Sex Marriage: A Reference Handbook*. 2nd ed. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2016.

“Obergefell vs. Hodges.” Scotusblog.com. Available at <http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/obergefell-v-hodges/>

Sherman, Amy. “Hillary Clinton’s Changing Position on Same-Sex Marriage.” Polifact.com. June 17, 2015. Available at <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2015/jun/17/hillary-calinton/hillary-clinton-change-position-same-sex-marriage>.

Stokols, Eli. “Trump Says He’s ‘Fine’ with Legalization of Same-Sex Marriage.” Politco.com. November 13, 2016. Available at

<http://www.politico.com/story/2016/11/donald-trump-same-sex-marriage-231310>.

See Also: 1885: United Kingdom Criminalizes “Gross Indecency”; January 12, 1939: *Thompson v. Al-dredge* Dismisses Sodomy Charges Against Lesbians; 1961: Illinois Legalizes Consensual Homosexual Sex; January 22, 1973: *Roe v. Wade* Legalizes Abortion and Extends Privacy Rights; June 21, 1973: U.S. Supreme Court Supports Local Obscenity Laws; August, 1973: American Bar Association Calls for Repeal of Laws Against Consensual Sex; October 18, 1973: Lambda Legal Authorized to Practice Law; November 17, 1975: U.S. Supreme Court Rules in “Crimes Against Nature” Case; 1981: Gay and Lesbian Palimony Suits Emerge; 1986: *Bowers v. Hardwick* Upholds State Sodomy Laws; January 1, 1988: Canada Decriminalizes Sex Practices Between Consenting Adults; 1992-2006: Indians Struggle to Abolish Sodomy Law

CHINA PROHIBITS DEPICTIONS OF LGBTQ PEOPLE ON TELEVISION

2015

On December 31, 2015, the People’s Republic of China, the world’s most populous country and most important Communist nation, announced a long list of content that would henceforth be prohibited from being depicted in television series, whether broadcast normally or online. Depictions of homosexuality were by no means the only content now banned, but the new directive explicitly defined same-sex relations as “abnormal,” along with “incest, . . . perversion, sexual assault, sexual abuse, and sexual violence.” Whereas China had previously seemed to be showing increasing tolerance toward people and views associated with the LGBTQ community, the new rules were part of a much broader government crackdown on putatively “anti-social” content in popular culture.

DATE: December 31, 2015

LOCALE: People’s Republic of China

CATEGORIES: Government and politics; laws, acts, and legal history; civil rights; organizations and institutions

KEY FIGURES

Xi Jinping (b. 1953), President of China as of March 14, 2013

Mao Zedong (1893-1976), ruler of China (1949-1976)

SUMMARY OF EVENT

Because China contains approximately one fourth of the population of earth, anything noteworthy that happens there is almost by definition important. This is especially true since China now has (or will soon have) the largest economy on the planet. It is one of the few nations with an atomic arsenal, and it has set its sights on the goal of increasing its power not only in Asia but



Vice President Joseph Biden raises a toast in honor of Chinese President Xi at a state luncheon at the U.S. State Department. (Courtesy of U.S. Department of State or its employees via Wikimedia Commons)

Examples from China's 2016 Censorship Rules for Television Series

[Prohibited Content Includes Anything That]

*** Contains pornographic or vulgar content**

1. Depicts prostitution, fornication, rape and other ugly behaviors
2. Expresses or displays abnormal sexual relations or sexual behavior, such as incest, homosexuality, perversion, sexual assault, sexual abuse, and sexual violence
3. Promotes unhealthy views of marriage and relationships, including extra-marital affairs, one-night stands, and sexual freedom
4. Contains shots that give sensory stimulus, and similar manifestations and indirectly related to or suggestive of sex
5. Contains shots, lines, music and sound effects that are obvious allusions to sexual advances, sexual harassment, sexual humiliation
6. Exposes of male and female sexual organs and other hidden parts, or contain sexually suggestive clothing
7. Uses vulgar language
8. Contains sex-related images, lines, music, sound effects that are not suitable for minors

Hirwitz, John and Zheping Huang. "China's New Television Rules Ban Homosexuality, Drinking, and Vengeance." Quartz.com. March 3, 2016. Available at <https://qz.com/630159/chinas-new-television-rules-ban-homosexuality-drinking-and-vengeance>.

