

The Newsletter **for the LGBTQ Study Group**

of the American Musicological Society

volume sixteen, number one (spring, 2006)

issn: 1556-0406

The LGBTQ Study Group is a recognized special interest group of the American Musicological Society. Its objectives include promoting communication among lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, transsexual and queer music scholars; increasing awareness of issues in sexuality and music in the academic community; and establishing a forum for the presentation of scholarly work on all aspects of sexuality and music. The group also provides an environment in which to examine processes of transitioning and coming out in academia, to contribute to a positive political climate for the inclusion of LGBTQ perspectives in curricula and to encourage affirmative action and non-discriminatory policies regarding sexuality and gender, as well as age, race, ethnicity and conjugal status.

Members of the Board

Gillian Rodger, Co-Chair

William Meredith, Co-Chair

Richard J. Agee, Secretary-Treasurer

Rose Theresa, Co-Editor of *The Newsletter*

Robert Torre, Co-Editor of *The Newsletter*

Luke S. Jensen, Member-at-Large

Christina Baade, Member-at-Large

Stephan Pennington, Member-at-Large

Megan Jenkins, Member-at-Large

Inside this issue

NEWS FROM THE EDITORS
page 2

ESSAY

Edward Maisel
and the Historiography of
Charles Griffes's Homosexuality
by Howard Pollack
page 3

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Calls for Papers
page 11

Places to Publish
page 15

Upcoming Events
page 18

Subscriptions & Contributions:

Membership dues for the LGBTQ Study Group include subscription to spring and fall issues of *The Newsletter*. The financial burden of producing *The Newsletter* is not eased by any institution or grant. Though we welcome contributions in any amount, a Supporting Membership of \$25 goes toward production of *The Newsletter*. Please see the insert to this issue for further information.

Mailing List:

The Newsletter mailing list is maintained by the Secretary-Treasurer of the LGBTQ Study Group and is not offered to any other organization.

Photocopying:

Libraries are authorized to photocopy materials from *The Newsletter* for the purposes of course reserve reading at the rate of one copy for every 15 students, and may re-use copies for other courses or for the same course offered subsequently. Back issues are available from the Secretary-Treasurer.

From the Editors:

Hello all! We the Editors, along with the Board wish to make a special effort in the next few months to bring more graduate-student members into the LGBTQ Study Group of the AMS. We are planning to address graduate-student participation at the upcoming business meeting in Los Angeles and would like, at this point, to request input from graduate students and others regarding topics for discussion. One potential question has come up already: does being out or not being out have anything to do with graduate-student perceptions of or interest in the LGBTQ Study Group? Does being out even matter to graduate students these days? Please feel free to contact

any members of the Board with comments, questions and suggestions regarding this and any and all aspects of graduate student participation. We hope to see you in Los Angeles!

Item number two: Stephan Pennington, our webmanager is in the process of designing a new website for the Group. More on this to come...

Our last bit of news includes a special announcement regarding the next issue of *The Newsletter*. We hope to make the Fall 2006 issue a nice, fat one. See our call for papers below

All best wishes,
Rose and Robert

Bisexuality in Music: A Call for Papers

For much of its history, bisexuality has barely been recognized as a legitimate topic for historical or theoretical discourse of any sort. Indeed, for many, bisexuality has often seemed little more than a question, at best. "Does bisexuality really even exist?" Only within the last decade or so has scholarship in the humanities begun to acknowledge, theorize and historicize this seemingly liminal aspect of human identity. Music scholarship in particular, much of which continues to perpetuate heterosexual-homosexual dichotomies, has yet to adequately acknowledge bisexuality, its place, histories and theories in music. In an effort to address this obvious lacuna, the editors and board members of the LGBTQ Study Group of the American Musicological Society propose the next issue of *The Newsletter* be devoted to the topic of Bisexuality in Music.

General questions we wish to pose for this special issue include:

Does bisexuality exist in music?

If so, how so?

In what ways and in what permutations do we encounter bisexuality in music?

Do these permutations follow queer pathways, or rather their own?

We invite submissions on all aspects of bisexuality and music and offer the following rubrics as suggestions for essay topics:

bisexuality and its significance to the lives of musicians;

the musical performance of bisexuality;

bisexuality and voice;

popular music and bisexuality;

operatic bisexuality/bisexual opera;

historiographies of music and bisexuality;

exploring analytical theories and methodologies of bisexuality and music.

Suggestions, questions and submissions may be sent by September 1, 2006 to:

Robert Torre

Rose Theresa

Edward Maisel and the Historiography of Charles Griffes's Homosexuality

by Howard Pollack

Edward Maisel's biography, *Charles T. Griffes: The Life of an American Composer*, remains a major, if somewhat neglected, milestone in the field of gay musicology. Maisel began researching Griffes in 1938, published his book in 1943, and republished it in 1984 with a few revisions, most notably, a new introduction and the inclusion – forty years after initial publication – of endnotes.¹

For its time especially, Maisel's biography was astonishing for its candid and respectful treatment of Griffes as a gay man. In the process Maisel shed helpful light on New York's gay subculture of the early twentieth century, as evident from George Chauncey's extensive reliance on it for his 1994 study of *Gay New York*.² That Maisel would write such a book in 1943 and that Knopf would publish it supports the notion that the dislocations caused by the Second World War helped reverse immediate, prewar trends and initiate a new tolerance and understanding of homosexuality, a development to which this book contributed. Some comparative study with the principal Griffes biography of our own time — Donna Anderson's 1993 study of the composer, *Charles T. Griffes: A Life in Music* — makes Maisel's achievement all the more remarkable.³

Maisel was aided in this project by his subject's candor, for Griffes wrote extensively about his sexual life in his letters and diaries, although he naturally engaged in various codes and innuendos, and took the added precaution of penning more sexually-oriented matters in German. In order to help round out his portrait of Griffes, Maisel also interviewed some of the composer's close friends on such matters as homosexual cruising in the 1910s.

