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Notes to Chapter One

1. This dubious number had its basis in the 1992 VRS national exit poll, discussed at length in chapter 6, which showed that 72 percent of self-identified lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals (the bisexual category was added that year) voted for Clinton. It also showed that 2.2 percent of the weighted sample (2.5 percent of the raw sample) self-identified as gay, lesbian or bisexual. Mixner and other gay leaders, however, employed the Kinsey-based, often abused 10 percent estimate and claimed that gay people who had voted for Clinton accounted for 7.2 percent of all American voters—roughly one-sixth of the 43 percent of the national popular vote that Clinton received.

2. The observant reader will note that "gay" sometimes is used in its generic sense as a nickname for all persons with romantic attractions to members of their own sex, and sometimes is used solely to delineate homosexual men, as opposed to homosexual women, who in the main prefer to be called lesbians. For the sake of simplicity and clarity I often will refer to the "gay rights" movement, because this is what it is called in the press and how it is referred to in general conversation.

3. The exact percentage of Americans who are homosexual or bisexual is uncertain, but it is possible to state a range. Kinsey's nonrandom-sample studies in the 1940s (Kinsey et al. 1948; Institute for Sex Research 1953) estimated that 14 percent of American men and 6 percent of women were exclusively homosexual in behavior for at least three years of their lives. From this was derived the much-used estimate that homosexuals make up 10 percent of the population. Fay et al. (1989), using 1970 random-sample data, estimated that 6 percent of U.S. men were exclusively or predominately homosexual; women were not studied.

Janus and Janus's quota sample (1993) found that 9 percent of U.S. men and 5 percent of women reported either ongoing or "frequent" homosexual activity. In a separate question, again 9 percent of the men and 5 percent of the women self-identified as either homosexual or bisexual. (Four percent of men and 2 percent of women called themselves homosexual; 5 percent of men and 3 percent of women called themselves bisexual.) The self-identifiers and the actors did not precisely overlap; Janus and Janus state (but do not present data) that many persons who reported frequent or ongoing gay experiences still identified as "heterosexual." (Twenty-two percent of men and 17 percent of women reported having had at least one homosexual experience.)

Most reliably and recently, the random-sample, nationwide "Chicago sex survey" (Laumann et al. 1994) found that 10.1 percent of men and 8.7 percent of women exhibited either same-sex desire, same-sex sexual behavior, or homosexual or bisexual self-
identification, or some combination of the three. Interestingly, only 2.6 percent of the men and 1.3 percent of the women self-identified as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in this in-person survey—less than half of all those of each sex who reported having engaged in same-sex behavior. This question will be discussed in greater depth in chapter 2.

4. The only voting behavior data collected on self-identified bisexuals are the “Glick poll” discussed in chapter 5 and the 1992 battery of primary and general election exit polls. The bisexuals are grouped together with lesbians and gay men in a single self-identification item in the latter poll, leaving no way to distinguish among them.

5. This usage may irritate some readers, so let me explain my conscious decision to employ it. Endless repetition of the term “lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals” would be cluttersome. “Gay” or “homosexual” is not an option: it is inaccurate to call bisexuals “gay” or “homosexual,” and some lesbians are offended by being called “gay” rather than “lesbian” (interestingly, to a much lesser extent, the reverse is true as well). Some of the all-inclusive terms that members of the movement have adopted, however, such as “lambda,” “rainbow,” “lesbigay,” “queer,” or even “lavender,” used in the title, are sufficiently obscure, slangy, or full of other meanings that to use them here would likely lead to the study being dismissed as frivolous. “LGB” was the happiest medium I could find.

In like manner, because the non-self-identifiers presumably include homosexuals and bisexuals who do not choose to self-identify for the reasons discussed later, it would be inaccurate to call them “straight” or “heterosexual” voters. In most instances, therefore, I call them “non-LGBs” when comparing them to lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals, and “nongay” for simplicity’s sake when comparing them to lesbians and gay men in the 1990 data sets, which do not allow for bisexual self-identification.


7. The number of marchers is in dispute. The District of Columbia government estimated that 1.1 million persons took part in the 25 April march. The National Park Service, however, estimated three hundred thousand. March organizers claimed that the latter figure resulted from political pettiness by former Bush administration employees still in charge of the Park Service, who had planned to reseed the Mall that weekend and allowed the marchers to use it only after the intervention of the Clinton White House and Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt. The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, the country’s second largest gay rights organization, later settled on a split-the-difference figure of seven hundred thousand.

8. As an example of some newspapers’ sensitivity: in March and April 1993, Lynn Johnston’s comic strip about a Canadian family, “For Better or for Worse,” featured a five-week story line about a seventeen-year-old boy who “came out” as gay to friends and parents. As a result, nineteen newspapers in the United States canceled their subscriptions to the strip permanently, and another fifty refused to run the gay story line (Kramer 1993).