throughout the world. During the rule of Mao Zedong, the Communist dictator who led the PRC from 1949-1976, any official rights for LGBTQ people were essentially non-existent and most such people were deeply closeted. However, after Mao's death in 1976, the country embarked on a course of slow but steady liberalization. Although still officially a Marxist nation, China more and more adopted elements of western capitalism. As its economy came increasingly to resemble a "free market," prosperity grew rapidly. Whereas China during Mao's period was mostly impoverished, China in the decades following Mao's death became richer and richer, with a growing middle class, rapid economic development, and growing influence on the world economy. Mass political terrorism of the sort associated with Mao's infamous "Cultural Revolution" of the 1960s disappeared. China was still far from being a democracy, but one could imagine it as headed, eventually, in that direction.

As economic freedom grew, so did freedom in other respects. China seemed to be destined to become a much more pluralistic system than it had been under Mao. In 1989, however, the regime brutally crushed massive peaceful protests in the huge Tiananmen Square of Beijing, the nation's capital city. This was the first of many signs that the Communist party had decided to reimpose strict rule over the country. Gradually, though, restrictions were relaxed, and China – especially in its

growing number of large cities – became increasingly open to "western influences." Life in the cities began to resemble life in the large cities of the west, with an increasingly visible LGBTQ culture. In March 2013, however, Xi Jinping became the newest President of China. Unlike some of his predecessors, who tended to represent factions within the Communist Party bureaucracy, Xi began to consolidate his personal rule. In a 2014 speech, he asserted that "art and culture will produce the most positive energy when the Marxist perspective on art and culture is firmly established." Like Vladimir Putin in Russia, he asserted personal control over ever-wider sectors of the government, the economy, and the culture. China's communist leaders, having seen the kind of political instability (including threats to one-party domination) that often results from rapid liberalization, by the mid-2010's had begun to crack down on dissent, especially any dissent inspired by "westernization."

SIGNIFICANCE

The mere fact that so many people live in China, and that China is becoming increasingly powerful in every way, makes the fate of LGBTQ persons living there relevant to the fate of LGBTQ people everywhere. Many analysts predict that China will be the dominant world power of the twenty-first century, eclipsing the United States both economically and in terms of international

influence. Many Chinese leaders, like many leaders of the Russian Federation, regard the United States and Western Europe as culturally “decadent.” They often cite the growing toleration of LGBTQ persons and culture as a prime piece of evidence of this decay. Increasing freedom for LGBTQ persons generally correlates with increasing freedom of many sorts. Nations interested in suppressing freedom, such as Communist China and Vladimir Putin’s Russian Federation, often see the growth of LGBTQ rights as just the tip of the proverbial spear that might threaten and eventually undermine the established order.

The fact that homosexuality is now officially equated in China with incest and sexual abuse is certainly not a positive development for LGBTQ persons living there. Whether China will continue to move in this repressive direction or will reverse course and move toward greater tolerance is potentially one of the most important of all issues in the twenty-first century. It seems undeniable that China will have a growing influence on the world stage. How that influence will affect LGBTQ communities both within and outside China is likely to be a matter of great importance.

—Robert C. Evans

FURTHER READING

- Beech, Hannah. “China’s Censors Are Leaving the World’s Most Populous Nation With Very Little to Watch on TV.” *Time.com*. March 3, 2016. Available at <http://time.com/4247432/china-tv-television-media-censorship>.
- “China’s Censors Take Another Gay-Themed Web Drama Offline.” *The Wall Street Journal*. February 24, 2016. Available at <https://blogs.wsj.com/chinareal-time/2016/02/24/chinas-censors-take-another-gay-themed-web-drama-offline>.
- Chou, Wah-Shan. *Tongzhi: Politics of Same-Sex Eroticism in Chinese Societies*. Binghamton, New York: Haworth, 2000.
- Ellis-Petersen, Hannah. “China Bans Depictions of Gay People on Television.” *The Guardian*. March 4,

2106. Available at <https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/04/china-bans-gay-people-television-clampdown-xi-jinping-censorship>.

