

THE DISCIPLINE PROBLEM

QUEER THEORY MEETS LESBIAN AND GAY HISTORY

Lisa Duggan

In 1991, I was interviewed along with three other historians of sexuality by a history department at a small, elite northeastern college. My interview ended in disaster. Someone asked, "How could undergraduates be expected to read Foucault?" Someone else asked, "Given your, uh, interests, could we expect that you would even know who the *presidents* were?" I was sent to talk to a dean, who tactfully suggested to me that my subject of research was probably really within the domain of psychology, not history. The college hired none of the historians of sexuality, canceling the search entirely for two years.¹

In 1992 I covered the Lesbian and Gay Studies Conference at Rutgers University for the *Village Voice*.² I called the organizers to ask why there were so few historical or ethnographic panels. I was told that there were in fact *many* historical panels that the organizers had made special efforts to include. These were pointed out to me. Nearly all the presentations featured analyses of fictional texts, given by people employed in English departments.

I tell these two stories to make the following point: lesbian and gay historians are relatively isolated from two crucial sources of support—the material and institutional support of university history departments, and the intellectual engagement and support of other scholars in the field of lesbian and gay or queer studies. And for both academic and public intellectuals, isolation leads to material as well as to cultural impoverishment and decline.

Academic and intellectual isolation (though *not* political isolation) used to be generally shared within lesbian and gay studies. The first generation of scholars often worked outside the university, or in uneasy relationship with the few institutions supporting their scholarship.³ During the past decade, however, a new generation of lesbian and gay scholars has been accepted into the academy; opportunities for jobs and publication have expanded exponentially. But this welcome is both limited and far from secure. Unfortunately,

history departments in particular remain largely hostile environments for new work in lesbian and gay studies. Why?

With a very few exceptions, history departments are not hiring historians of sexuality. Most of the work within history departments, particularly on lesbian and gay history in the United States, is being done by scholars who got tenure before beginning their research in this area. And because so few have been hired, few new such historians are being trained. Again, why? I don't think this failure is solely or even largely due to conservatism or stark prejudice (though I don't mean to underestimate the continuing importance of these sources of hostility). I would attribute the failure to hire and train historians of sexuality, and lesbian and gay historians specifically, to at least three other significant factors: (1) Sexuality, as a subject matter, is treated as trivial, as more about gossip than politics, more about psychology than history. The subject generates much nervous joking at faculty meetings and symposia. Even progressive and leftist historians are not exempt from treating sexuality as somehow disconnected from, and less important than, other subjects of research. (2) Lesbian and gay history, particularly, is understood as the history of a marginalized "minority" population, as the story of a small percentage of the citizenry and their doings. This history is seldom understood as linked to the study of a central historical process—the production and organization of sexualities. This is a problem that afflicts historians of race and gender as well, when their work is understood as being "about" marginalized or ghettoized populations—women, African-Americans, Latinos, Asian-Americans, or Native Americans—rather than as concerned with the operations of social hierarchies in the broadest possible sense. (A well-known historian was quoted to me by a graduate student as saying in his U.S. history survey course, "I'm using the word 'race,' now, but it's really a code word we use for African-Americans.") (3) Historians of sexuality fit uneasily into existing job categories, and may be considered only if they have a "major" field in women's history, family history, or cultural history. Search committees will often then debate whether the candidate is "really" a women's historian or a historian of sexuality, for instance. There are virtually no advertisements that even mention history of sexuality or lesbian and gay history; the most likely relevant job category for such historians is cultural history. But history of sexuality shouldn't have to hide itself under the supposedly "broader" rubric of cultural history, any more than women's history should have to hide itself under the rubric of family history.

