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This chapter offers a comparative historical analysis of the disputes that have spurred people of color to mobilize on a platform of "race" within mainstream, white-dominated LGBT movements, and the ideological postures they assumed in doing so, in two national contexts: the Netherlands and the United States. We revisit crucial transition points in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries transrapping in both countries at which LGBT people of color (henceforth LGBT PoC) launched campaigns for distinctions under the banner of racial difference within, or sometimes separate from, mainstream movements. Comparing the Dutch and US cases, we see that, initially, there had been a divergence between these two contexts in the positioning of LGBT PoC vis-à-vis the state, which, in turn, necessitated divergent strategies of mobilization. This formation, of course, depended on who counted as a "person of color" and the very meaning of the category for political action. In this chapter, then, we discuss the particular historical sequences that account for this divergence in national contexts.

To synopsize the chapter’s content: at a formative stage, in the Netherlands, there was a move towards a normative discourse of LGBT identity, downplaying racial and cultural specificity, whereas in the USA a discourse of diversity and structural pluralism became a fairly well defined and defended ideological position in the LGBT movement. However, at a secondary stage, inclusive of the contemporary moment, we have seen a convergence of ideological trends operative in the Netherlands and US national contexts due to new challenges in the US that have redrawn the parameters of LGBT PoC mobilization. Specifically, post-9/11 America gave rise to systems of national surveillance which interact with racial/ethnic profiling and LGBT "inclusion" to produce the phenomenon of homonationalism (Puur 2007), a condition that has been in formation in the Netherlands, and, Western Europe widely for some time. Given this process, and the ways in which it constructs race and sexuality, transcends, to some extent, national borders, we suggest that a comparative analysis of the Dutch and US contexts can be fruitful towards understanding global trajectories in LGBT PoC mobilization through the category of "race". LGBT PoC mobilization cannot be fully understood if viewed solely through the lens of the evolution of the LGBT movement. Rather, it must be located in the broader political and social contexts of the respective nations. It is crucial to assess the extent to which hegemonic formations of race, ethnicity, class, religious affiliation, citizenship, and other culturally constructed or state-defined categories constituted the bases upon or against which LGBT PoC activists articulated their claims. Indeed, the politicization of such maneuvering, to
which one strand of LGBT PoC thought gave the name intersectionality (Crenshaw 1989; Collins 2000), has in different ways been at the center of debates over the expediency of factional organizing within movements for sexual liberation in both the Netherlands and USA.

We discuss the United States and the Netherlands as two cases that over time have shown inverse dynamics. Whereas mobilization by LGBT PoC increased and diversified in the US in the decades following Stonewall, and race-based identity politics achieved—after a lengthy, and ongoing struggle—a fair degree of mainstream LGBT legitimacy, the opposite occurred in the Netherlands. In the Dutch context, the political legitimacy for people of color (whether postcolonial migrants from the Caribbean, South America and Asia, or, later, mostly Moroccan and Turkish Muslims) to mobilize—either within the LGBT movement or outside it—decreased. This ineptitude was directly related to the fraught issue of integration, with its strong undercurrent narrative of Dutch progressiveness, particularly as concerns Muslim immigrants. Since the vast majority of “native” Dutch assume Muslim migrants to be homophobic (Dayvendak 2011), a gay Muslim identity became a contradiction in terms, as will be discussed in the latter half of the chapter.

In what follows, we present a survey of LGBT PoC activism in historical sequence. The texts selected for inclusion in this survey are those that were the direct output of on-the-ground organizing efforts, authored by activists themselves. Thus, this chapter is not offered as a review of the vast bodies of literature addressing LGBT PoC identities and social histories. Such texts, theorized by thinkers not involved in direct-action mobilization, are referenced only insofar as they intersect with the work of activists, or help to provide conceptual framings.

The United States

In order to understand LGBT activism and mobilization by and for people of color in the United States, it is necessary to first take account of the language through which racial politics has been negotiated within the LGBT movement in the USA.