9. Given that this is so, and given the complete absence of published work on LGB people as voters, it is quite possible that the former is responsible in large part for the latter—in other words, it may be that fear by researchers of being associated with a study
of homosexuals is the reason for the absence of any such study up to now. I hope that, the 
ground now having been broken, fruitful future research on this important topic may 
take place with less hesitation.

10. It is notable as well that the union movement in the United States increasingly is 
dominated by white-collar professionals, particularly teachers and other government 
employees, whereas blue-collar unionism has declined dramatically in the past forty years.

11. The question was first used on an experimental basis in the New York Democratic 
presidential primary. Four percent of New York primary voters identified themselves as 
gay or lesbian, and of this predominantly white group, 57 percent cast their ballots for 
Jesse Jackson, who had made strong appeals for gay and lesbian support. The question 
was asked thereafter in all ten Democratic presidential primaries remaining that year, 
including those in Pennsylvania, Ohio, California, and New Jersey.


13. The U.S. Census found about 145,000 U.S. households in 1990 constituting 
same-sex “unmarried couples” (DiLallo and Krumholtz 1994).

14. The question appeared on the second page of the two-page form, in a “grab bag” 
of demographic and attitudinal descriptions headed, “Which of the following describes 
you? (Check all that apply)”; the answer item, appearing at the bottom of the list of eight 
to ten items (depending on the state) such as “union member” and “first-time voter,” read 
“gay or lesbian.”

15. VRS merged in 1993 with the News Election Service, which reports actual 
returns on election nights, to form Voter News Service (VNS).

16. This data set, regrettably, was not publicly available at the time of this study, and 
has not been examined here.

Notes to Chapter Two

1. This last alternately is expressed in voluntary “working-class” self-identification 
and/or in membership, not always voluntary, in a labor union.

2. There is not universal agreement on this. Young (1990), synthesizing New Left 
thinking on the subject, wholly redefines “oppression” as systemic and essentially organic, 
requiring no oppressing group or ideology and no conscious intent to oppress. For her, 
oppression is the result of unquestioned adherence to “norms, habits, and symbols” that 
diminish certain human beings because of their membership in groups, which membership 
is an integral and inseparable part of what they are. Further, like a virus, oppressive 
assumptions infect and are reproduced in nearly all economic, social, and political institutions 
and, therefore, oppression cannot be done away with by changing laws or even 
systems of government.

3. Interestingly to the non-Marxist, a (fairly simplistic) Times Mirror cluster analysis 
of a survey of roughly fifty-seven thousand American voters in 1987 found that, of their 
eleven clusters, the two that formed the support base of the Republican Party were 
“enterprisers,” voters most concerned with maintaining free enterprise and limiting
government intervention in the economy, and "moralists," those most concerned with using government to reinforce traditional Christian moral teachings and to fight what they consider to be moral degeneration (Ornstein et al. 1988).

4. All members of the Mattachine Society initially were men. The Daughters of Bilitis, founded in 1955, was the first lesbian organization in America (Martin and Lyon 1972).

5. Illinois became the first state to remove its consensual "sodomy" law from the books in 1961. To date, twenty-eight states (most recently, at this writing, Nevada) and the District of Columbia either have repealed their laws through the legislative process or had them struck down by state supreme courts as unconstitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court, in Bowers v. Hardwick (1986), ruled five to four that homosexual acts between consenting adults in private are not protected by the federal Constitution's right to privacy enunciated in previous rulings on contraception and abortion, and therefore twenty-two states retain laws criminalizing such behavior (Murdoch 1993).

6. The use of this term sticks in the craw of every LGB organization and every serious researcher on the subject of homosexuality and bisexuality. Sexual attraction, or even sexual behavior, manifestly is not a "lifestyle" in any meaningful sense of the term; the use of the term "lifestyle" appears to be a matter of initial carelessness compounded by sloth. Any readers who plan survey research in this area are warned hereby to employ accurate terminology in order to achieve valid results.

7. So named for the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), headquartered at the University of Chicago, which conducted the survey over seven months in 1993.

8. It is curious that no objections are raised to detailed public education about narcotics on the ground that such will promote drug abuse. Sherrill (1991) points out a similar lack of congressional concern with AIDS education aimed at intravenous drug users compared to such concern with respect to "safer sex" education for homosexual adults.

9. Writing for the majority, Justice Byron White (who dissented in both Griswold and Roe) framed the issue around the conduct in question rather than on the constitutional right to privacy issue, stating, "there is [no] constitutional right to commit homosexual sodomy." Chief Justice Warren Burger concurred, and quoted the opinion of the eighteenth-century English legal commentator Sir William Blackstone that sodomy was "abominable and unspeakable" and a crime "worse than rape."

The Bowers decision is discussed further by Goldstein (1988) and Vieira (1988).

10. These three countries still draw a distinction between same-sex and opposite-sex marriages; same-sex couples may not be married in the state church, nor may they adopt children. The Netherlands also has national legislation recognizing same-sex "domestic partnerships" for certain purposes, but does not give them the status of legal marriages.