- Fox, Tal. “China Bans Depictions of Gay People on TV in Crackdown on ‘vulgar, immoral and unhealthy content.’” *The Telegraph*. March 5, 2016. Available at <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/china-bans-depictions-of-gay-people-on-tv-a6913946.html>.
- Hinsch, Bret. *Passions of the Cut Sleeve: The Male Homosexual Tradition in China*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1990.
- Kang, Wenging. *Obsession: Male Same-Sex Relations in China, 1900-1950*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009.
- Kong, Travis S. K. *Chinese Male Homosexualities: Memba, Tongzhi and Golden Boy*. New York: Routledge, 2011.
- Lim, Song Hwee. *Celluloid Comrades: Representations of Male Homosexuality in Contemporary Chinese Cinemas*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006.
- Rofel, Lisa. *Desiring China: Experiments in Neoliberalism, Sexuality, and Public Culture*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2007.
- Sullivan, Gerard and Peter A. Jackson, editors. *Gay and Lesbian Asia: Culture, Identity, Community*. Binghamton, New York: Haworth, 2001.

See Also: November 17, 1901: Police Arrest “Los 41” in Mexico City; 1912-1924: Robles Fights in the Mexican Revolution; 1933-1945: Nazis Persecute Homosexuals; June 30-July 1, 1934: Hitler’s Night of the Long Knives; 1969: Nuestro Mundo Forms as First Queer Organization in Argentina; October 14-17, 1987: Latin American and Caribbean Lesbian Feminist Network Is Formed; June 19, 2002: Gays and Lesbians March for Equal Rights in Mexico City; April, 2003: Buenos Aires Recognizes Same-Gender Civil Unions; January, 2006: Jiménez Flores Elected to the Mexican Senate; June 11, 2013: Russia Enacts “Homosexuality Propaganda” Law

CHRONOLOGY

1800's

- July 19-20, 1848: Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention
- July 4, 1855: Whitman Publishes *Leaves of Grass*
- Nov. 11, 1865: Mary Edwards Walker Is Awarded the Medal of Honor
- Aug. 29, 1867: Karl Heinrich Ulrichs Speaks Publicly for Gay and Lesbian Rights
- May 6, 1868: Kertbeny Coins the Terms "Homosexual" and "Heterosexual"
- 1869: Westphal Advocates Medical Treatment for Sexual Inversion
- 1885: United Kingdom Criminalizes "Gross Indecency"
- Jan.-June, 1886: Two-Spirit American Indian Visits Washington, D.C.
- Jan., 1892-July, 1892: Alice Mitchell Found Guilty of Murdering Her Lover
- May 25, 1895: Oscar Wilde Is Convicted of Gross Indecency
- 1896: *Der Eigene* Is Published as First Journal on Homosexuality
- 1896: Raffalovich Publishes *Uranisme et UnisexualitŽ*
- 1897: Ellis Publishes *Sexual Inversion*
- May 14, 1897: Hirschfeld Founds the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee
- c. 1899: Transgender Reporter Covers Spanish-American War Revolts

1900's, 1910's, 1920's

- Nov. 17, 1901: Police Arrest "Los 41" in Mexico City
- 1903: Stein Writes *Q.E.D.*

- 1905: Freud Rejects Third-Sex Theory
- 1906: Friedlaender Breaks with the Scientific-Humanitarian Committee
- 1907-1909: The Eulenburg Affair Scandalizes Germany's Leadership
- 1908: Carpenter Publishes *The Intermediate Sex*
- Oct., 1909: Barney Opens Her Paris Salon
- 1912-1924: Robles Fights in the Mexican Revolution
- Mar. 15, 1919-1921: U.S. Navy Launches Sting Operation Against "Sexual Perverts"
- 1920-35: LGBTQ People Contribute to the Harlem Renaissance
- Feb. 19, 1923: *The God of Vengeance* Opens on Broadway
- 1924: Gide Publishes the Signed Edition of *Corydon*
- Dec. 10, 1924: Gerber Founds the Society for Human Rights
- Feb., 1927: Wales Padlock Law Censors Risque Theater
- 1928: Hall Publishes *The Well of Loneliness*
- 1929: Davis's Research Identifies Lesbian Sexuality as Common and Normal
- 1929: *Pandora's Box* Opens

1930's

- 1930's-1960's: Hollywood Bans "Sexual Perversion" in Films
- 1933-1945: Nazis Persecute Homosexuals
- June 30-July 1, 1934: Hitler's Night of the Long Knives
- 1939: Isherwood Publishes *Goodbye to Berlin*
- Jan. 12, 1939: *Thompson v. Aldredge* Dismisses Sodomy Charges Against Lesbians