How much Maisel drew upon his own experiences in crafting Griffes's life story remains largely unknown. In spite of efforts over the last few months to discover more about Maisel —

assisted in this matter by Donna Anderson, among others — I have been unable to find out very much. He was Jewish; he grew up in Buffalo, New York; he majored in American studies at Harvard; and he lived his adult life in Manhattan — first on the upper west side, and later in the Village — where he earned his livelihood as a free-lance writer, with work that included publications on Tai-chi and the Alexander technique. He may still be alive. At some point, he married Betty Cage, who worked for many years as the general manager of the New York City Ballet, and who died in 1999; Cage's obituary names as sole survivor, "her husband, the writer Edward Maisel," with whom she lived "in Manhattan." But professional contacts who knew Maisel always remembered him living on his own, and were sometimes shocked when they found out, after many years acquaintance, that he was married; many of these friends believe that he was homosexual.⁴

In his Griffes biography, Maisel used codes and innuendos of his own. For three important personages in his narrative — Griffes's boyfriend during his years in Berlin (1903-1907); a student of his at the Hackley school with whom he became infatuated (Griffes taught at Hackley in Tarrytown, New York, from 1907 to his death in 1920); and the married New York policeman with whom he enjoyed a longstanding emotional and apparently physical relationship — Maisel used pseudonyms: Konrad Wölke for the Berlin boyfriend; Robert Corby for the Hackley student; and Dan C. Martin for the policeman. Donna Anderson, in her monograph, helpfully provided the real names for the Berlin boyfriend (Emil Joël) and the police officer (John Meyer), but even she refrained from identifying Corby or any other Hackley boy whom Griffes romanced; instead, she substituted their names with dashes.

Maisel's unapologetically gay reading of Griffes takes early, if subtle, expression in his book with a discussion of the young Charles's "strange

tastes” and “inexplicable preferences.” Speaking of Griffes’s “delicate perception of color,” Maisel notes his description of a little girl’s dress as “watermelon pink,” and adds, “The proper matching of segments for quilting, the correct flower arrangement of the jars and blooms at hand, the appropriate costume for the time of day and occasion, all fell within the scope of his judgment. Whether Katharine [his sister] were to essay the hat with the roses or a leghorn with pansies hinged on his authority” (p. 10). (Griffes had three sisters — Katherine (b. 1874), Florence (b. 1880), and Marguerite (b. 1886) – and a brother, Arthur.)

Donna Anderson also mentions Griffes’s “keen” sensitivity to color, but offers as examples a bright orange tie that the adult Griffes kept on his tie rack, and that he chose not to wear because “he thought it was a little too bright.” She also cites his request that sister Marguerite “wear a green plaid dress that she had made, because he was especially fond of it and because she looked so good in it” (pp. 31, 33).

These parallel discussions already reveal differences in sensibility. Maisel mentions Griffes’s “delicate perception of color,” Anderson, the stronger “keen, observant eye;” Maisel mentions, “watermelon pink;” Anderson, the more masculine “green plaid;” Maisel speaks of quilts, flower arrangements, and flowered hats, while Anderson, again, evokes the more masculine tie. Maisel, knowing full well the association of “pansies” with homosexuals, fairly winks at the reader by ending his discussion with a reference to “leghorn with pansies,” a reference which further implies a sensitivity on Griffes’s part to women’s accessories.

Similar differences between Maisel and Anderson crop up in their discussion of the dress-up parties in which Charles and his friends would don various costumes. Anderson writes that these friends would ransack through an old trunk of clothes, “some of which had belonged to Grandfather Solomon – hats, shoes, dresses, vests, suits, coats, dusters, ribbons, everything under the sun.” Although she mentions “dresses,” “dusters,” and “ribbons,” she doesn’t specifically state that Charles wore any of these feminine articles, as opposed to the “vests,” “suits,” or other clothing presumably worn by his grandfather (p. 33).

Maisel, on the other hand, writes, “On one occasion Charles might deck himself in the finery and chic of a Gibson girl. Or on another, he might become Faust, in a woolly cape of eiderdown lined with cerise satin and replete with swan’s-down about the neck, and ruff and beads” (p. 12). The Gibson girl reference obviously introduces the matter of cross-dressing, while the description of the Faust costume approaches high camp. Anderson discusses neither outfit in her text, though she reproduces photos of Charles in the Gibson girl costume (looking happier, incidentally, than at any time in his life) as well as in the Faust costume, thus acting as a kind of silent witness to Griffes’s homosexuality (a tactic also manifested in her citations of gay diary entries without accompanying commentary).

Regarding Charles’s everyday dress, both as child and adult, Maisel and Anderson again register different tones. Anderson speaks of Griffes as “fastidious in his dress,” citing a sister-in-law who remembered him as “neat, well-dressed, and well-groomed;” and quoting a nephew as saying, “He was pretty well-dressed, wore a tie and suit – and dark, usually brown. I remember his wearing yellow shirts once in a while, and a green tie” (p. 33). As with her discussion of the orange tie, Anderson thus relegates Griffes’s brighter, more audacious clothes to the closet.

Again, compare with Maisel, who talks of Griffes’s “veneration for clothes,” in particular, his childhood preference for “a broad-brimmed straw hat” with a “mahogany” band that he wore all day and even all night – thus taking that article of clothing, at least, out of the closet and into the bed. Maisel also relates an incident in which, after his mother altered one of his coats, the young Charles “wept bitter tears because the marks showed on the sleeves where they had been let down” (p. 12). These anecdotes plainly suggest a temperament that goes beyond the description of Griffes as “neat” and “well-groomed.”