11. Missouri and, until 1995, Virginia, alone among the states, held the legal position that living in a homosexual relationship per se was unrebutable proof of unfitness and, therefore, sufficient grounds to deprive a natural parent of custody. This rule was applied in 1993 in Henrico County, Virginia (suburban Richmond), in the well-known case of
Sharon Bottoms, a divorced woman living with her female lover. Custody of her two-year-old son was taken from her and given to Bottoms's mother by a trial judge, solely on the grounds of her live-in lesbian relationship. There was no allegation of abuse or neglect, and the child's father, Bottoms's ex-husband, supported Bottoms in the custody fight; but Virginia retains its felony sodomy law on the books. The Virginia Supreme Court, in a four to three decision on 21 April 1995, abandoned the rule of unfitness per se it laid down in 

*Roe v. Roe* (1985) but upheld the trial court, on grounds of other alleged (though unproven) deficiencies in Bottoms's character and of the possible stigma and "social ostracism" that might attach to her child as a result of the mother's living arrangement.

12. A trial court in Denver in December 1993 ruled that Amendment 2, as the measure is known, violated the U.S. Constitution and was therefore void; this ruling was affirmed by a six to one majority of the Colorado Supreme Court. The case at this writing is on appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.

13. For the sake of clarity, I am referring here to the child's becoming aware of the fact that differences in skin color or genitals are important to the people in her life, not to the political form of "group consciousness" discussed in this chapter.

14. I do not enter into the debate about what "causes" sexual attraction to one or another sex, or to both; the evidence is inconclusive, although Tripp (1975) and most subsequent researchers believe that the direction of one's sexual attraction is set in early childhood (if not before birth, by physiology), and is largely or entirely beyond the conscious control of parents. Most of the considerable share (43 percent) of the population who believe that homosexuality is "a choice" (Schmalz 1993) likely would concede that some preexisting internal inclination exists to act on homosexual attraction or "temptation," be it derived from nature, nurture, or Satan, and that the principal aim of the laws and practices we have discussed is strongly to discourage youth and adults alike from acting on this attraction.

15. The theoretical concept of "group consciousness" defined as such probably goes back to Engels's introduction to *The Communist Manifesto*.

16. Because of fears that group members could be arrested simply for discussing homosexuality, the Mattachine at first was organized into mutually anonymous cells organized from the top down, along the lines of the Communist Party. By 1953, however, partly because of concern over the rumored Communist ties of some of the leaders, partly because of a growing confidence that their activities could be pursued more publicly, the society became an open, membership-run organization. Although the organization effectively died out on the West Coast and in New York after the Stonewall riots, the Washington, D.C., branch, founded by longtime activist Dr. Frank Kameny, survived into the 1980s.

17. The American Psychiatric Association's governing board removed homosexuality from its list of mental and emotional disorders in 1972. Sharp protest in the ranks led to an unprecedented membership referendum on the issue in 1973, wherein the members voted by a margin of three to two to uphold the board. The American Psychological Association followed suit in 1975, and the World Health Organization did so in 1990.
It is well to note that Kameny was a particularly militant “homophile,” organizing the first gay pickets of the White House, the State Department, and other government facilities and lobbying for an end to the Civil Service’s exclusion of homosexuals from government employment. Following Stonewall, Kameny was the principal founder of the liberationist Gay Activists Alliance in Washington, and ran in the first election in the District of Columbia for a nonvoting delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1971, the first openly gay candidate for Congress in the country.

18. Friedan later repented—mostly—of her remarks and joined NOW leaders in 1973 who officially proclaimed lesbian rights an essential part of the women’s rights agenda. By late 1991, NOW had elected a national president, Patricia Ireland, who made headlines when she acknowledged having simultaneously a husband in Miami and a female lover in Washington, saying that she valued both relationships, that all three parties were happy with the arrangement, and that she was going to keep both partners. At this writing Ireland remains president of NOW, although numerous commentators in the popular press used her as Exhibit A in their case that NOW had become an extreme, avant-garde organization that had completely lost touch with the aspirations of the average American woman.

19. The most notorious incident involving members of ACT UP was a 1989 demonstration inside St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York during a mass said by John Cardinal O’Connor, a vociferous conservative who had led efforts to quash safer-sex education and condom distribution in city schools on the grounds that these would promote fornication, homosexuality, and condom usage, all of which the Roman Catholic Church deems sinful. A half-dozen demonstrators repeatedly disrupted the cardinal’s sermon, then chained themselves to pews or lay across the main aisle while congregants were attempting to receive Communion. One person took a Communion wafer (which devout Catholics believe contains the actual body of Christ), dropped it on the floor in front of the cardinal, and crushed it under foot. The St. Patrick’s incident was cheered by some people furious at conservative religious leaders whose sexual mores seemed to them more important than saving people’s lives, while it appalled or enraged most everyone else.