Given the historical formation of US society as a black–white binary, certainly juridically, African American civil rights discourse. However, alternative orientiations toward the construction of identities reflected appreciably from intersection, both long-standing and more recent, produced discourses and strategies attuned to distinct struggles (Gillroy 1993)—the political economic legacy of slavery and so forth—to the Pacific, foregrounding Asian and Pacific Islander passages (Okhiro 2001). Similarly, towards the nation’s southwestern borders, circulations of Chicano and other Latin American populations brought about an activist focus on issues of border crossings and citizenship as they intersected with queer realities (Anzaldúa 1987; Cantu and Lubheid 2005). Throughout the development of mobilization by and in the interest of communities marked by race, there has been a tacit maneuvering between advancing single-community agendas—in the name of Asian or Black or Latino or Native American liberation—and espousing pan-racial coalitions. Progressive social movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s identified with Third World struggles and placed “Third World” in their titles and borders (Smith 1983). This conceptualization presaged the logic of the heading “People of Color,” which would gain currency two decades later. It also, to some extent, anticipated the discourses of transnational identity which were to emerge in the 2000s.

Beginning in the late 1980s, US-based mobilization began utilizing the organizing term, “people of color.” This designation has been deployed in multiple contexts and senses to represent actors who are not white and whose quality of life has historically been denied the full rights and privileges afforded those occupying the category of whiteness (West 1990). It is often abbreviated to “PoC” in activist, NGO, and policy discourses. “People of color” refers specifically or collectively to Americans of African, Asian, Latino or Hispanic, and Native American heritage. The term is a form of strategic essentialism (Spivak 1990) that foregrounds the shared experience of racism across these groups. It also recognizes and adapts to the ways in which the targets of racist exclusion and denigration shift as regimes of power recalibrate along differing ideological axes. For instance, the heightened post-911 state surveillance of Muslims in the US, and the social stigmatization of both Muslims and those merely perceived to be Islamic, such as Sikhs, have increased the tendency both within and outside these communities to articulate their identity discourses inside the PoC frame (Bayoumi 2009; Prashad 2012). Thus, claims to inclusion in the political purview of PoC continue to be launched by and for groups who by dint of identity markers intersecting with skin color—religion and residency status, for example—are subject to “new” or intensified mechanisms of racialization in the United States.

Lesbian organizing, in particular, was on the forefront of the transition to coalition politics. Homophobic stigmatization produced an added valence through which LGBT actors articulated the intersecting oppressions that impact individuals and communities not only vis-a-vis the mainstream, but also within racial/ethnic communities and the LGBT movement itself. PoC rhetoric has been extensively operationalized in the mobilization strategies of LGBT activism, as we shall see below.

That said, theorizing and organizing by LGBT (or queer) PoC in the United States (Ferguson 2003) has simultaneously informed and drawn sense from activism in four main social movements that unfolded between the 1960s and the present. First, the civil rights movement and initiatives benefiting from its legacy, which focused on equality for African Americans. Second, Stonewall, in which PoC activists such as the Puerto Rican trans organizer Stella Riveras and African American trans organizer Marsha P. Johnson, occupied key roles (Duberman 1993). Third, 1970s feminism, to which significant contributions in writing and action were made by lesbians of color, notably Latinas Gloria Anzaldúa and Cherrie Moraga (1984), African Americans Audre Lorde (1984) and Barbara Smith (1983), and the Combahee River Collective (1977). Fourth, 1990s discourses of multiculturalism, which challenge the essential understandings of diversities in the post–twentieth century diaspora dynamics (Collier 2013) and transnationalism. The latter development was embodied in the presence of high-profile figures such as the immigrant Iranian-American activist Urvashi Vaid, who has worked and spoken not from race- and gender-specific standpoints, but a central location in the mainstream US LGBT movement, as executive director of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Considered as a whole, LGBT PoC mobilization has coalesced around three salient, interrelated themes: visibility, gender equality and diversity, and social change. In turn, these themes have manifested in four main LGBT PoC organizational missions: to build community; to build coalitions; to celebrate cultural distinctiveness; and to address specific concerns, such as AIDS, or crisis moments of intra-racial/intra-ethnic homophobic discrimination.

The development of these conceptualizations and their actualization within the movement can be tracked in the following schematic periodization.
1970s: Awakening of Intersectional Politics

On the heels of the Stonewall Riots, homosexual organizing broadly assumed more radical stances (D'Emilio 1998). Yet, PoC, and particularly lesbians of color, still found their issues marginalized within this radicalized movement. From a web of complications emerged race- and gender-specific collectives and knowledge production to raise awareness and empowerment of LGBT PoC.

