

People of Color Mobilization in LGBT Movements in the Netherlands and the United States

Nicholas Boston and Jan Willem Duyvendak

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 transpiring in both countries at which LGBT people of color (henceforth LGBT PoC) launched campaigns for distinctiveness 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 (Puar 2007), a condition that has been in formation in the Netherlands, and Western Europe widely, for some time. Given that this process, and the ways in which it constructs race and sexuality, transcend, 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/a 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

- Millet, K. 1970. *Sexual Politics*. New York: Doubleday.
- Mills, S. 2004. "Québécoises deboutte! Le Front de libération des femmes du Québec, le Centre des femmes et le nationalisme" [Québec women stand up! The Front de libération des femmes du Québec, the Centre des femmes, and nationalism]. *Mens: revue d'histoire intellectuelle et culturelle* 4 (2): 183–210.
- Montréal-Matin. 1971. "Fête de la confédération sans histoire: les séparatistes manifestent dans le calme" [Confederation celebration without incident: Separatists demonstrate calmly]. July 2: 3.
- Myers, J. 2003. *Historical Dictionary of the Lesbian Liberation Movement: Still the Rage*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Books.
- O'Leary, V., and L. Toupin, eds. 1982. *Québécoises, deboutte! Une anthologie de textes du Front de libération des femmes (1969–1971) et du Centre des femmes (1972–1975)* [Québec women stand up! An anthology of texts by the Front de libération des femmes (1969–71) and the Centre des femmes (1972–75)]. Vol. 1. Montreal, ON: Éditions du remue-ménage.
- Picq, F. 1993. *Libération des femmes: les années-mouvement* [Women's liberation: Years of change]. Paris: Le Seuil.
- Radicalesbians. 1992 [1970]. "Woman-Identified Woman." In *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation, 20th Anniversary Edition*, edited by K. Jay and A. Young, 172–6. New York: New York University Press.
- Rich, A. 1980. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs: Journal of Women, Culture and Society* 5 (4): 631–60.
- Ross, B.L. 1995. *The House that Jill Built: A Lesbian Nation in Formation*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Roussel, Y. 1995. "Le mouvement homosexuel français face aux stratégies identitaires" [The French homosexual movement in the face of identity strategies]. *Les temps modernes* 582: 85–108.
- Shumsky, E. 2009. "The Radicalesbian Story: An Evolution of Consciousness." In *Smash the Church, Smash the State: The Early Years of Gay Liberation*, edited by T.A. Mecca, 190–96. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Books.
- Sibalis, M. 2005. "Gay Liberation Comes to France: The Front Homosexuel d'Action Révolutionnaire (FHAR)." *French History and Civilization: Papers from the George Rudé Seminar* 1: 267–78.
- Stein, M. 2012. *Rethinking the Gay and Lesbian Movement*. New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, V., and L. Rupp. 1993. "Women's Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19 (1): 32–61.
- Taylor, V., and N.E. Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity and Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by A.D. Morris and C.M. Mueller, 104–29. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Teal, D. 1971. *The Gay Militants: How Gay Liberation Began in America, 1969–1971*. New York: Stein and Day Publishers.
- Turcotte, L. 1998. "Itinéraire d'un courant politique: le lesbianisme radical au Québec" [The Itinerary of a political current: radical lesbianism in Quebec]. In *Sortir de l'ombre: Histoires des communautés lesbienne et gaie de Montréal* [Coming out of the shadows: Stories of the Montreal lesbian and gay communities], edited by I. Demczuk and F.W. Remiggi, 363–98. Montreal, ON: VLB Éditeur.
- Wittig, M. 1992. *The Straight Mind and Other Essays*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

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 in expediency 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 (Duyvendak 2011), a gay Muslim identity became a *contradictio in terminis*, 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, models for conceptualizing and organizing around racial inequality derived appreciably from African American civil rights discourse. However, alternative orientations linked to patterns of immigration, both long-standing and more recent, produced discourses and strategies attuned to distinct struggles. On the West Coast, for example, there was a relevant shift in dialogue from Black Atlantic circulations (Gilroy 1993)—the political economic legacy of slavery and so forth—to the Pacific, foregrounding Asian and Pacific Islander passages (Okiihiro 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 intertwined with queer realities (Anzaldúa 1987; Cantu and Luibheid 2005).