Relations with history departments are just the first difficulty faced by the field of lesbian and gay history. In addition, as lesbian/gay studies has expanded, work has become increasingly concentrated in fields devoted to textual analysis—primarily literary and media studies based in the twentieth century. Students interested in lesbian and gay studies have turned to these

growth areas, where there is acceptance and faculty support, when considering graduate studies; they are frequently warned away from history departments. Thus there has been a progressive impoverishment of the empirical, historical grounding for textual analyses of various sorts. The impressive expansion of increasingly sophisticated analyses is balanced precariously atop a stunted archive. (We get yet another article on Gertrude Stein, without any accompanying expansion of the research base for analyzing the changing discursive context for her writing at the turn of the century.⁴)

The difficulty here is not merely one of imbalanced growth. It is also one of strained relations between what is now being called “queer theory,” on the one hand, and lesbian and gay history, on the other. Queer theory, located within or in proximity to critical theory and cultural studies, has grown steadily in publication, sophistication, and academic prestige. Queer theorists are engaged in at least three areas of critique: (a) the critique of humanist narratives that posit the progress of the self and of history, and thus tell the story of the heroic progress of gay liberationists against forces of repression; (b) the critique of empiricist methods that claim directly to represent the transparent “reality” of “experience,” and claim to relate, simply and objectively, what happened, when, and why; and (c) the critique of identity categories presented as stable, unitary, or “authentic.”

These critiques, applied to lesbian and gay history texts, might produce a fascinating discussion—but so far, they haven’t. Queer theorists have generally either ignored lesbian/gay history texts or treated them with condescension. Lesbian and gay historians, in turn, have largely ignored the critical implications of queer theory for their scholarly practice.⁵

Queer theorists’ condescending treatment of earlier ghettoized authors and texts has often struck me as a kind of projected shame, or perhaps a fear of the humiliation associated with the ghetto. The emphasis in much academically privileged work on the analysis of canonized literary and artistic texts or widely circulated pop culture texts implicitly aligns the critic with privilege or popularity. The relative neglect of studies of ghettoized or stigmatized populations and texts keeps the associated denigration and humiliation at a distance. When earlier, ghettoized work by lesbian and gay scholars goes unacknowledged or is dismissed with an implied sneer, the hierarchy that has endowed the academic author with greater institutional resources and cultural privilege is reinforced. How radical! How subversive and transformative!

At the same time, the lack of engagement of lesbian and gay historians with critical theory and cultural studies (widely shared by historians in general, especially historians of the United States) is proving to be a devastating mistake. Though I wouldn’t argue that it’s necessary for all historians to become poststructuralists, or to write within the framework of cultural studies, I would argue that it is necessary to *engage* with cultural and critical

theory across disciplinary lines in order to remain intellectually vital. And for lesbian and gay history, the need for such engagement is especially pressing—historicizing sexuality is a project that demands rigorous analysis of changing identity categories and explication of the ideological work that such categories perform. Theoretical texts characterized by attention to the workings of systems of representation, and by close analysis of categorical imperatives and codes of language embedded in particular ideological regimes, can challenge and enrich the work of historians. Social history methods, based on empirical strategies that treat documentary sources as transparent windows onto the “real” experience of populations, hinder our ability to analyze the ideological construction of “documents,” and hide the political narratives underpinning our own texts. Until lesbian and gay historians engage the critical implications of queer theory—as well as race theory, feminist theory, and emerging theoretical work on nationalism and imperialism—their productions will constitute a political and intellectual backwater (a backwater within queer studies, and within intellectual life more broadly).

Let me be more concrete, and give two examples of the lack of engagement I’m talking about—the differing responses to one provocative article that raises questions about the politics of queer theory, and to another that criticizes the methods of lesbian and gay social history.