In 1974, lesbians of color activists founded the Salsa Soul Sisters, an organization for “Third World Gay Women” (Third World Gay Women, Inc. 1980). It was a “splinter group of the Black Lesbian Caucus, which in turn was a splinter group of Gay Activists Alliance, which itself was a splinter group of Gay Liberation Front” (Third World Gay Women, Inc. 1980). The organization was to undergo a series of modifications to its mission, turning, first in 1990 to prioritize issues impacting African American women and Latinas, and eventually exclusively black women, under its current title, African Ancestral Lesbians for Social Change. These transformations occurred in response to various currents of factionalism that tested the PoC framework, notably the bolstering of Latino mobilization around matters related to language and citizenship.

In 1975, in San Francisco, Gay American Indians, the first Native American gay and lesbian organization, was founded in response to what its founders saw as a “lack of support for people of color in the gay and lesbian liberation struggle” (Gilly 2006: 27).

In 1979, AMALGAM (Alliance of Massachusetts Asian Lesbians and Gay Men), now QAPA (Queer Asian Pacific Islander Alliance), the first independent Asian queer organization in the United States, began operations in the Boston–Cambridge area. The National Coalition of Black Gay (changed to National Coalition of Black Lesbians) and Gays in 1984) was founded in Washington, DC in 1978 and acted as a prime supporter of the 1979 National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights.

1980s: Increasing Visibility and Building Coalitions

The 1980s saw a surge in LGBT PoC organizing. Activism at this stage took many forms, from non-governmental organizations dedicated to the provision of social services, to political advocacy groups, to outlets for community media and cultural products, to incursions into electoral politics. The collectives and initiatives mentioned here do not constitute the totality of organizing efforts, but, rather, are taken as samples of groundbreaking regional and national mobilization. Due to a number of contributing factors, such as urban concentrations of sexual minorities, breakthrough organizations were largely sited in New York, Washington, DC or in or near the San Francisco Bay Area.

The organization Gay Men of African Descent was founded in New York in 1986 as primarily an HIV prevention group with an expanding mission. Trikone, the first organization to promote LGBT South Asian visibility, was launched in San Jose, California. In 1986, LLEGO—The National Latina/o Lesbian and Gay Activists (later changed to National Latina/o Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Organization)—was founded as a full service community NGO in 1987 in Washington, DC. In San Francisco around the same time, two Asian American organizations emerged: in 1987, Gay Asian Pacific Alliance, a men’s collective, and in 1988, the Asian Pacific Sisters for Lesbians. Noteworthy as “new” organizational objectives were these groups’ emphasis on addressing “internalized racism and internalized homophobia” within their own target communities. Also in this period, LGBT PoC activism began to seek out avenues for participation in electoral politics. In 1980, Mel Boozer, a sociologist who served as the first African American president of the DC-based Gay Activists Alliance, and was active in both the Socialist and Democratic Parties, was nominated for the office of Vice President of the United States, becoming the first openly gay nominee for the position. In his televised debate with the Democratic National Convention, Boozer called for party support of PoC LGBT equality.

Increasingly in this period, mobilization in the form of direct action—as protest, lobbying, and social support organization—came to be interlinked with individual and collective artistic expression, and cultural production (Ferguson 2003; Muñoz 1999). This development was coextensive with an equally fraught turn in academic and artist-run spaces to identity politics (West 1990). Black gay activism, in particular, interlocked with the creative work of artists and media makers, notably the writers Joseph Beam and Essex Hemphill, whose literary output on the theme of racial and sexual identity drew inspiration from lesbian-feminist autobiographical literature of the previous decades. Filmmaker Marlon Riggs’ work mediated the complications of negotiating between LGBT environments unfriendly to blacks and anti-queer black communities (Boston 1993). Riggs’ film, Tongues Untied, was the first documentary discussing black gay experiences to reach a national mainstream audience when it was broadcast on PBS in 1989.