Throughout the development of mobilization by and in the interests of communities marked by race, there has been a tactical maneuvering between advancing single-community agendas—in the name of Asian or Black or Latino or Native American liberation—and espousing pan-racial coalition politics. Progressive social movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s identified with Third World struggles and placed “Third World” in their titles as a moniker that expressed solidarity amongst racial and ethnic groups across geo-political 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-9/11 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 interlocking with skin color—religion and residency status, for example—are subject to “new” or intensified mechanisms of racialization in the United States.

Lesbigay 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-à-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 Sheila Rivera 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] 1979). Fourth, 1990s discourses of multiculturalism, which channeled to the movement understandings of diversity rooted in late twentieth-century diaspora dynamics (Collier 2013) and transnationalism. The latter development was embodied in the presence of high-profile figures such as the immigrant Indian-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" (Gilley 2006: 27).

In 1979, AMALGM (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 Gays (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 production, to incursion 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 and 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 address to 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 (Gilley 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 PoCC—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" (Gilley 2006: 28).

A multicultural landscape in the United States formed of 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-Fatiha Foundation, an LGBT Muslim organization that grew to 14 regional chapters nationwide, was launched. Many Al-Fatiha members opted for anonymity when, in 2001, Al-Muhajiroun, a radical Islamist organization, issued a fatwa on Al-Fatiha, 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 treaded 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).

Popular culture 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 GAIMNY 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 (Puar 2007). In January 2013, the Muslim Alliance for Sexual and Gender Diversity was formed by the founder and former members of Al-Fatiha 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.

LGBT PoC mobilization efforts broadly can be interpreted as factional developments within and in reaction to the mainstream LGBT movement; formal assertions and articulations of visibility in racial and ethnic communities; and extensions of broader activist agendas such as those of the four above-mentioned movements.

The Netherlands

Compared to the United States, mobilization of gays and lesbians of color in the Netherlands has been remarkably limited. In fact, the gay and lesbian movement has, overall, been rather homogeneously white, propagating a moderate and normalized homosexuality, excluding queer identities and, therefore, internal diversity (Duyvendak 1996). This does not mean that ethnicity or, broader, differences in culture and religion, have been absent from debates regarding homosexuality. The fight for "gay liberation" and secularism went hand in hand, given the peculiar Dutch context of a highly religious, "pillarized" society that transformed since the 1960s into one of the most liberal and secular in the world. This partly explains why recent debates are so focused on religion (intersecting with ethnicity), in particular Islam and its presumed incompatibility with a Western, Dutch embrace of homosexuality.

How to understand these dynamics? From our perspective, the lack of diversity within the gay and lesbian movement and the othering of Muslims in society at large are outgrowths of the same historical developments. After a long period of "pillarization" — Dutch society was strictly organized in religious pillars — the Dutch wholeheartedly welcomed societal changes in the 1960s and 1970s, one significant manifestation of which was a sexual revolution that had far-reaching effects in Dutch society. While surveys show that until the late 1960s there was strong opposition amongst the Dutch to homosexuality, prostitution, pornography, abortion, divorce and pre- and extramarital sex, a decade later the majority of Dutch citizens had adopted a position of tolerance concerning such behavior. Stimulated by the Nederlandse Vereniging voor Seksuele Hervorming [Dutch Society for Sexual Reform] (NVSH) and the Cultuur en Ontspanningscentrum [Center for Recreation and Culture] (COC), a code name for what would be baptized in 1971 the Dutch Society for Integration of Homosexuality, as well as by numerous social changes, the Dutch in the 1970s emerged as one of the most liberal nations in the world on issues of sexual morality (Hekma and Duyvendak 2011). This gave the Netherlands, and especially the city of Amsterdam, a worldwide reputation as a place of sexual freedom, a haven almost.