In 1990, Jeffrey Escoffier published a widely discussed article, “Inside the Ivory Closet: The Challenges Facing Lesbian and Gay Studies.” Escoffier, an activist and intellectual in the Bay Area and now in New York City, has been an editor of *Socialist Review*, an organizer of the San Francisco Lesbian/Gay Historical Society, and a founder and editor of the now-defunct national lesbian and gay quarterly *Out/Look*. He also has a Ph.D. in economic history, and has taught and published widely in lesbian and gay studies over a period of two decades. “Inside the Ivory Closet,” published in *Out/Look*, was an attempt to sketch out a generational conflict that Escoffier saw emerging in his field between Stonewall-era scholars with roots in political communities (mostly historians and archivists, as well as some sociologists, anthropologists, and journalists) and post-Stonewall academics with disciplinary concerns and university jobs (largely literary scholars and critical theorists). In this article Escoffier carefully maps out the history and accomplishments of the first generation during the period from 1969 to 1983 and includes the work of radical feminists and gay leftists, women of color, and sex radicals. He argues that the major intellectual accomplishment of this diversely productive crew was the critique of essentializing, universal categories of identity, and the forging of a theory of the historical, social construction of lesbian and gay identities—identities of recent vintage, which have intersected and interacted with changing identities of race, gender, class, and nation. He then warns that the work of this first generation is in danger of being erased and

replaced by that of the second, more privileged generation of lesbian and gay academics.

Escoffier specifically asks whether the second generation is losing touch with the political concerns of lesbian and gay communities through its deployment of an arcane and frequently obfuscating language and its address to limited audiences who are schooled in technical vocabularies and subscribe to rarefied academic journals. He asks whether this younger generation is falling out of dialogue with broad-based publics, becoming an unrepresentative and intellectually narrow professional elite.

In asking these questions, Escoffier is expressing the anxieties and resentments of his peers—frustrated lesbian/gay historians, sociologists, and anthropologists (among others) who believe that their work is being ghettoized, not just within university departments but by lesbian/gay studies scholars as well. Many of these activist-intellectuals see their pioneering work being strip-mined for research and insights, but not cited or seriously engaged by queer theorists. But in representing this frustration, Escoffier does not engage with the projects and points of view of the second generation whose work he questions. Though he lists the names of scholars belonging to that generation, including D. A. Miller, Lee Edelman, and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (among others), he doesn't describe the work or lay out the accomplishments of those who have been publishing in the years since 1983, as he does for the earlier authors and publications. That is because it is the first generation on whose behalf he is writing. It is the earlier work that he wants to describe and defend, in the face of denigration or erasure.

In structuring his argument this way, Escoffier has set up an opposition between generations that overstates both the homogeneity within each group and the points of contrast between them. He neglects the possibility that many among the first generation may become narrow themselves, "out of touch" with younger activists as well as intellectuals. He omits mention of the many bridge or transition figures whose work cannot easily be slotted into his generational schema. In correctly pointing out the importance of community-based institutions for Stonewall-era scholarship (especially periodicals such as the Toronto-based newspaper *Body Politic* and history projects such as the Lesbian Herstory Archives), he invents a location of imagined unity and political authenticity—"the community." And he completely omits any mention of the many theoretically informed, younger scholar-activists who exemplify precisely the sort of politically engaged work he admires in the first generation—writers such as Cindy Patton and Kobena Mercer.

Nonetheless, Escoffier's article points out a tension, and the existence of a hierarchy that is painfully obvious to most of those situated at its lower end. It performs the invaluable service of articulating a grievance and offering a history and defense of a decade's worth of pioneering scholarship, much of it

eked out in the margins of daily lives consumed with wage labor and stigmatized outside the ghettoized communities in which it was forged. Interestingly, academic scholars of Escoffier's second generation gossiped and grouched about the article but did not respond to it seriously. Though it was being discussed nearly everywhere I went during the year it was published, those included on the post-Stonewall list ignored it in print, and occasionally shunned Escoffier in person.

Even someone as politically sensitive and personally generous as Eve Sedgwick succumbed to the mood of condescension. In a review of Cindy Patton's book *Inventing AIDS* for the *Lesbian and Gay Studies Newsletter* in 1991, Sedgwick responded to Escoffier's salvo. She used Patton's book as an example from which to argue, correctly, that Escoffier had completely neglected AIDS activism and scholarship and had thus missed one of the most significant crossroads for theory and politics during the 1980s. But she then went on to concede absolutely nothing to Escoffier's article. She recognized no hierarchies, perceived no basis for his concerns. (It makes one wonder—are hierarchies *always* invisible to those who profit from them?) She misrepresented his arguments, quoting him out of context, and concluded her piece by calling him "anti-intellectual."⁶ I wonder if this particular accusation, in an academic newsletter, would be as acceptable if Escoffier were a professor rather than a public intellectual and activist.