There were, in addition to these PoC-exclusive efforts, initiatives to strengthen affinities with white LGBT. Not without controversy was the founding in San Francisco in 1980 of Black and White Men Together (BWMT), a “consciousness-raising and support group for gay men involved in or interested in multiracial relationships” (BWMT 1980). The organization has evolved into a national association with chapters throughout the US, the New York one of which adopted the name Men of All Colors Together to eschew long-standing charges of racial exclusivity. Indeed, in March 1990, a racism workshop for Asian and Pacific Islander gay men sponsored by Men of All Colors Together provided a context in which to generate interest for the founding of New York’s first organization on such a platform, named Gay Asian and Pacific Islander Men of New York (GAPIMNY).

1990s–2000s: Addressing AIDS, multiculturalism, and shifting definitions of LGBT PoC

Organizing through the 1990s and 2000s has highlighted issues related to AIDS, multiculturalism, and generational shifts in the interpretation of gender expression, pansexuality and racial or ethnic positionality (Boston 2004a). Concerning the latter, Native American LGBT, for example, began to assert the term “Two-Spirit,” used historically in Native communities to articulate sexual nonconformity, in their organizing efforts (Gilly 2006). Similarly, South Asian queers began to mobilize around the identity of “Desi,” proposing this term as more encompassing of diverse experiences of US-born South Asian LGBT to stem factionalism (Maira 2002). The designation of transgender itself came in this period into wider circulation and theorization, and various PoC claims were made via this identity category.

As concerns AIDS awareness and lobbying, organizing has been extensive, shooting off from LGBT PoC agendas to interface and coalition-build with those of class-based and regional organizations. The Audre Lorde Project and PoC—People of Color in Crisis were founded in New York as AIDS advocacy and service organizations to specifically address the needs of LGBT PoC. Two-Spirit activists working through Gay American Indians were instrumental in the 1992 founding in San Francisco of the Indian Center of All Nations, a treatment center whose mandate was to “serve all genders—that of Two-Spirits as well as women and men” (Gilly 2006: 28).
A multicultural landscape in the United States formed the coming of age of late twentieth-century migrants and their descendants lead to LGBT organizing efforts in support of LGBT PoC whose representative presence was formerly either missing or subsumed into larger African-, Asian-, Latino- or Native American agendas. Notably, in 1997, the Al-Fatihah Foundation, an LGBT Muslim organization that grew to 14 regional chapters nationwide, was launched. Many Al-Fatihah members opted for anonymity when, in 2001, Al-Mubahahin, a radical Islamist organization, issued a fatwa on Al-Fatihah, calling for the deaths of all its members. The group maintained its membership and operations for another decade until dissolving in 2011 (see Hunt in this collection).

Within this time period, a number of ad hoc initiatives were launched to address acute crises that threatened to undermine the civil liberties or debase the public images of LGBT PoC. Such initiatives were aimed at combating both instances of racism in LGBT spaces and homophobic actions in racial and ethnic enclaves, as well as sexism against lesbians of color. In some cases, ad hoc mobilization has led to sustained programs to not only directly resolve the problems at hand, but continue to raise consciousness surrounding the issues. Whilst each ad hoc initiative has had varying degrees of success in the context in which it was waged, remaining a primarily local battle, a small number stand out as having been catalysts for far-reaching shifts in awareness or even policy concerning LGBT PoC. These latter few commonly serve as reference points in activist discourse or academic analysis of the complex challenges of de-marginalization for LGBT PoC.

One such struggle has been the New York-based South Asian Lesbian and Gay Association (SALGA)s campaign from 1995 onward against a ban placed on its formal participation in the annual India Day Parade, the nation’s largest such festival, organized by the Federation of Indian Associations. The campaign was successful in 1995, when LGBT marchers gained inclusion, only to have the right repealed again for another decade until 2010. The parade organizers’ decision to exclude SALGA made explicit the contested terrain on which LGBT South Asians trod in not only mainstream American, but contestation diasporic communities. Hence, the outcome of this contestation would be widely discussed and have far-reaching implications beyond the local (Gopinath 1997).

A similar transnational ad hoc organizing effort, No More Murder Music, was launched as a coalition of queer groups, composed primarily of Caribbean and African American activists, acting in response to violent and hateful lyrics in Jamaican dancehall music, an art form that traveled globally through diasporic networks and commercial channels (Boston 2004b; Larcher and Robinson 2009).