Turning to questions of sexual identity, both biographies turn murky, partly because of a certain shared evasiveness. Both agree that, in Anderson’s words, “Griffes felt no shame about his homosexuality; rather he expressed frustration that homosexuals could not meet openly” (p. 40). Maisel further states that

Griffes's theories regarding homosexuality derived in part from his readings of Edward Carpenter and Havelock Ellis, whereas Anderson mentions only a letter from Griffes to Carpenter in passing, and makes no mention at all of Ellis. In the endnotes for the 1984 edition, Maisel helpfully elaborated on these important connections, stating, "From these two writers [Carpenter and Ellis] he appears to have gained his lifetime conviction that his condition was innate and organic," and that "his homosexual nature was congenital and unchangeable and must be accepted as such." Maisel also guesses that Griffes had no knowledge of Freud; underscores differences between Ellis's and Freud's "interpretation of inversion as a sidetracking of sexual development precipitated by Oedipal factors;" and quotes a friend of Griffes's as saying, "What he said about his inclination was very like Havelock Ellis" (pp. 345-346).

Maisel clearly wants the reader to understand that Griffes, like Ellis, believed that homosexuality was "congenital and unchangeable," and not "a sidetracking of sexual development," though this represents something of an imaginative leap. As further support, Maisel cites some of Griffes's thoughts on Robert Sherard's *The Life of Oscar Wilde* as set down in a diary entry of December 22, 1912, in which Griffes "takes for granted the 'latent tendency toward inversion,' the only questions being whether it manifests itself early or late in life, and if late, under what kind of external influence" (p. 346).

In discussing Griffes's construct of homosexuality, Anderson similarly makes use of his thoughts on Oscar Wilde, though to different ends. She first quotes a November 16, 1922 diary entry inspired by a reading of André Gide's book on Wilde: "He [Gide?] mentioned a thing which has often struck me in the description of 'cases' and otherwise – namely that when, of the two parents, the husband is weak-willed and less energetic than the wife, the son is frequently inverted." Anderson comments, "Griffes was likely thinking of himself here, since, although Wilber Griffes [his father] was by no means 'weak-willed,' the Griffes household had been a matriarchal rather than a patriarchal one" (p. 43). Anderson thus implies that Griffes's homosexuality was possibly shaped by early childhood experiences – or that at least Griffes entertained this possibility.

Anderson then quotes an excerpt from the aforementioned diary entry of December 22 only alluded to by Maisel, in which Griffes writes, "[Sherard] says interesting things about the traits of Wilde's parents and other relatives, and their part in his inherited nature But it is not quite clear to me whether Sherard considered Wilde as from the start inverted, or one with whom the homosexual nature broke forth only under outward impulse. The tendency sometimes does not appear until later in life, but Oscar Wilde certainly had from childhood on many traits of inverts" (p. 43). Anderson infers from this that Griffes thought homosexuality "inherited," but this does not really contradict her reading of the earlier diary entry, with its implication that Griffes's homosexuality was formed by a "matriarchal" household, for the word, "inherited," can suggest something "congenital" or something learned and absorbed.

If Griffes in fact entertained these contradictory theories of homosexuality, he certainly would not have been the only gay man to have done so, and we might suspect Maisel of stacking the deck in favor of nature over nurture by inferring too much from circumstantial evidence, by glossing over certain diary entries, and by relying so heavily on perspectives of the composer's gay friends. But a close reading of both diary entries indicates only that Griffes had simply observed that Gide and Sherard noted environmental influences in their discussions of homosexual men. Anderson makes her own imaginative leap in guessing that Griffes himself not only subscribed to such theories, but that the Griffes household exemplified one such "case." This supposition gains even greater emphasis by the prominent positioning of the November 16 entry in Anderson's fairly short discussion of the matter and, concomitantly, by her silence regarding the importance that Carpenter and Ellis held for Griffes. Maisel may have had some personal attraction to the notion that homosexuality might be "innate" and "unchangeable," but that is not to say that Griffes felt otherwise.

As regards Griffes's actual sexual activities, both Maisel and Anderson are again somewhat evasive. Both agree that Charles had no one with whom he felt comfortable discussing homosexuality during his teenaged years, but Anderson adds, "It is highly unlikely that he had

any sexual encounters in Elmira” (p. 37), a plausible assumption, but an assumption nonetheless. It is certainly possible that a gay teenager at the turn of the century might have engaged in some physical intimacy with another male, even in Elmira. Maisel refrains from any such guesses, though offers an anecdote, not found in Anderson, in which Clara asked the young Charles, during these same years, “why he displayed so little interest in girls,” to which Griffes enigmatically replied, “I have resources of my own” (p. 29). Even more provocatively, Maisel alludes to “clear evidence of a determinative connection with a certain older man during childhood” (p. 27) (the 1984 edition only somewhat more explicitly uses the word “romanticized” as opposed to “determinative,” perhaps to fit better the notion of homosexuality as “innate”).