Sedgwick's was one of a very small number of responses to Escoffier in print. But if the article had touched such a nerve, if it was worth gossip and insult, then surely it merited acknowledgment and serious debate.⁷

My second example centers on the work of Joan Wallach Scott. There are very few figures who can cross the gap between the practice of history and the arguments of critical theory, and there are few historians who can speak specifically to the ramifications for women's history of feminist theorists' work on gender. Joan Scott occupies both of those roles, bringing critical theory as well as the insights of feminists to an often reluctant historical profession. The republication of her article "The Evidence of Experience" in *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader* is a clear indication of the importance of Scott's work for the field of lesbian and gay studies as well. This article elegantly presents the poststructuralist critique of the use of the category of "experience" by historians, and of the strategy of "giving voice to the voiceless" or "making the invisible visible."

The article begins with an extended quotation from Samuel Delany's memoir, *The Motion of Light in Water*, which describes his vision of a scene inside a gay bathhouse in 1963. Scott quotes Delany's observations ("what *this* experience said was that there was a population—not of individual homosexuals . . . not of hundreds, not of thousands, but rather of millions of gay men, and that history had, actively and already, created for us whole galler-

ies of institutions, good and bad, to accommodate our sex”) and interprets him to claim that

knowledge is gained through vision; vision is a direct apprehension of a world of transparent objects. In this conceptualization, the visible is privileged; writing is then put at its service. Seeing is the origin of knowing. Writing is reproduction, transmission—the communication of knowledge gained through (visual, visceral) experience. (398)

Scott then makes an abrupt transition by arguing that “[t]his kind of communication has long been the mission of historians documenting the lives of those omitted or overlooked in accounts of the past.” This shift from the workings of memory in memoir to the mission of history signals the logic of the rest of the article. Scott takes critical aim at the reliance of social historians on an unexamined notion of “experience,” which serves as a foundational concept in their discourse.

Scott’s critique, following upon her use of Delany, focuses on the work of historians of homosexuality as illustrative of the practices of historians of difference in general. She criticizes this work in the following manner:

Histories that document the “hidden” world of homosexuality, for example, show the impact of silence and repression on the lives of those affected by it and bring to light the history of their suppression and exploitation. But the project of making experience visible *precludes* [emphasis added] critical examination of the workings of the ideological system itself, its categories of representation (homosexual/heterosexual, man/woman, black/white as fixed immutable identities), its premises about what these categories mean and how they operate, and of its notions of subjects, origin, and cause. . . . History is a chronology that makes experience visible, but in which categories appear as nonetheless ahistorical: desire, homosexuality, heterosexuality, femininity, masculinity, sex, and even sexual practices become so many fixed entities being played out over time, but not themselves historicized. Presenting the story in this way excludes, or at least understates, the historically variable interrelationship between the meanings “homosexual” and “heterosexual,” the constitutive force each has for the other, and the contested and changing nature of the terrain that they simultaneously occupy. (400)

But *whom* is Scott criticizing here? Clearly, she has shifted away from Delany, though his memoir provides the platform she steps off from. She is evidently criticizing lesbian and gay history texts, but she doesn’t cite or quote a single one in the text or notes of her article. Later in the article she

does cite feminist historians of whom she is critical (Judith Newton and Christine Stansell), and she provides an extended critique of a widely circulated article by John Toews (this article's defense of the historical concept of "experience" seems ultimately to be her central target). But lesbian and gay history texts, which provide her with the initial critical focus for her arguments, appear as mute and primitive "others," spoken for but unreferenced, and profoundly misrepresented in Scott's exegesis.