A new, progressive moral majority developed, in which homosexuality was normalized, and no radical queer identities or other significant forms of difference were celebrated, in either the mainstream or LGBT movement. Radical identities tend to develop under more repressive conditions. The Dutch context of heightened liberalism and tolerance was anathema to the "breeding ground" for more radicalized and diversified mobilization (Duyvendak 1996). Attention paid to cultural or racial "others" concentrated on their emancipation, on integrating them into the allegedly progressive Dutch nation. Support for ethnic organizations within the gay and lesbian community was and is conditional on their acceptance of a normalized, Western homosexuality. The rest of this section will look at how this condition came to develop over time.

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 Nederlandsch Wetenschappelijk Humanitair 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 disintegrated 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 reformulated 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

"War on Terror," he argued that he saw his sexually expressive lifestyle and his liberties and joys as a gay man threatened by backward Muslims. Fortuyn managed to reframe the Dutch political landscape by entangling traditionally "new left" themes—secularism, gender equality and gay liberation—with a neoliberal and anti-immigration populist agenda, antipathy towards Islam with a politics of sexual freedom. His party won almost 35 percent of the vote in his hometown of Rotterdam in the March 2002 municipal elections, and 17 percent nationally in May of that year in elections held only days after his assassination. Fortuyn attacked the established political right for not heeding widespread frustrations among the native Dutch, and proposed closing the borders to most asylum seekers and taking a tough stance towards the Muslim community. Unlike Islam, Fortuyn argued, Judaism and Christianity had been transformed by the Enlightenment, during which essential "Western" values developed: individual responsibility, the separation of church and state, and the equality of men and women. "I refuse to start all over again with the emancipation of women and gays," he said.

In this context, almost all political parties, including the right-wing populists, define progressive values—particularly regarding gender equality and sexual orientation—as being the core characteristics of the Dutch. The acceptance of homosexuality serves as an ideological benchmark to test whether Muslims have entered "modernity," the singular condition according to which they are allowed to belong to Dutch society (Wekker 2009).

In the Dutch political context, populists appeal to gay rights in order to establish what is typical for modern Dutch society, and subsequently to proclaim who does and does not belong within society. As Butler (2008: 2) analyzes:

Sexual politics, rather than operating to the side of this contestation, is in the middle of it, and that very often claims to new or radical sexual freedoms are appropriated precisely by that point of view—usually enunciated from within state power—that would try to define Europe and the sphere of modernity as the privileged site where sexual radicalism can and does take place. Often, but not always, the further claim is made that such a privileged site of radical freedom must be protected against the putative orthodoxies associated with new immigrant communities.

Within this nationalist discourse, then, Muslims are portrayed as others who cannot share in the collective, national identity because of their religious and cultural background. Sexual freedom is used to frame Dutch society as the "avatar of both freedom and modernity" (Butler 2008: 2). In order to understand gay politics, we must therefore analyze how these politics are implicated in the Dutch progressive narrative. According to this narrative, Dutch society is characterized by liberal values such as gender equality, freedom of speech, sexual emancipation and tolerance towards gay rights. Populists, in particular, and political leaders in a broader sense, "have reconfigured what had been values of liberal citizenship into national values of cultural distinctiveness: 'Dutch values' versus 'Islamic values'" (Uitermark et al. 2014: 35). In other words, the revival of nationalism defines these values in opposition to a perception of Islam as irrational, intolerant, illiberal and backward. Hence, in this nationalist discourse, Islam is framed as belonging to a different time and space. In this sense, Islam is not only positioned as the religious "other," but as a pre-modern state of mind and lifestyle. The notion of time becomes crucial here, for it makes a divide possible between modernity and the supposedly pre-modern Islam (Butler 2008). Constructing an antagonistic relationship between Islam and homosexuality has had a marginalizing effect on gay Muslims (Jivraj and de Jong 2011).