As for Griffes’s four-year relationship in Berlin with Emil Joël, Anderson shows perhaps an excess of circumspection, writing, “The degree of physical involvement between Emil and Charles is a matter of conjecture” (p. 60). In fact, all the cited evidence – even though most of this consists, unpromisingly enough, of letters to family members and his piano teacher – points unequivocally to an ardent romantic relationship. The two young men spent much of their free time together, especially evenings; Joël even helped make it financially possible for Griffes to extend his time in Berlin by one year. Joël presented Griffes with the score to *Tristan und Isolde*, inscribed, “Bleibe mir, wie Du bist;/so wirst Du es sein, wie/ich wünsche, dass Du mir/immer bleibst” (which can be roughly translated as, “Stay for me as you are;/then you will be what I want, that you with me/will always remain”), while Griffes gave Joël a score of his own, the *Symphonische Phantasie*, inscribed “Dem einzigen Freunde widme ich diese Partitur, das Kind unserer Freundschaft, in unvergänglicher Liebe” (“To my beloved friend I dedicate this score, the child of our friendship, in imperishable love”) (Maisel, pp. 61-62). Anderson omits the former inscription, but includes a letter, dated August 13, 1905, not found in Maisel, in which Griffes tells his mother, “Emil and I have just come from the bath where we had a

lot of fun” (p. 75) – this from someone who as an adult regularly frequented gay bathhouses.

Maisel’s discussion of the Joël affair, for its part, turns highly euphemistic. “Hitherto,” he writes, “there had been considerable mystification in Griffes’s comprehension of his sexual nature. His friendship with Konrad lifted the veil from his eyes” (p. 61). Still, his discussion of the relationship is clearly more knowing and sexually charged than Anderson’s, including a description of Joël as “a stocky, blond, handsome man, military in appearance, and of a ruddy complexion” (p. 55), a helpful indicator of Griffes’s taste in men. Nor was Maisel fooled by Joël’s marriage in 1908, writing, again with a wink, that even in his later years, Joël continued “his role of sponsor to promising musical young men” (p. 108). (Griffes, incidentally, returned to Berlin in both 1908 and 1910 to attend the marriage and then baptism of his godson — Joël’s first son, Helmer Karl.)

Both Maisel and Anderson are, for obvious reasons, particularly opaque on the subject of Griffes’s emotional and physical relationships with some of his students at the Hackley School. Maisel focuses almost all attention on one Robert Corby (a pseudonym), drawing on diary entries, letters, and personal interviews to paint a rather melodramatic picture of unrequited love. “[Homosexual] romances were flourishing when Griffes arrived,” writes Maisel. “Early in his stay he recognized the danger of immersion in the lukewarm bath of immature emotion thus accessible, and resisted it with almost entire success. The exception was Robert Corby, a student whom he watched over with special affection and concern.” Discussing Griffes’s relationship with Corby after the latter graduated and joined the armed service, Maisel claims that Griffes was “hampered by a tormenting restraint that bitter experience had taught him [Griffes] to adopt” (p. 142); speaking of a still later time, he states further that Griffes’s “affection” for Corby had “overreached itself. The subsequent inner turmoil that he experienced is revealed in a pathetic letter that he dispatched soon after” (p. 242). The letter quoted, to my mind, is not particularly “pathetic,” though Griffes expresses some anxiousness about making Corby’s time in New York as pleasant as possible. All in all, the

record suggests that Corby made a sympathetic confidant, with whom Griffes could discuss personal and professional matters with an open mind and heart.

Anderson acknowledges that Griffes had what she calls “crushes” on some of his students, but characteristically adds, “it is doubtful whether these ever culminated in physical intimacy,” citing the risks that teachers ran “entering into sexual relationships with their students,” and concluding, “It is likely that the most Griffes ever shared with a Hackley student was furtive kisses.” Later, she also writes, “He [Griffes] could dream, somewhat adolescently, but he knew that such dreams were illusions” (pp. 38-39). As documentation, Anderson cites three diary entries involving two unnamed students, though one can deduce, by consulting the endnotes, that the second and third entry concern Maisel’s Robert Corby. The first entry, in which Griffes relates visiting a student in his room one morning, is the most homoerotic of the three (so much for Maisel’s claim that Corby represented some exception): “He was as fascinating as I have ever seen him and when he left me finally to go down to the gym, I caught him to me and kissed his lips—a kiss which he eagerly returned.” As Griffes leaves, the boy calls him “dearest” and “sweetheart.” The next evening, upon receiving a Christmas present, the boy, writes Griffes, “kissed me again with the greatest tenderness,” but the relationship soon after fizzles out.

In the second diary entry, Griffes writes that he “got hold” of Corby “for the afternoon and he cured me completely. After all that is the most powerful remedy. If he knew what a magical effect he is capable of on me, and what a beautiful afternoon he gave me! . . . The feeling that I have his confidence and that he is not indifferent to me make me very happy at times.” Anderson, in an endnote, acknowledges that the phrase “powerful remedy” “may be taken to mean the sex act,” but in this case, she argues, it does not, referencing a Maisel endnote in which *he* cites Corby as saying that Griffes never “sought” what he, Griffes, termed the “ultimate” – and which Maisel understands as “a sexual act” (pp. 272, 358); though what precisely the “ultimate” might be, and where Corby and Griffes stopped short in their relationship, is really anybody’s guess.

Notwithstanding all this torturous linguistic subterfuge, and the perhaps equally unsatisfactory portraits of Griffes as either pathetically tormented (Maisel’s take) or wistfully adolescent (Anderson’s interpretation), the evidence marshalled to date suggests a man who pursued physical relationships with young men rather aggressively; and that these young men occasionally responded to his overtures, making him “very happy at times.” The dynamics do not seem all that different from Griffes’s parallel habit of pursuing men in bathhouses and theaters, as well as policemen and streetcar conductors on the streets of New York (and conductors on the trains he rode to and from Tarrytown).