For example, Scott argues that the texts she is describing present homosexual and heterosexual as "fixed immutable identities," and claims that categories appear in them as "ahistorical." Certainly, many lesbian/gay political texts do use these categories ahistorically; the dominant discourses of liberal lesbian and gay political action take the homosexual/heterosexual polarity as universal and axiomatic. But most lesbian and gay historians have challenged such assumptions and placed the project of historicizing and denaturalizing the categories of sexual identity at the center of their agendas. Following on the pioneering work of Jeffrey Weeks and John D'Emilio, who presented the historical emergence of the homo/hetero polarity over the last century as political, contingent, and contested, Jonathan Ned Katz wrote in 1983,

Because the homosexual/heterosexual distinction became the socially dominant usage, and is still so, it is useful to note in some detail that opposition in the process of its earliest American formulation. The homosexual/heterosexual distinction is now so deeply ingrained that it is difficult for us to think in other terms. An historical view helps us to situate the homo/hetero dualism in time, and distance ourselves from it. . . .

To the extent that homosexual and heterosexual represent a limiting imposition on humanity, a labeling created for the purpose, and functioning in the interest of social control, we should consider how to transcend that polarity in theory and practice. To the extent that "lesbian" and "gay" represent, simply, reverse affirmations of the old homosexuality, thereby reproducing it, we need to ask how we might transcend . . . categorization. (147, 173)

This kind of argument is not unique, but has appeared in lesbian and gay history texts since the late 1970s. If Scott had engaged with those texts, she would have needed to alter her argument significantly. Weeks, D'Emilio, and Katz (among many others) undertake a project that Scott describes as simply impossible when she writes that "the project of making experience visible *precludes* critical examination of the workings of the ideological system itself, its categories of representation," etc. Weeks and other lesbian and gay historians set out specifically to make the historical "experience" of lesbians

and gay men “visible” *at the same time* as they present categories of identity as historical, contingent, and political—as products of changing and contested systems of representation. At a minimum, including such texts would have required that Scott acknowledge and critically evaluate this project (there is much in these texts with which she might take issue without resorting to misrepresentation), rather than dismissing it so presumptuously with that little word “precludes.”

Scott expends a lot of ink in “The Evidence of Experience” restating the Foucauldian critique of the repressive hypothesis, while erroneously attaching that hypothesis to lesbian and gay history texts—texts that explicitly contested the repressive hypothesis and approvingly cited Foucault themselves by the early 1980s. But she also offers an exploration of historians’ use of the category of “experience” as foundational, and explores the possibilities for an antifoundationalist historical practice. These latter projects are timely, compelling, and important for the future of history writing. And Scott supplies a model in her article for a way of reconsidering a text for which she had earlier provided a reductive reading. Toward the end of “The Evidence of Experience” she writes,

The reading I offered of Delany at the beginning of this essay is an example of the kind of reading I want to avoid. I would like now to present another reading—one suggested to me by literary critic Karen Swann—as a way of indicating what might be involved in historicizing the notion of experience. (410)

The rereading Scott goes on to provide is nuanced and sensitive to the ways in which memory, history, and sight are related in Delany’s work. She rejects her earlier flattening of his observations into a distorted polemic. I would suggest that she return to the lesbian and gay history texts, which she reads with similar reductiveness, and engage in dialogue with them. Rather than an opposition, in which her own theoretical sophistication is offered as wholly superior to the mute and dominated texts she leaves uncited, she might produce instead a critical dialogue in which appreciation might play some role. As it stands, the hierarchy she produces in her article only reproduces the privilege of the elite academic voice over the writing of those who have labored with far less support, reward, and recognition for their work.⁸

The lack of direct engagement I’m pointing to here is two-sided. Scott does not refer directly to the texts she implicitly critiques, and no lesbian or gay historian thus far (including myself) has responded to Scott’s widely circulated article.

Lack of engagement, isolation. . . . For lesbian and gay history, the result is a kind of homelessness. Much work (by Jonathan Ned Katz, for example,

and Allan Bérubé) goes on without consistent material or institutional support. Other historical work (by Henry Abelove and Martha Vicinus) takes place in English departments or in institutionally marginal interdisciplinary locations (especially women's studies). Major figures in the field of lesbian/gay history (John D'Emilio, Henry Abelove) often teach at institutions that don't train graduate students. Venues for publication on lesbian/gay topics support a broad range of literary and media studies (from *differences to Discourse*, *Cultural Critique* to *Cultural Studies*), but the only journal consistently publishing lesbian/gay history is the *Journal of the History of Sexuality*. (We have yet to see what will happen with *GLQ*.)