PoC has been the realm in which several standout ad hoc initiatives have been waged. In 2002 and 2004, LGBT PoC organizers in New York rallied against a white gay male comedian who performs in blackface drag as a character named Shirley Q. Liquor. The protesters argued that the performance was racist and sexist. They placed pressure on local commercial venues, owned or heavily patronized by gays, which had booked the performer, to cancel his appearances (Boston 2004c). The effort extended into an ongoing nationwide online campaign. Similarly, in 2004, an ad hoc coalition of Asian American organizations led by GAIMINe mobilized in protest of a defamatory representation of gay Asian identity published in a major mainstream men’s lifestyle magazine (Boston 2004d).

In the twenty-first century, LGBT PoC attention has turned in certain quarters to questions of Islamophobia (Puwar 2007). In January 2013, the Muslim Alliance for Sexual and Gender Diversity was formed by the founder and former members of Al-Fatihah Foundation, now working under the auspices of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force. However, US-based LGBT organizing around Muslim identity has largely looked towards efforts in Europe, notably the United Kingdom and France, where populations and debates have, arguably, been more extensive.
Brief History of the Dutch Gay Movement

In the Netherlands, the gay emancipation movement has a long history that begins in 1919 with Article 248, which prohibited homosexual contact between adults and minors. This legislation inspired the foundation of the Nederlandse Wetenschappelijk Humanitarishe Komitee [Dutch Scientific Humanitarian Committee] (NWHK). The Committee’s goal was to acquire complete equality for homosexual men and women as a response to the negative perception of gays and lesbians in Holland (Kane 2005: 10). Though NWHK dissipated under German occupation during the Second World War, its goals were taken up in 1946 by the COC. As did the NWHK before it, the COC kept its operations low profile, concealing itself from broader publics. Political changes during the sixties, however, provided opportunities for the COC to alter its strategy and be more visible as an openly homosexual organization. Its mission was reformed to reach out to a wide spectrum of political parties, work closely with government, run open, public campaigns and set a national agenda for full equality. In 1971, Article 248 was abolished. Two years later, the COC acquired legal status, becoming eligible for government funding and other forms of state support.

As homosexuality became increasingly integrated into Dutch society, equality, rather than the celebration of difference, became the main goal. As a result of the many legal battles won by the gay and lesbian movement, gay identity became less politicized, with many gay men and some lesbian women claiming that the struggle was over since acceptance, broadly speaking, had been gained. And, indeed, there was a decrease in discrimination against Dutch homosexuals, which also allowed for increased visibility. Hence, as acceptance of homosexuality rose, further gay and lesbian mobilization stagnated (Holzhacker 2007). The juridical battle culminated in 1998 with the legalization of registered partnership between couples of the same sex, and, three years later, in 2001, full marriage for same-sex couples.

In the late 1990s, homosexuality thus became a depoliticized issue in Dutch society (Duyvendak 1996). As legal rights were attributed to gays and lesbians, their emancipation seemed complete. Emancipation, however, does not end with legal statutes; it is achieved in full through the stamping out of workplace discrimination, homophobia at schools and in nightlife activities, and with the acquisition of the general freedom not to have to comply with heterosexual norms. Such emancipatory ideals, however, became less important in the political arena.

It was on the topic of the integration of immigrants that homosexuality, as an issue, got brought back into the foreground of public and political debate as a problem. This was especially true regarding the alleged political and social tensions between the reductively defined "gay" and "Muslim" communities. How did homosexuality, after being a depoliticized issue in the late 1990s, become an extremely hot political topic again? To understand the re-politicization of homosexuality, we must analyze the nationalist discourse that emerged during the 1990s.

LGBT Mobilization within a Nationalist Context

Since the 2000s, we witnessed a wave of abhorrence of public Islam. In Dutch society, Islam is framed as the "Other" that is irreconcilable with universal liberal values (Uitermark 2010).

The influential populist politician Pim Fortuyn, who emerged on the political scene in 2001, capitalized on the trope of sexual progress as essentially Dutch and managed to ingrain it deeper into the Dutch self-image. Fortuyn was openly and flamboyantly gay himself, and spoke of Muslims as backwards and rural. In the slipstream of 9/11 and the ascent of the
get subsumed into the larger, undifferentiated, putatively straight, Muslim populace. Where LGBTQ Muslims do figure in the nationalist discourse is when their subjugation is appropriated to express the claim that not only are they, too, illiberal and pre-modern, but they are also a threat to the rest of the community, but, for as long as they continue to identity themselves with Islam, they will remain oppressed. To be recognized as queer, then, Muslim LGBTQ are called upon to break with their religious selves and communities.