Maisel’s endnotes for the 1984 edition provide the most ample discussion of these latter activities (pp. 340-341, 356-358). The author derived most of this information, these endnotes further reveal, from Griffes’s diaries, but also from personal interviews with such friends of the composer’s as the pianist Noble Kreider, the singer William Earl Brown (with whom Griffes roomed on stays in New York), his policeman-boyfriend, John Meyer, and one Cecil Corwin, no doubt the C.C. with whom Griffes, as can be gleaned from his diaries, pursued a romantic relationship in 1915. This group seems to comprise members of an intimate circle of gay friends, though neither Maisel nor Anderson identify them as such. George Chauncey was able to further our knowledge of Griffes’s adult sex life by interviewing Maisel himself; and by consulting Griffes’s “extraordinary diary” (p. 108) as well as a July 31, 1938 letter from Kreider to Maisel, in the possession of professor David Reed, a friend of Maisel’s. Among other things, Chauncey reveals that while in Berlin, “Griffes had learned of the German homosexual emancipation movement led by Magnus Hirschfeld” (p. 107).

One need not spend time here detailing the elaborate stratagems devised by Griffes to seduce policeman and streetcar conductors into sexual liaisons (explicated by Maisel, pp. 356-358) nor the complex social-sexual ties that he created in the context of gay bathhouses (discussed by Chauncey, pp. 162, 200-203). Maisel, with characteristic sympathy, writes in his 1984 endnotes that such pursuits often brought with them “a full measure of disappointment,” but

perhaps because of cultural changes since 1943, seems more upbeat than in the first edition, writing that “there were also the unique moments of pride and satisfaction that he appears to have experienced on the way,” and noting that these “sexual adventures” displayed “an almost comically American spirit of pluck and derring-do” (p. 358) – so that Griffes’s gay cruising practically becomes an emblem for his national identity. For Chauncey, Griffes represents more of a sociological type, that of a middle-class “queer” (as opposed to a more effeminate “fairy”) who pursued workingmen because they were more sexually available than middle-class men. In contrast, Anderson, though sampling a few tidbits from the diaries, has little to say on the subject other than to accurately note that Griffes “pursued his [sexual] interests with an enormous amount of energy and ingenuity” (p. 39).

Indeed, all three authors probably underestimate the fact that, far from representing a type, Griffes had an extremely prodigious and active sex life. Nor do any of these three authors mention, let alone explore, what appears to be his highly fetishistic attraction to uniforms and to cops in particular, or how such fetishism might relate to his attentiveness to clothing that dated back to childhood; or to his sado-masochistic inclinations as reflected in the diary entry, “A rather sadistic person interested me, but he hurt me” (Anderson, p. 40). Anderson even quotes, though again without comment, the following diary entry: “I was rather disappointed in [C. H., a train conductor] – he doesn’t look at all attractive in civilian clothes. One can see by that how much certain clothes, like a uniform, matter” (p. 41).

Maisel, meanwhile, shows more interest than either Anderson or Chauncey in Griffes’s attempts to establish more permanent relationships. He tells of a relationship with an unnamed, married, Brooklyn high school science teacher/Y.M.C.A art instructor who “had too late discovered the mistake in his life, and eagerly sought Griffes’s fellowship.” Maisel, though, is at his most elliptical here, writing, “Because he [Griffes] would not simulate what he did not feel nor cheapen a valuable association by protracting it under false pretenses he had nearly sacrificed a companionship of long standing,” and later adding, “After prolonged introspection . . . Griffes could not honestly tolerate a continuance and had to insist upon some adjustment”

(pp. 141-142). Again, Anderson, who could have clarified the story by talking with Maisel and consulting the cited diary entries herself, chose not to delve into the matter.⁵

Maisel also offers a fuller exploration than Anderson of Griffes’s relationship with John Meyer (b. 1877); there are twenty-one page-references to Meyer (Dan Martin) in Maisel versus five page-references in Anderson. Maisel also includes three photographs--to Anderson’s none--of Meyer: two of the policeman in uniform at a crosswalk; the other in a bathing suit at the beach. “The man he loved was a burly policeman,” writes Maisel, “with a slightly better educational background than most and more definite aspirations towards advancement and a comfortable life” (p. 157). Griffes and Meyer met in 1915 and saw each other for the remainder of the composer’s life; surviving letters from Griffes to Meyer – which wound up in Maisel’s possession – reveal that Griffes found in Meyer a helpful and supportive friend. Anderson had no access to these letters, which helps explain her sketchy treatment of this relationship, though again, she at least had access to those excerpts found in Maisel--and she does, in fact, cite one such letter (p. 161). She also neglects what appears to be a crucial document, namely, a condolence letter to Meyer from Griffes’s woman friend Marion Clark, who sensitively writes, “I know that you filled a place in his life, and brought him happiness that no one else could” (p. 327).

Who knows, moreover, how Griffes’s life would have turned out had he not died so tragically young at age thirty-five? One imagines that over time, he may have settled down with a divorced John Meyer, or with another policeman or street-car conductor, or perhaps with one of his gay musical friends. Maisel doesn’t speculate on this, but Anderson ends her discussion of Griffes’s homosexuality with a decidedly bleak forecast, sadly quoting the composer’s mother as saying, shortly before her death, “Maybe it’s just as well he died. He might have been very unhappy” (p. 44).