ACT UP in New York eventually splintered in a conflict over the role of its Treatment and Data Committee, which more militant members thought was getting too powerful within the organization and too close to the government agencies and drug companies it was supposed to be confronting. Meanwhile, the ACT UP chapter in San Francisco split in two in late 1990 over differences between members who wanted to concentrate solely on AIDS issues and other members who wanted ACT UP to get involved in other causes, including opposition to the Persian Gulf War.

Notes to Chapter Three

1. There are two separate self-identification questions in the “Glick poll” discussed in chapter 5, one of which includes “bisexual” as a category. However, that question differed distinctively from the self-identification format in the other polls, and, in addition, only
fourteen persons self-identified as bisexual, three of whom also called themselves "gay or lesbian" in the other self-identification item. For these reasons I chose to use the self-identification question that more closely resembled that used in the national and state exit polls as my indicator.

2. Regrettably, no such study has appeared in the literature concerning women.

3. The percentages by age group were as follows: eighteen to twenty-nine, 2.6; thirty to thirty-nine, 1.4; forty to forty-four, 1.6; forty-five to forty-nine, 1.5; fifty to fifty-nine, 0.3; sixty and older, 0.3.

4. The term "heterosexual" or "straight" must be used with some caution, in that the "heterosexual" respondents include the probable majority of homosexual or bisexual voters who would not declare themselves. I have avoided its usage here.

5. As noted earlier in this study, about 9 percent of men and 5 percent of women in the Janus-Janus study (1993) indicated they were exclusively or predominately homosexual in behavior; 4 percent of men and 2 percent of women identified themselves as homosexual; and 5 percent of men and 3 percent of women identified themselves as bisexual.

6. Eighteen percent of self-identified lesbians reported having children under the age of eighteen in the CBS poll, as opposed to 6 percent of the gay men.

7. At the time of the survey, only the District of Columbia and three states—Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Hawaii—had statewide laws on the books banning discrimination of various kinds based on sexual orientation. In several other states, governors had issued executive orders barring antigay discrimination in state employment and/or contracting practices. Since the 1990 survey, California, Connecticut, Minnesota, New Jersey, Vermont, and Rhode Island have added sexual orientation as a protected category in certain of their state civil rights laws.

8. The term "other Christian" is an extremely broad brush. Clearly it includes the Eastern Orthodox churches; Latter-day Saints would consider it to include them as well. However, those raised in some conservative sects of Protestant origin also may identify as "other Christian," as may some Anglicans, Christian Scientists, and Unitarians, for example.

9. The link between Christianity and certain conservative positions, however, is less easy to grasp. Although it is clear from previous studies, as well as from the present data, that some positive correlation exists between Christian identification and ideological conservatism, why Christians should be more inclined to favor the death penalty, oppose cutting defense spending, or emphasize law enforcement over drug education and treatment than are non-Christians is simply curious.

10. This being the case, the finding that nearly identical shares of the gay and nongay samples call themselves "fundamentalist or evangelical Christians" is curious indeed; one would expect that those who identify with "mainline" Protestant churches would be far more forthcoming. I can offer no explanation for this finding at present.

11. Responses rated "liberal" were those supporting decreased defense spending, opposing restrictions on legal abortion, favoring education and treatment over law en-
forcement in dealing with the drug problem, supporting protection of the environment over preserving jobs when the two conflicted, opposing the death penalty, and opposing continued deployment in the Persian Gulf. Responses rated "conservative" were the converse, including support for any restrictions on abortion and for either increasing defense spending or maintaining it at current levels.

12. Most of the lesbian/gay Republican voters, we may note, were George Bush supporters in 1988, and tended to approve of Bush's conduct in office—but two-thirds were undecided as to whether they would vote for him again, and one in six said they would vote for the Democrat.

13. The actual 1988 electorate gave approximately 53 percent of its votes to Bush, 46 percent to Dukakis.

14. The other listed candidates were conservative Georgia Senator Sam Nunn and Virginia's Douglas Wilder, the nation's first elected black governor and a fiscal conservative.

15. The only demographic differences of any note were the propensity of a larger share of gay men to reside in central cities, while a plurality of lesbians in the sample resided in the suburbs; a small "gender gap" in household income between gay men and lesbians, which may be attributable to living arrangements such as suburban residence in that there was no significant difference in occupational status; and the fact that three times as many lesbians as gay men had children living at home.

16. Gay men were not broken out by feminism because of the small number of gay men who called themselves strong feminists (N = 6).

17. Because the question on children living at home was in the CBS data base, it is impossible to determine whether there is a relationship among actual child care responsibilities, attitudes on education, and feminism among lesbians.

18. In addition, only one "strong feminist" identified as a Republican.

19. These paragraphs discuss self-identified independents and third party identifiers together. The hypothesized "green" vote for the House of Representatives is discussed separately after this.

20. Only eight respondents were in states with Senate elections, and their votes were scattered among the parties.

21. See the discussion of the William Weld- John Silber gubernatorial race in Massachusetts in chapter 4 for an illustration.