Within the heated debates around Islam and homosexuality, gay Muslims are largely invisible as agents—and lesbian and trans Muslims even more so (El-Tayeb 2011). They

get subsumed into the larger, undifferentiated, putatively straight, Muslim populace. Where LGBT Muslims do figure in the nationalist discourse is when their subjecthood is appropriated to express the claim that not only are they, too, illiberal and pre-modern along with the rest of the community, but, for as long as they continue to identify themselves with Islam, they will remain oppressed. To be recognized as queer, then, Muslim LGBTs 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 (Mepschen 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 LGBT 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 (Puar 2007) is not as new as it looks. Since the 1960s, the Dutch have convinced themselves that their progressiveness should be an example for everyone else, both not-yet-emancipated 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 protest 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 problems 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 Ballatoui, 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, we have shown, 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 legitimization 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 "native" Dutch as progressive on issues of gender and sexuality. Hence, in this instance, they are defined as values to the nation. By 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 legitimates 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 governmentality 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.

References

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. Iowa City: Auntie Lute Books.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria, and Cherrie Moraga. 1984. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Bayoumi, Moustafa. 2009. *How Does It Feel to Be a Problem? Being Young and Arab in America*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Boston, Nicholas. 1993. "Brothas Gotta Work It Out: Black Gay Men, Activism, Popular Culture and the Black Faggot Love-Hate Relationship." *Diaspora* 1(1): 60–69.
- . 2004a. "Asian and Pacific Americans Convene." *Gay City News* 3 (311). Accessed September 13, 2013. http://gaycitynews.com/gcn_311/asianandpacific.html.
- . 2004b. "Friday Protest, and a Larger Struggle." *Gay City News* 3 (337). Accessed September 13, 2013. http://gaycitynews.com/gcn_337/fridayprotest.html.
- . 2004c. "Blackface Drag Again Draws Fire." *Gay City News* 3 (308). Accessed September 13, 2013. http://gaycitynews.com/gcn_308/blackfacedragagain.html.
- . 2004d. "Magazine Feature Outrages Asians." *Gay City News* 3 (315). Accessed September 13, 2013. http://gaycitynews.com/gcn_315/magazinefeatureoutrages.html.
- Butler, Judith. 2008. "Sexual Politics, Torture, and Secular Time." *British Journal of Sociology* 59 (1): 1–23.
- BWMT: Black and White Men Together. 1980. San Francisco Bay Area Records. Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender Historical Society, San Francisco.
- Cantu, Lionel, and Eithne Luibheid. 2005. *Queer Migrations: Sexuality, US Citizenship, and Border Crossings*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Collier, Paul. 2013. *Exodus: How Migration is Changing Our World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. "Gender, Black Feminism, and Black Political Economy." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 568: 41–53.
- Combahee River Collective. [1977] 1979. "A Black Feminist Statement." In *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, edited by Zillah R. Eisenstein, 362–72. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140: 139–67.