Finally, Maisel, unlike Anderson, shows some interest in possible relations between Griffes’s homosexuality and his music. Sometimes this emerges implicitly, as in the relation between Griffes’s childhood sensitivity to color as a “harbinger

of the composer's preoccupation with color in its relation to music" (p. 10), including an association of various keys with certain colors. But one remarkable passage views two aspects of Griffes's creative life explicitly to his homosexuality: first, "the overwhelming urgency of the passion that motivated the composer" that Maisel equates with homosexual yearning and desire; and the "quiet strength of character" that marked the composer's mature acceptance of his homosexuality, which Maisel associates with Griffes's ability to achieve the detachment necessary for creative work (pp. 27-28). Maisel finds this "quiet strength" more or less in place by the time Griffes returns from Germany, but later suggests a date—mid-1914—when, as a result of his involvement with the aforementioned high school teacher, he more thoroughly achieved "honesty and balance in his emotional life" (p. 141), leading, Maisel further suggests, to the greater maturity of his music after this date.

Although this whole area holds no particular interest for Anderson, one observation in her book might be read as a virtual negation. Quoting a review stating that Griffes played some piano pieces, including his great Sonata, "with delicacy and tenderness," Anderson asserts that the Sonata "should not be played with either delicacy or tenderness. It is an overpowering work, full of anger and passion" (p. 142). Compare this with Maisel's discussion of the Sonata's "sorrowful resignation," and its "dreamy last notes," or certain themes from the work described as "rather peculiar—hesitant" or "wistful" (pp. 276-283).

To some extent, the differing treatment of Griffes's homosexuality as found in Maisel and Anderson results from the material at their disposal. Maisel clearly derived much of his information about the young Charles, for instance, from interviews with Griffes's mother, Clara, and his sisters (the detailed description of the Faust costume suggests that he may have had actual access to that outfit); whereas Clara and Florence died by the time Anderson began her research. Moreover, mother and daughters apparently spoke rather freely with Maisel never imagining that he would publish such a candid book, which left them, as Anderson recalled, "surprised" and "disappointed;" they surely were much more circumspect with

Anderson, who wrote her book with their sensibilities in mind.⁶

As for written documentation, Griffes himself destroyed at least some sources, including his correspondence with F. (Frank Church), an important contact from 1914. According to Anderson, a small diary from 1919 also disappeared under mysterious circumstances even before Maisel began his research. Indeed, in his preface to his 1984 edition, Maisel claimed that Marguerite, "in a spirit of sweeping though inconsistent censorship," had engaged in "willful damage" and "wholesale destruction" of the "composer's papers," though in a footnote, he also accuses sister Florence of destroying a letter from Griffes to the early homosexual-rights spokesman, Edward Carpenter (p. 345). "Now matters have grown still worse," he added in 1984. "More and more, it appears, letters, personal papers, even a whole diary, have either vanished or been destroyed. In opposition to Griffes's known wish to leave behind a full and frank record of his life, the data have been steadily made to disappear. By no means was all this material of an intimate nature. Responsibility for most of the continuing loss must again go to Marguerite, since she had sole and exclusive possession of the archives" (pp. xvi-xvii). Disturbed by Maisel's book, Marguerite—who, like Florence, read German—plausibly may have censored Griffes's papers in the interim between Maisel's research and Anderson's.⁷

But on the other hand, Anderson at least had Maisel's book at her disposal. Furthermore, she could have interviewed Maisel about such matters, but chose not to, feeling that this was an area that he had already thoroughly explored and one, moreover, somewhat beyond her ken. In short, the varied approaches of Maisel and Anderson reflect not so much differences of available sources, but divergences of tone, intention, language, and emphasis; and that Maisel's more queer reading of Charles Griffes derived from his own presumed homosexuality. This is not meant to minimize Anderson's significant contribution to Griffes scholarship, a decades-long pursuit that yielded, besides her dissertation and book, a seminal annotated bibliography-discography published in 1977 and various editions of the music; but rather

to underscore Maisel's achievement in dealing with Griffes's homosexuality.

The hostile critical reception that greeted Maisel's book only highlights this achievement the more. A key document in this regard remains a scathing review by Carl Engel, editor of the *Musical Quarterly*, in that journal's issue of April 1943. Engel wrote,

We sat down to the reading with gusto – and finished in disgust . . . There is a saying that dead men tell no tales; but sometimes their biographers will – tall tales and evil ones. Remembering Griffes only as an essentially normal, frank, and manly being, we were not a little puzzled when his biographer unfolded, with cumulative insistence, the story of a homosexual, beginning on the twenty-fifth page of his book and weaving, like a leit-motiv, through the succeeding chapters. Not that we are in the least shocked by problems of sexual pathology. They are too common to attract attention. Yet, such pathological inquiries are apt to be dragged into the open, not for their dubious importance, but because of an unwholesome fascination which they exercise on some people. Only if there were artistic abnormality, might there be an excuse for seeking its roots in emotional abnormality. However, the composer's music, be it on occasion frail or delicate, is always natural, always 'masculine'; and nothing else counts.

Engel added for good measure, "In the last years of his life, the composer is said to have had close relations with a New York policeman. These relations may have been no more than an unusual friendship."⁸

Engel's homophobic critique provides a chilling reminder of the shame, denial, outrage, ignorance, and "disgust" which which the musical establishment of the times viewed homosexuality, let alone attempts to correlate music and homosexuality. Exemplifying a famous double standard, Engel even failed to find any relevance or "importance" in discussing Griffes's homosexuality and homosexual affairs for their own sake, though he surely would not have fumed over a biography of, say, Liszt that included some discussion of that composer's romantic life. Suffice to say, had Maisel been a college professor – tenured or not — he surely would not have risked this publication.