22. As noted in the table, this also gave rise to the peculiar, although highly insignificant, effect of causing the direction of the relationship to be reversed. That is, after all the control variables were added in, self-identification as gay or lesbian purportedly made one less likely to vote for a Democrat for the House. This appears to be a direct result of liberal (especially lesbian feminist) desertions of the Democrats for third candidates, as discussed above.

23. Named for the University of Michigan, where the four coauthors of The American Voter taught and did their research.
24. Race sometimes is included as a fourth independent variable in retrospective models.

25. In the three-way 1992 presidential election, Dr. Steven E. Finkel (unpublished data), using a pre-election survey of Charlottesville, Virginia, area voters, found that when Ross Perot supporters were excluded from the analysis, the retrospective model was 95 percent accurate in predicting who would support Bill Clinton or George Bush.

26. The wording varies slightly in the two data sets. The VRS form asked respondents whether they approved or disapproved of the job Congress was doing; the CBS form asked whether they believed most members of Congress were deserving of reelection.

27. These VRS findings were substantially confirmed in the CBS database, which included no question on retrospective economic evaluations and must therefore be deemed incomplete in that respect. However, in neither test run with the CBS data was the evaluation of Congress as a whole significant. Also, curiously, there was a statistically significant independent effect of self-identification on voting for a Democrat, but not on voting for a Republican (data not shown). Why this last should be so is exceedingly curious. One possible explanation, confirmed in the data, is the fact that religion was a statistically significant factor in voting for the Republicans, but not for the Democrats.

Notes to Chapter Four

1. I employ this typology with caution. This scheme may be unsatisfactory to those seeking a strong empirical basis for Elazar’s normative classifications (the present data bases certainly provide us with none), and the classifications themselves are thirty years old. I have taken into account population migrations among the states, and the veritable revolution in voting rights and representation law that have taken place in the interim.

2. It is very important that the reader not confuse “moralistic,” as Elazar uses it, with the “moralistic” politics of the Religious Right. A number of the states with “moralistic” political cultures are those least inclined to be influenced by religious conservatives. A better term for this classification of political culture probably would have been “communitarian,” although when Elazar wrote his book he or his editors may have thought the word too easy to confuse with, say, “communist.”

3. A few examples: The forty state senators each represent districts of about 750,000 inhabitants apiece, larger than the fifty-two U.S. House districts, and the eighty state assembly members have districts of about 375,000 persons each. Each of the five members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors is elected from a separate district of 1.8 million people apiece. (Thirty percent of Californians live in Los Angeles County.) San Franciscans elect their eleven-member Board of Supervisors at large, and the fifteen Los Angeles City Council districts each comprise more than 200,000 people.

4. Shilts (1982) noted that Feinstein’s warm relations with individual gay and lesbian people go back many years. In 1975, only a few weeks before facing voters citywide in
her bid for reelection to the Board of Supervisors, Feinstein, at her own insistence, hosted a lesbian wedding in her backyard; she wanted to be present for the 'holy union' ceremony for two lesbian friends, but could not leave her dying first husband at home.

Epstein (1986), however, took note of Feinstein's strong ties to downtown business interests in San Francisco and her leadership on the board of the six to five majority opposing the liberal, "neighborhood"-oriented forces of Mayor Moscone and Harvey Milk.

5. These included former governors John Volpe and Francis Sargent, former U.S. Senator Edward Brooke, and the late Representative Silvio Conte.

6. A third principal candidate in the primary, Lieutenant Governor Evelyn Murphy, is of interest to our discussion. Murphy dropped out of the race eight days before the primary; the most liberal candidate in the race, she was harmed by being tied to Dukakis, even though she once staged a brief (and technically constitutional) takeover of state government while Dukakis was out of state. In June 1990, a Boston gay activist accused her on live television of being a closeted lesbian, a charge on which she declined comment and for which the activist later apologized (Bull 1990). The "outing" incident was not widely publicized and apparently was not a factor in Murphy's poor showing in the polls, which led to her withdrawal.

7. Among other comments, Silber suggested that old people, once having reached a certain level of inability, should die in order to save society trouble; he also said Massachusetts had become a "welfare magnet" for those he euphemistically said were more used to "warmer climes."

8. Even the state's lieutenant governor occupies an independent power center; elected separately from the governor, he (there have been no women in the job) is the leader de facto and de jure of the state senate.

9. She was not the first woman governor of Texas; that distinction belongs to Miriam "Ma" Ferguson, who was elected to succeed her incarcerated husband in 1924.

10. "Big Green" may be presented as an inherent case of what Elazar might describe as Californian conflict between its desire for a more pristine "commonwealth" and its desire to let people alone. It can be argued that—the strongly individualistic tendencies of self-identified lesbians and gay men seen in chapter 3 notwithstanding—when it came to the environment the "moralistic" or communitarian tendency won out with California gay and lesbian voters.