This notion of queer Muslims as being oppressed and alienated from their true selves comes from a model of sexuality that is not only homonationalist, but homonormative. It presupposes that the proper political orientation of a homosexual, any homosexual, is to embrace progressive and neoliberal values (Mepschens et al. 2010; Richardson, this volume). The proper “gay” is individualistic, and lets go of tradition. Following this model, explicit “coming-out practices” are implicitly represented as the only natural way of being gay (Wekker 2009). As Jivraj and de Jong (2011: 152) argue, “Those queer Muslims that come out and match this paradigmatic model can be absorbed into ‘Dutchness’ and indeed be held up as mascots, the ‘performative’ Muslim gay as an embodiment of emancipated gayness, symbolizing modernity, no longer really Muslim.” Furthermore, expecting LGBTQ Muslims to publicly come out forces these actors to choose between their kinship and cultural heritage on the one hand, and Dutch national belonging, with its emancipatory discourses of LGBT inclusion, on the other (Jivraj and de Jong 2011: 152).

This imperative is simultaneously articulated within Moroccan and Turkish communities, the two largest public Islam-adherent groups in the Netherlands. Influential orthodox community leaders’ defense of religious-minority rights has intersected with anti-homosexual rhetoric to argue that one of the effects on the Muslim community of the destabilization of Islam as an institution has been the incursion of (Western) homosexuality (Uitermark et al. 2014).

Homonationalism (Paar 2007) is not as new as it looks. Since the 1960s, the Dutch have encouraged themselves that their progressiveness should be an example for everyone else, both not-yet-emanicipated groups within the Netherlands, and the rest of the world. While in the 1960s and 1970s this mono-cultural progressive moral majority was still somewhat tolerant towards others who did not yet share their opinions, this started to change in the late 1980s and early 1990s when groups perceived as culturally different turned out to perform badly in socio-economic terms as well. The “native” Dutch lost their tolerance for those in Dutch society who allegedly did not share in the progressive consensus, particularly migrants, both postcolonial migrants from Surinam, the Antilles, and Asia as well as guest workers from Morocco and Turkey.

In the 1990s, just one organization seemed to be capable of escaping this rather paternalistic model of emancipation. Strange Fruit, a multi-ethnic LGBT organization, was founded by youths with backgrounds ranging from Muslim to Afro-Caribbean and Asian. Strange Fruit was active between 1989 and 2002. Its members intended to challenge their marginal positions within their own communities as well as in the Dutch gay scene. Though a sub-organization within the COC, Strange Fruit came at one point to question what it saw as COC’s homogeneous image of homosexuality. Strange Fruit’s members challenged Western conceptions of homosexuality and coming-out practices: “It is hardly ever discussed what these minority youths encounter within the Dutch society/ the Dutch educational system, in gay and lesbian organizations, subcultures, in contracts, friendships, relationships Dutch peer/adults, hardly ever is there room for ... the insights of black/migrant experts” (cited and translated by El-Tayeb 2011: 88).

Since the 2000s, the space for such a rather critical position has even further diminished, as the focus in the political debate shifted even more towards topics of national identity as

figured through religion and ethnicity. As far as people of color do mobilize, it is often in line with the mainstream gay and lesbian organizations and government policies.

The Conditional Funding of Racial-Ethnic Minority LGBT Organizations

The national government emancipation policy, just Being Gay, aims at making homosexuality less of a taboo amongst, in particular, Muslim migrants of Moroccan and Turkish descent (OCW 2007). This policy encourages individuals to be gay by the act of articulating it, by coming out. LGBT organizations such as the COC receive governmental funding for dealing with immigrants’ attitudes towards homosexuality (OCW 2007: 11). In 2007, the federal COC became responsible for the allocation of local funding of Muslim and ethnic gay and lesbian organizations. However, the stipulation is made that ethnic and Muslim LGBT organizations that pursue the same goal as proclaimed in the gay emancipation policy are identified as “frontrunners” and will be actively supported (OCW 2007: 11). The idea here is that when leaders of ethnic and Muslim LGBT organizations publicly come out, the social acceptance of homosexuality within their communities will increase. On the condition that their leaders and members publicly come out of the closet, their organizations can count on financial support. This is an example of not only the prominence in Dutch LGBT politics of the coming out narrative as marker of national openness, but the ways in which its endorsement and propagation through institutional policies places conditions on the existence or longevity of LGBT organizations themselves, particularly those mobilizing LGBT POC.