Clearly, this is a dismal situation. So what is to be done? I have three suggestions, which track the three major complaints that I have mentioned:

(1) History departments should hire and train historians of sexuality. In order to accomplish this, job categories must be restructured. The current distribution of chronological, thematic, and regional categories in history department divisions of labor needs fundamental rethinking to leave behind the present, thoroughly colonial arrangements—in which Europe and the United States occupy the center and their former colonies the margins, and in which “political” history is understood narrowly but evaluated broadly, while histories of women and people of color are considered peripheral.⁹ If history departments are to be forward-looking, they also should hire in areas now located oddly in English departments. For instance, why should cultural studies be consigned to English departments? Hiring in cultural studies would be one way for history departments to bring in the kind of engagement with cultural and critical theories that generate productive interdisciplinary dialogue. This would help create the kind of intellectual environment in which lesbian/gay history might thrive.

(2) Lesbian and gay historians must engage with queer theory, take its arguments seriously, review theoretical texts, take issue with its distortions of historical work. It is a terrible mistake to dismiss work in queer theory as jargon-ridden, elitist claptrap, as some do. Recent work on racial formations, new publications on the historical construction of nationalism, and continuing debates within feminist theory also must be engaged by lesbian and gay historians.

(3) Queer studies must recognize the importance of empirically grounded work in history, anthropology, and social and political theory (as Michael Warner has also recently argued, in his introduction to *Fear of a Queer Planet*). Scholars in this field must also acknowledge their debt to earlier, ghettoized texts. I can't count the number of times I've read a queer studies article clearly indebted to the research and writing of Jeannette Foster, Jonathan Ned Katz, or Esther Newton that then footnotes only continental theory, or Stuart Hall.

Like any other field, lesbian and gay historians need material support and intellectual and political exchange. For us, isolation equals cultural and professional death.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An earlier version of this paper was delivered at the annual conference of the American Historical Association in San Francisco in January, 1994. I am especially grateful to Nan Hunter for her comments there and elsewhere. I would also like to thank my reading group of Fellows at the Humanities Research Centre of the Australian National University during the summer of 1993 for hashing out these issues with me: Henry Ablove, John D'Emilio, Cindy Patton, Gayle Rubin, and Carole S. Vance. Exchanges with Judith Butler have also challenged my thinking on these issues.

NOTES

1. This interview situation reflected a split within the history department. A minority of the faculty wanted to hire a historian of sexuality, and this group had managed to control the search committee for a position advertised as women's history and social/cultural history. The majority of the history department faculty were appalled when the candidates selected by the search committee turned out all to be historians of sexuality, with particular interests in aspects of lesbian and gay history.
2. See my conference review, "Scholars and Sense."
3. See my review essay "History's Gay Ghetto" for an account of the early institutionalization of lesbian and gay history, largely outside the academy.
4. I don't mean to imply here that there is any such thing as an "empirical grounding" or a "research base" that is free of the need for textual analysis of sources, or of the requirement to define (rather than "discover") a discursive context. I am arguing that particular, privileged texts are overanalyzed, and overbroad claims are made based on such analyses. Historians are trained to collect a large number and variety of texts before making generalizations. Reference to this larger number and variety would provide sounder grounding for the close textual readings by literary and cultural critics.
5. A notable exception can be found in the work of Henry Ablove. Ablove's paper "The Queering of Lesbian and Gay History" carefully and brilliantly analyzes the tensions and differences between the standard tropes and assumptions of lesbian and gay history texts and the politics and reading strategies of his more postmodern queer students at Wesleyan University.
6. Sedgwick 25-27. The newsletter in which this review appeared is published by the Gay and Lesbian Caucus of the Modern Language Association.