11. The sample appears extreme in other respects as well, even among the gay and lesbian voters examined so far. Three of five claim some postgraduate education, three of seven are "strong feminists," and nearly one in four were raised in the Jewish faith. These results may reflect the fact that a large disproportion of the sample precincts were in the city of Boston; one-third of all respondents, and an absolute majority of gay and lesbian self-identifiers, are found within the city limits of Boston. It is true, additionally, that the tiny sample makes inferences to the whole self-identified gay and lesbian population of the state considerably more hazardous. Be this as it may, statistically significant differences remain even with this sample size.

12. Massachusetts has a "semi-closed" primary system; registered independents may
vote in the primary of either party, but registered Democrats or Republicans may not
cross over. Among voters as a whole there is significant overreporting of voting in this
particular Republican primary.

13. In the sample, of the seven gay men who evidently voted against Richards because
of her sex, four were self-described moderate Democrats and three self-described liberal
independents. All voted for Ben Parmer, the unsuccessful (and somewhat unknown)
Democratic nominee facing Senator Phil Gramm. The only thing they appeared to have
in common was an uncommonly strong opposition to abortion; all said it should never be
legal. However, none rated abortion as a strong factor in their voting decision.

14. Unlike in the national data examined in the last chapter, incumbency cannot be
entered as a factor in an individual contest. As it happens, only in the Massachusetts and
Texas U.S. Senate races were incumbents seeking reelection; all other contests were “open
seat” races.

15. It is odd that the addition of party affiliation, in the case of Massachusetts,
slightly increases the explanatory power of sexual self-identification after demographic
correlates have been controlled for.

16. Whether it does so in the governor’s race depends on whether one uses a vote for
Ann Richards (significant) or for Clayton Williams (not significant) as the dependent
variable. I include it in the “significant” category because identifying as gay or lesbian
was significant in determining whether or not to vote for Ann Richards.

Notes to Chapter Five

1. On 27 June 1969, police raided the Stonewall Inn, a bar frequented by younger
gay men and some transvestites, on the grounds that the bar had violated its liquor
license. However, numerous patrons were herded into police wagons and some were
roughed up. Other patrons and onlookers who had left the bar attacked the police, first
verbally, then with rocks and bottles, forcing the police to call for reinforcements.
Evening skirmishes between police and gay people continued for three successive nights.
“Stonewall” is widely regarded as the Lexington and Concord of the gay rights movement,
the first time that homosexuals stood up to and fought back against police repression
(Duberman 1993).

2. Source: personal interviews and communications with Robert W. Bailey and Ken-

3. Owles ran in 1973 against City Councillor Carol Greitzer, a lower Manhattan
Democrat who had offended the gay and lesbian community by declining to meet with
community leaders, saying she “couldn’t be bothered.” (Revson 1978; Kenneth S. Sherrill,
personal communication.)

Morrison was president of GLID at the time of our conversation, and Ryan had been
involved with the organization for many years.

5. Ryan and Morrison, ibid.
6. To “out” people is to disclose their homosexuality or bisexuality without their permission, particularly in a public forum. Initially its chief practitioner and advocate was Outweek’s columnist Michelangelo Signorile, although by this writing the practice has been adopted among some in the mainstream press when deemed “newsworthy.” “Outing” has remained a source of extreme controversy in the LGB community. Some argue it is justified only when a public figure uses his or her influence actively to oppose lesbian and gay civil rights; others say it is never justifiable at all. (See Mohr 1992; Signorile 1993; Gross 1993.)

7. New York has a “challenge” primary law for statewide elections. A state convention chooses the party’s nominee, unless more than one candidate can succeed in winning the votes of 25 percent of the state convention delegates. The only candidate facing a primary challenge was Carol Bellamy, a former New York City Council president seeking the nomination for state controller, a post then held by a Republican; all other statewide elected offices, except for one U.S. Senate seat, were held by the Democrats. Bellamy, as expected, easily won her primary.

8. The assembly district is the principal unit of party organization in New York City; each is composed of numerous “election districts” or precincts. Assembly district leaders make up the general governing bodies of each of the four county party organizations (Staten Island excepted), which in turn constitute the citywide organizations. In the Manhattan Democratic organization, each assembly district is divided for ease of management into two, three, or four “executive parts,” each of which has two co leaders, one male and one female, who are elected in the party’s primary. Shollenberger was the female leader, and Hoffmann the male leader, in the northern “executive part” of the Sixty-first, and Freed the female leader of the southern part.


10. Source: Robert W. Bailey, Kenneth S. Sherrill, Philip Ryan, and Laura Morrison, interviews and personal communications.

11. It should be noted that Glick, although the first elected legislator, would not be the first openly gay or lesbian elected official in New York City. In 1989, a gay man and a lesbian both were elected to Manhattan judgeships, becoming the first “out-of-the-closet” elected public officials in the city. Tim Mains, elected to the Rochester City Council in 1985, was the first openly gay elected public official in New York state. Because New York City’s Democratic and Republican district leaders are elected in party primaries, Kenneth S. Sherrill (one of the three principal co creators of the Glick poll), who was elected a Democratic leader of an assembly district on the Upper West Side of Manhattan in 1977, holds the distinction of being the first openly gay elected official in New York.