- D'Emilio, John. 1998. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States 1940–1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Duberman, Martin Bauml. 1993. *Stonewall*. New York: Dutton.
- Duyvendak, Jan Willem. 1996. "The Depoliticization of the Dutch Gay Identity, or Why Dutch Gays Aren't Queer." In *Queer Theory/Sociology*, edited by Steven Seidman, 421–38. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.
- . 2011. *The Politics of Home: Nostalgia and Belonging in Western Europe and the United States*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- El-Tayeb, Fatima. 2011. "Gays Who Cannot Properly Be Gay: Queer Muslims in the Neoliberal European City." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 19(1): 79–95.
- Ferguson, Roderick. 2003. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gilley, Brian Joseph. 2006. *Becoming Two-Spirit: Gay Identity and Social Acceptance in Indian Country*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double-Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gopinath, Gayatri. 1997. "Nostalgia, Desire, Diaspora: South Asian Sexualities in Motion." *Positions: Asia Critique* 5(2): 467–89.
- Hekma, Gert, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2011. "Queer Netherlands: A Puzzling Example." *Sexualities* 14 (6): 625–31.
- Holzhaacker, Ronald. 2007. "The Europeanization and Transnationalization of Civil Society Organizations Striving for Equality: Goals and Strategies of Gay and Lesbian Groups in Italy and the Netherlands." *EUI Working Papers, RSCAS/36*. Accessed May 16, 2013. http://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/7673/RSCAS_2007_36.pdf?sequence=1.
- Jivraj, Suhraiya, and Anisa de Jong. 2011. "The Dutch Homo-emancipation Policy and Its Silencing Effects on Queer Muslims." *Feminist Legal Studies* 19 (2): 143–58.
- Kane, Matthew. 2005. "Lost Cause? A Post-Gay Examination of the Politics of Homosexuality, Islam and Difference in the Netherlands." *Independent Study Project (ISP) Collection*. Paper 425. Accessed May 6, 2013. http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/isp_collection/425.
- Larcher, Akim Ade, and Colin Robinson. 2009. "Fighting 'Murder Music': Activist Reflections." *Caribbean Review of Gender Studies* 3: 2–12.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Maira, Sunaina. 2002. *Desis in the House: Indian American Youth Culture in NYC*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Mepschen, Paul, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Evelien Tonkens. 2010. "Sexual Politics, Orientalism, and the Multicultural of Citizenship in the Netherlands." *Sociology* 44 (5): 962–79.
- Muñoz, José Esteban. 1999. *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- OCW (Ministerie voor Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap). 2007. "Gewoon homo zijn. Lesbisch- en homo-emancipatiebeleid 2008–2011" [Just being gay]. Accessed May 4, 2013. <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten-en-publicaties/notas/2007/11/14/nota-lesbisch-en-homo-emancipatiebeleid-2008-2011-gewoon-homo-zijn.html>.
- Okiihiro, Gary. 2001. *Common Ground: Reimagining American History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Prashad, Vijay. 2012. *Uncle Swami: South Asians in America Today*. New York: New Press.
- Puar, Jasbir. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Smith, Barbara. 1983. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.

- Smith, Michael. 1983. *Colorful People and Places: A Resource Guide for Third World Lesbians and Gay Men, and for White People who Share Their Interests*. San Francisco, CA: BWMT Quarterly Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1990. *The Postcolonial Critic*. New York: Routledge.
- Third World Gay Women, Inc. 1980, "Salsa Soul Sisters Pamphlet." Greenwich Village History. Accessed September 7, 2013. <http://gvh.aphdigital.org/items/show/1159>.
- Uitermark, Justus. 2012. *Dynamics of Power in Dutch Integration Politics*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Uitermark, Justus, Paul Mepschen, and Jan Willem Duyvendak. 2014. "Populism, Islam, Sexual Politics: Progressive Politics of Exclusion." In *European States and their Muslim Citizens*, edited by John Bowen, Christophe Bertossi, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and Mona Lena Krook, 235–55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wekker, Gloria. 2009. "Van homo nostalgie en betere tijden. Multiculturaliteit en postkolonialiteit" [On gay nostalgia and better times to come: Multiculturalism and post-colonialism]. *George Mosse Lecture*, Amsterdam: 1–20.
- West, Cornell. 1990. "The New Cultural Politics of Difference." In *Out There: Marginalization and Contemporary Cultures*, edited by Russell Ferguson, Martha Gever, Trinh T. Minh-ha, and Cornell West, 19–38. Cambridge: MIT Press.

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 firstly 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