At the beginning of the review, Sedgwick writes that Escoffier worries about "an academically more privileged generation of younger scholars whose grounding in continental critical theory makes us, he claims, 'increasingly irrelevant to the cultural and political needs of lesbians and gay men'" (25). The assertion she is referring to appears on p. 48 of Escoffier's article. He writes, "The problem is that most of the current efforts to start programs in lesbian and gay studies are primarily concerned with building up the intellectual status of the field. This step may be necessary in order to gain legitimacy for funding and support within the academic community, but it encourages lesbian and gay academics to respond

more to academic and disciplinary standards than to the political and cultural concerns of the lesbian and gay communities outside the university. The intellectual work of scholars out of touch with those communities will shrink the audience and become increasingly irrelevant to the cultural and political needs of lesbians and gay men. And the intellectual style of the post-Stonewall scholars only reinforces the potential for their academic isolation." Escoffier's argument about the impact of economic pressures and the process of professionalization is represented by Sedgwick as pure and simple theory-bashing.

Sedgwick concludes her review of Patton's book by returning to Escoffier: "So long as this is what theory sounds like—so long as this is what activism sounds like—we need hardly join Jeffrey Escoffier or other anti-intellectuals in worrying that either one will become 'unrepresentative and intellectually narrow'" (27). Here she is referencing Escoffier's call, at the close of his article, for serious attention to be paid to the "asymmetries" within the field of lesbian and gay studies, asymmetries including less than full representation of women and people of color. "Otherwise," Escoffier writes, "the field will become unrepresentative and intellectually narrow" (48).

7. The only other published discussion of Escoffier's article by an academic that I have seen is Christopher Looby's "Gay Academy, Gay Communities." Looby writes, "It is difficult to sort out the legitimate criticisms in Escoffier's manifesto from the elements of oversimplification, resentment, and invidious discrimination with which it is replete." He goes on to agree with many of Escoffier's points, however.
8. Scott's lack of citation withholds legitimacy and authority from already stigmatized texts. But her use of Delany and homosexuality allows her to profit from the avant-garde cachet of gay sex, without being herself stigmatized by it. For an example of a respectful, productive exchange between an academic writer of theory and nonacademic texts, see Martin.
9. Ramón Gutiérrez made this point in the strongest terms when he commented on an earlier version of this paper, delivered at the January 1994 conference of the American Historical Association in San Francisco. He concluded, however, that reform is impossible and recommended flight from departments of history.

WORKS CITED

- Abelove, Henry. "The Queering of Lesbian /Gay History." *Radical History Review* 62 (1995): 44–57.
- Abelove, Henry, Michèle Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin. *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- D'Emilio, John. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities: The Making of a Homosexual Minority in the United States, 1940–1970*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Duggan, Lisa. "History's Gay Ghetto: The Contradictions of Growth in Lesbian and Gay History." *Presenting the Past: Essays on History and the Public*. Ed. Susan Porter Benson, Steven Brier, and Roy Rosenzweig. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1986. 281–90.
- . "Scholars and Sense." *Voice Literary Supplement* 106 (1992): 27.
- Escoffier, Jeffrey. "Inside the Ivory Closet: The Challenges Facing Lesbian and Gay Studies." *Out/Look* 10 (1990): 40–48.
- Katz, Jonathan Ned. *Gay/Lesbian Almanac*. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Looby, Christopher. "Gay Academy, Gay Communities." *Outlines* 5.9 (1992): 34–35.
- Martin, Biddy. "Lesbian Identity and Autobiographical Difference[s]." Abelove et al. 274–93.
- Scott, Joan. "The Evidence of Experience." Abelove et al. 397–415.
- Sedgwick, Eve. Rev. of *Inventing AIDS*, by Cindy Patton. *Lesbian and Gay Studies Newsletter* 18.2 (1991): 25–27.

- Toews, John. "Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience." *American Historical Review* 92 (1987): 879–907.
- Warner, Michael. *Fear of a Queer Planet*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.
- Weeks, Jeffrey. *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800*. London: Longman, 1981.