12. Rygor, left without any significant endorsements, created a “New Frontier Democratic Club,” comprising himself and a few supporters. The club promptly gave him their “endorsement,” which then appeared on his campaign literature.


14. The Times gave its blessing in 1989 to Tom Duane, the openly gay opponent of
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downtown Manhattan council member Carol Greitzer, who as previously noted had offended the LGB community in the early 1970s and was never forgiven. Greitzer’s council district at the time overlapped the Sixty-first Assembly District to some extent. In a court-ordered special election in 1991, in which the size of the council was expanded from thirty-five to fifty-one members, Duane was elected in an open-seat district—largely overlapping Deborah Glick’s assembly district—which was drawn in order to maximize LGB influence. Greitzer was defeated for reelection in a neighboring district.

15. Glick won the November general election with more than four-fifths of the vote against token Republican and minor party opposition.

16. It is interesting to note that half of the nongay identifiers nonetheless agreed that “activist groups such as ACT-UP” had helped the cause of gay rights. Given its particularly confrontational tactics in New York, including the disruption of a 1989 service at St. Patrick’s Cathedral led by John Cardinal O’Connor (chapter 2, n. 19), this is a verdict not likely to be rendered by heterosexuals in the rest of the country, nor even in much of the city.

17. I am struck by the constant recurrence of the figure 77 percent. The reader will recall that the “progay” gubernatorial candidates in California, Massachusetts, and Texas won 77, 77, and 78 percent of the gay and lesbian self-identifiers, respectively, in their general elections. The fact that Deborah Glick won 77 percent of these voters in her primary, and David Dinkins won 77 percent of these voters in this district in his primary, is a terribly amusing coincidence.

18. It is notable in this context that Rygor, the other openly gay candidate, was not picked by any of the lesbian and gay respondents.

19. One gender-based issue difference came to the fore: lesbians were as likely as nonlesbian women, and more than twice as likely as gay or nongay men, to name abortion as one of the top two issues in the election.

20. Rygor’s faux club, the “New Frontier Democrats,” was included to see if it made any impact at all. One gay respondent (who was heavily downweighted) did cite New Frontier—and that person voted for someone other than Rygor.

21. The “New Frontier Democrats” were excluded from the analysis.

22. This is not to say, however, that the GLID endorsement was unimportant. The initial base of volunteers Glick needed to contact her supporters in the lesbian and gay community came from her home club, GLID; and the voter contact apparently had some of the desired mobilizing effect.

23. Kenneth S. Sherrill (various personal communications) argues strongly that the Times endorsement did not necessarily persuade uncertain lesbian and gay voters, but instead “validated” their predisposition to vote for Glick and gave them ammunition to use with undecided heterosexual friends and neighbors. That this is possible I concede, and Dr. Sherrill is, saying the least, far better schooled and experienced in New York’s Democratic politics and LGB politics than am I. Yet the wording of the endorsement question on the exit poll was such that the stronger inference, I believe, is that these voters may not have turned out, or may have voted for a different candidate, absent the
good word from the *Times*. The one way to test these differing interpretations would have been to ask the voters when they made up their minds, a question frequently asked in exit polls and postelection surveys. Sadly, no such question was included in the Glick poll, so the debate remains unresolved.

Notes to Chapter Six

1. Edelman (1993) reports figures differing slightly from mine. Employing a larger, combined database which incorporates both the national survey responses and the California and New York state-level respondents (weighted down to their share of the national electorate), he reports, among other findings, that 70 percent of self-identifiers voted for Clinton. The national data set made available to academic researchers by ICPSR appears to be the one used on election night, incorporating only the respondents to the three versions of the national survey.

2. Oddly, one question was included in Versions W and Y, but not in Version P, whereas three additional questions were include in Y and P, but not W.

3. I found no support, incidentally, for the notion that the proportion of LGB schoolteachers is significantly higher in states with gay rights laws preventing those teachers from being dismissed because of their sexual orientation.

4. That one's party identification has a direct effect on evaluations of presidential performance, and on "objective" national economic evaluations, is not in dispute.

5. Only thirteen states, most of minimal size, held gubernatorial elections in 1992; thirty-five held such elections in 1990. The total LGB sample from states electing governors, therefore, was minimal as well (N = 40), and the difference between the LGB and non-LGB groups only approached statistical significance (at .099). Little further analysis of the gubernatorial results has been undertaken.

6. As noted at the beginning of the chapter, the vote for third candidates for the House of Representatives was omitted from the 1992 data set. Given the high percentage of votes for third candidates for the House among lesbians and gay men in 1990, one cannot conclude that the two-party results presented and analyzed here are definitive.

7. Less encouraging for Clinton, however, is the finding that one-quarter of the LGB Democrats would have voted instead for Ross Perot if he had had a chance to win the election. The same was true of equal proportions of LGB Republicans and independents who did not vote for Perot.