This is not to say that Maisel's handling of Griffes's homosexuality strikes a thoroughly modern profile, though perhaps the times left him little choice but to indulge in some melodrama and to resort to all kinds of evasive tactics. One suspects, too, that he may have played out some personal conflicts in the course of the narrative. In any case, recent developments allow us to see Griffes – as neither Maisel nor Anderson nor even Chauncey really do – as a heroic figure: as one of the first – if not the first – known American composer to live an honest (if by absolute necessity, discreet) life as a gay man as we understand the term today. With Maisel's materials now at the New York Public Library (though the whereabouts of the Griffes-Meyer correspondence remain unknown) and Anderson's Griffes materials slated for eventual deposit there as well, the time is growing ripe for a fuller account of the composer's sexual life. Even so, Maisel's brave and generous book will remain an indispensable foundation for all such future investigations.

NOTES

¹ Edward Maisel, *Charles T. Griffes: The Life of an American Composer* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1943, updated and revised, 1984).

² George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World 1890-1940* (New York: BasicBooks, 1994).

Calls for Papers

³ Donna K. Anderson, *Charles T. Griffes: A Life in Music* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993).

⁴ Conversations with Byron Adams, Donna Anderson, and Emil DeCou, February 2004.

⁵ This science teacher might be the "F." of the 1914 diaries, and whose letters, as earlier mentioned, Griffes destroyed.

⁶ Donna Anderson, interview with author, 26 February 2004.

⁷ Marguerite left all her legal rights and all remaining Griffes material to Anderson, who spoke of her plans, in her own preface, to eventually place these materials in the New York Public Library and the Library of Congress (p. ix-x).

⁸ Carl Engel, "View and Reviews," *Musical Quarterly* 29/2 (April 1943): 405-409.

Howard Pollack is the John and Rebecca Moores Professor of Music and Director of Graduate Studies at Moores School of Music, University of Houston. A specialist in American music, Pollack's books include *Walter Piston; Harvard Composers: Walter Piston and his Students, from Elliott Carter to Frederic Rzewski; John Alden Carpenter: A Chicago Composer; and Aaron Copland: The Life and Work of an Uncommon Man*, which has been described as "the definitive study of Aaron Copland's life and work, no doubt for a long time to come" (New York Times). He also co-edited *German Literature and Music: An Aesthetic Fusion (1890-1989)*. His critical biography of George Gershwin will be released by the University of California Press in the fall of 2006.

Pollack has lectured at colleges and arts organizations in England, Germany, Australia, Mexico, and across the United States. His awards include a Fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Irving Lowens Award, an ASCAP-Deems Taylor Award, a Research Excellence Award from the University of Houston, and a Newberry Library Fellowship.

Deadline: May 15, 2006

*Seeking Queer Alliances:
Resisting Dominant Discourses and Institutions*
7th international queer studies conference
29 - 30 August, 2006 at Warsaw University,
Gender Studies and American Studies Centers

As the political climate in many parts of the world turns increasingly conservative, we are asking whether a concept such as global homophobia may be a useful analytical and/or political tool, and—as a correlate question—whether queer concepts travel well across political borders and geo-cultural spaces.

Do dominant discourses that include neo-liberalism as well as fundamentalisms of all kinds, and dominant institutions spanning the state as well as churches, require distinct forms of counterpractice? What are and what could such practices of resistance be?

What is the role of mutual and self-respect in the forming of queer/LGBTQ alliances across cultural spaces? What are the internal and external obstacles to communication among queers occupying different social and geographical spaces? What role does the category of gender play in those different places? And what are the factors of cohesion from one alliance to another?

We wish to ask these questions, and many others, in the context of the translatability of queer concepts across cultural and linguistic spaces, as well as between analytical and practical uses to which these concepts are put.

As far as the format of the conference is concerned, there will be twelve 90-minute sessions over the course of two days, and a two-hour summing up discussion at the end of each day. We would like each of the 90-minute sessions to be hosted by individuals or teams ("session leaders") who will be responsible for the theme and form of the session, e.g. workshop, roundtable discussion, conventional panel, panel consisting of several short statements (or "postcards") followed by a discussion, or any other format.

We welcome 200-word proposals for individual papers or for whole 90-minute sessions. Please send to:

Tomasz Basiuk
American Studies Center, Warsaw University
Al. Niepodleglosci 22
02-653 Warszawa (Warsaw)
Poland
Fax: (+4822) 5533322 or via e-mail:
queerconference@gmail.com

DEADLINE: May 15, 2006

Call For Papers:

Gay & Lesbian Studies
Pacific Ancient and Modern Language Association Conference 2006
November 10-11, 2006 University of California, Riverside Riverside, California

Paper proposals are requested for a standing panel of the PAMLA conference. While the panel is open to any topic in Gay & Lesbian Studies, we are particularly interested in papers that address the following areas:

- Queer community formation/dissolution
- The role of Gay/Lesbian/Queer Theory in a Democracy
- Lesbian/Gay/Queer citizenship
- The import of Lesbian/Gay/Queer studies for 21st Century Late-Capitalism
- Lesbian/Gay/Queer consumer culture
- How Queer/Lesbian/Gay studies impact interdisciplinary studies
- The Queer Teacher and her/his role in the classroom
- Teaching GLBQ fiction/artwork

All other topics revolving around gay/lesbian/queer studies are welcome.

Please email 500 word abstracts (inline or word attachments only) to Joshua Fenton at fentonjp@gmail.com

For additional information, please see the PAMLA website at www.PAMLA.org or contact Joshua Fenton directly.

DEADLINE: June 30, 2006

Editors are currently seeking scholarly essays (as opposed to personal narratives) that address the movie *Brokeback Mountain*, and/or Annie Proulx's short story of the same title. The deadline for submissions has been extended until June 30, 2006.