In 2009, the local COC in Amsterdam started supporting ethnic LGBT organizations, especially queer Muslim groups. One of the Muslim organizations that continues, as of this writing, to receive financial support from the COC is Secret Garden. The goal of Secret Garden is, in line with the national COC’s homo-emancipation policy, to make homosexuality “speakable” within the Muslim community. Its leader, Emir Balouici, publicly came out of the closet and has, ever since, prioritized making homosexuality visible within his community as an organizational mandate.

Conclusion

In the Netherlands, then, homosexuality is higher on the public and political agenda than ever before. But this prominence, this discourse, is accompanied by coercions and omissions that further queer certain groups of color. At present, homosexual identity is often instrumentalized in nationalist discourse as a lens through which to educate newcomers, particularly Muslims, towards accepting Dutch “norms and values,” as defined by policymakers. In the Netherlands, politicians aspire to be movement allies. However, state legitimation of homosexuality creates dissonance for LGBT POC mobilization by attaching two distinct, mutually exclusive, meanings to two broad categories of people of color. Postcolonial migrants and their descendants are positioned alongside the taken for granted as part of the nation. In contrast, Muslims are framed as culturally pre-modern, therefore positioned as a threat to the enlightened, modern state. This polarization complicates solidarity among people of color as the politicization of homosexuality in itself legitimizes national belonging for the former group while contesting and delimiting it for the latter (El-Tayeb 2011).
Conversely, in the United States, the state has been positioned as the prime adversarial target in LGBT organizing; it is vis-à-vis governmentalism that LGBT efforts have conceived and formalized their varied identity discourses and practices. However, as regards people of color organizing, even though the Dutch situation is substantially different from the US case, the mechanisms turn out to be largely the same. Internal LGBT organizing is highly determined by the dominant views on identity and diversity in society at large. In that sense, it does not make much of a difference if the government is an ally or the adversary of LGBT organizations. The identities that do mobilize—that are lived and experienced as important and distinctive—draw their meanings from the broader society. The extremely marginal position of Muslims in the Netherlands is mirrored in the quasi-absence of Muslim LGBT organizations, while the strong and highly diversified LGBT landscape in the US mirrors decades of rather successful political struggles around race and ethnicity.
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Inside or Outside? Bisexual Activism and the LGBTI Community

Kirsten McLean

Introduction

Strong bisexual communities, and strong ties between bisexual men and women and the LGBTI community, are important in providing visibility and a voice for bisexual people. Across the world, bisexual communities operate on a relatively small scale compared with the LGBTI community, and often exist as an ad hoc network of groups and networks maintained with very little, if any, funding. However, the relationship between the bisexual and LGBTI communities has been, to date, rather complex. Much of this relates to the continuing invisibility of bisexuality and bisexual people within LGBTI communities, brought about by a legacy of negative attitudes towards bisexuals, or biphobia, both in LGBTI communities and in the broader society.

This chapter argues that, historically, the relationship between bisexual men and women and the LGBTI communities has been marked by conflict and tension, and that some exclusion of bisexuals still exists within LGBTI communities across the Western world. However strong, vocal bisexual communities have emerged, and while they are typically involved in grassroots support of bisexual men and women rather than large-scale activism, they provide a significant space for bisexual men and women to come together to fight biphobia and discrimination, and to provide support and visibility for bisexual people.

To examine the role of bisexual activism both inside and outside LGBTI spaces, this chapter first examines the construction of bisexual identities, and then moves on to the role of bisexual men and women in the broader LGBTI communities both historically and contemporarily. Finally, the chapter examines the development of separate bisexual communities, and the challenges to bisexual activism in a world dominated by expectations that one is either heterosexual or homosexual.

Bisexual Identities and Activism

Bisexuality is a commonly misunderstood identity, and is further complicated by the multiple meanings attached to bisexuality. For example, some of those who identify as bisexual may have attractions and/or relationships with both men and women; others may