8. Again, it is important to state that this analysis excludes any votes cast for third party and independent candidates in House races, because these votes were not coded into the data set.

Notes to Chapter Seven

1. In cities with populations of 250,000 to 499,000 in the West, self-identified gay men and lesbians accounted for 6.1 percent of the voting population in November 1990.
This was the highest figure for any region or size/type of locality. (Source: Combined 1990 national data bases [U.S.A. data])

2. The most extreme example comes from a contest I did not examine in detail, the 1990 North Carolina Senate race between ultraconservative Senator Jesse Helms, regarded by LGB groups as the most antigay member of the Senate, and Harvey Gantt, the African American former mayor of Charlotte who quietly courted LGB support. The twenty-two gay and lesbian self-identifiers in the Helms-Gantt exit poll, nearly half of whom said they had voted for George Bush in 1988, voted unanimously for Gantt.

3. Dole—who has twice signed a Human Rights Campaign pledge that he does not discriminate against LGBs in hiring his Senate staffers—got into hot water in the summer of 1995 when his campaign returned a thousand-dollar contribution from the Log Cabin Federation, the national LGB Republican organization. A letter to Log Cabin from Dole's campaign said the group's agenda was "completely opposed" to the senator's own. (Log Cabin had also sent thousand-dollar donations to Wilson and Specter's campaigns, which had been quietly accepted.) After being criticized in the media for appearing intolerant, Dole publicly disavowed the return of the contribution and blamed it on his staff. This led to more criticism, from religious conservatives and from commentators who accused Dole of behaving like the allegedly flip-flopping president he was trying to unseat.

Notes to Appendix

1. I have chosen not to analyze the polls on the 1988 and 1992 Democratic presidential primaries, in that primary electorates do not reflect the populations of the states in which they are held—and the 1988 races have already been looked at (Bailey 1989). The Glick poll in chapter 5 is analyzed principally because of its unique independent variable indicators, and additionally because it is the only contest on which polling data were available to me that included an openly gay or lesbian candidate.

As this work goes to press, analyses of the LGB vote in the New York and Los Angeles mayoral races of 1993 are forthcoming from Dr. Robert W. Bailey of Rutgers-Camden, who performed the analysis of the 1988 Democratic primary races.

2. The sole exception was Virginia, in which Republican Senator John Warner faced opposition to his reelection only from an independent candidate allied with Lyndon LaRouche.

3. In Kentucky, to take the most extreme example, all of four respondents checked the self-identifier box. In several other states, the number of respondents was in the single digits or low teens (see table 4.1).

4. For example, region was recoded into "East" or "non-East," "South" or "non-South," "Midwest" or "non-Midwest," and "West" or "non-West." One such dummy variable was chosen as the "baseline" against which the others were measured. "Midwest" was chosen as the baseline for region, "Protestant" for religious background and religion
today, and "rural" for size of locality in the national data sets; in the three state data sets there were no "rural" cases, so "10,000–49,999" population was used as the baseline.

In later analyses, party affiliation and party of the incumbent officeholder seeking reelection also were coded into "dummies." "Independent" was the baseline for party, and "open seat" for incumbency.

5. Age groups in 1990 were clustered as follows: 18–29, 30–39, 40–44, 45–49, 50–59, and 60 or above. Translated, these produce categories of people born, respectively, in 1961 or after; 1951–60; 1946–50 (the immediate postwar period that began the baby boom); 1941–45 (the World War II years); 1931–40; and 1930 or before.

In 1992 the age groups were clustered as follows: 18–24, 25–29, 30–39, 40–44, 45–49, 50–59, 60–64, and 65 or above. This translates into groups of those born, respectively, in 1968 or after; 1963–67; 1953–62; 1948–52; 1943–47; 1933–42; 1928–32; and 1927 or before.

6. Education clusters were as follows: did not graduate high school, high school graduate, some college, college graduate, and postgraduate study. Household income clusters in 1990 were the following: less than $15,000, $15,000–$29,999, $30,000–$49,999, $50,000–$99,999, and $100,000 or more. In 1992 the last two income categories were revised to $50,000–$74,999, and $75,000 or more.

7. This last was deemed important because of the large infusion of American troops into the Persian Gulf and the possibility of war in that region at the time of the 1990 general election.

8. Size of locality clusters: city of 500,000 or more, city of 250,000–499,999, city of 50,000–249,999, suburbs, city/town of 10,000–49,999, or rural area (including nonsuburban towns of 10,000 or fewer residents).

9. In calculating and reporting these last results, I excluded Republican identifiers. The candidates listed, in order, were Texas Senator Lloyd Bentsen, New Jersey Senator Bill Bradley, Arkansas Governor Bill Clinton, New York Governor Mario Cuomo, the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Georgia Senator Sam Nunn, and Virginia Governor Douglas Wilder; an additional box allowed the respondent to indicate "someone else."