Submit full essays electronically (no abstracts, please) to:

Dr. Annette Olsen-Fazi
Associate Professor of English and French
216 F Pellegrino Hall
Texas A & M International University
5201 University Bld
Laredo, TX 78041-1900
Telephone: (956) 326-2657
Email: aolsen-fazi_at_tamui.edu

DEADLINE: August 15, 2006

Radical History Review Issue #100
Queer Futures: The Homonormativity Issue

Much has changed since the *Radical History Review's* special "Queer" issue (No. 62, Spring 1995), in which historians and their allies explored "new visions of America's gay and lesbian past." Queers now unabashedly eye straight guys on cable television; films featuring gay characters and themes are celebrated by mainstream audiences, breaking box office records and winning major industry awards; "gay marriage" has emerged as the central civil rights cause for powerful organizations like the Human Rights Campaign; urban activists and civic boosters promote "gay business districts" as a means for achieving visibility and equality; and multibillion-dollar markets targeting gay and lesbian tourist dollars are booming.

Such articulations of gay and lesbian identity in the public sphere provide evidence of true social and political progress. Yet, in the past decade, radical activists and scholars have cited such developments not as progressive signs of liberation but as reactionary responses linked directly to the privatizing imperatives of a powerful, ascendant brand of politics that coalesced in the 1990s. Lisa Duggan, for example, has identified this trend as evidence of "the new homonormativity—a politics that does not contest dominant heteronormative assumptions and institutions but upholds and sustains them." This makes strange bedfellows of lesbian/gay rights organizations and social conservatives: for both endorse normative and family-oriented formations associated with domestic partnership, adoption, and gender-normative social roles; both tend to marginalize those who challenge serial monogamy and those — including transgender, bisexual, pansexual, and intersex constituencies — who feel oppressed by a binary gender or sex system. Moreover, because of its economic base in the neoliberal philosophy of consumer rights rather than that of citizen rights, the politics of homonormativity exercises an influence beyond U.S. borders, through gay and lesbian tourism, the global proliferation of gay and lesbian-themed U.S. cultural productions, and economic and political interventions that claim to make "gay rights" a global issue.

Many queer and/or sex-positive radicals fear such neoliberal strategies, not only because they undermine citizens' rights but because they threaten to erase the historic alliance between radical politics and lesbian and gay politics, at the core of which has been a struggle for sexual freedom. In order to counter the long-term con-

sequences of historical amnesia, we need new analytical frameworks for talking about lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer history that expand and challenge current models of identity and community formation as well as models of political and cultural resistance.

The RHR seeks submissions that explore the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer past in relation to contemporary conceptions of homonormativity, neoliberalism, and globalization in North America and beyond. Some suggested topical fields include:

- Genealogies of homonormativities
- Homonormativity and racial formations
- Historical analyses of the politics of marriage and procreation in relation to gay and lesbian political and community formations
- Historical studies of the "domestic partner" in relation to law, corporate policy, privatization, and/or cultural production
- Studies of how homonormativities travel across borders, including histories of gay and lesbian tourism and organized interventions into issues in the name of "gay rights"
- Homonormativities in relation to transgender studies and politics - Urban models of "gay gentrification" and contemporary configurations of LGBT identity
- Histories of gay and lesbian markets and consumption
- Analyses of academic culture and its disciplining of glbt studies, institutional development, and academic investments in homonormativity
- Globalization, gay/lesbian identities, and cultural hegemonies
- State investments in the production and sustenance of gay and lesbian identities
- Genealogies of gay and lesbian conservative political movements
- Sexual politics and history of the "right to privacy"
- Histories and critiques of identity and queer migrations
- Resistance to politics of homonormativity in U.S. and globally

The editors of this special edition invite contributions that explore these or any themes that relate to homonormativity, queer pasts, or queer futures.

Submit a 1-2 page abstract to rhr_at_igc.org. By September 30, 2006 authors will be notified whether they should submit their article in full. Articles selected for publication will appear in volume 100 of *Radical History Review*, scheduled to appear in Winter 2008.

Abstracts and manuscripts should be submitted electronically, in Microsoft Word or rich text format, with "Issue 100 submission" in the subject line.

DEADLINE: September 1, 2006

WOMEN'S STUDIES INTERDISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE-CALL FOR PAPERS

Interdisciplinary Conference in Women's Studies

Middle Tennessee State University

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

February 22-24, 2007

We invite proposals for individual papers, panels, and other presentation formats such as roundtables, posters, and performances with scholarly and/or activist emphasis, addressing the general conference topic of women's studies or the featured theme of "Performing Gender." Proposals are welcome from all scholarly fields and disciplines, including the sciences, social sciences, humanities, arts, design, business, sports, and cultural studies.

"Performing Gender" involves a wide spectrum of subjects and approaches.

Possible topics addressing the theme:

The Biology, Sociology, and Psychology of Transgender & Transsexuality

Race, Ethnicity, and Class in the Performance of Gender

Media Genders

Globalizing Gender: International Gender Performances

Performing Queer Gender

Marketing and Advertising: The Commodification of Gender

Gender Identity in the Visual Arts

Corporate Genders: Doing Business, Doing Self

Sports and Gender Performance

Cyborgs, Cyberspace and Cybersex: Performing Gender Online

Children, the Family, and Gender Performance

Gender and War

The Theater of Gender Performance

Performing the Academy: Gender in the Classroom

Fashion and Gender Performance

Presentations and Representations of the Gendered Self

Religion and Gender Performance

Gender Performance and Ecology

The Ethics of Performing Gender

Politics of/and Gender Performance

Voyeurism: Watching Gender Performance

Proposals for 18-20-minute individual presentations and for posters should be 250-500 words, with working bibliography. Panel proposals should include 250-500 word abstracts and bibliographies for each presentation (2-3 per panel). Workshop and performance proposals (up to one hour in length) should include a description of purpose, form, and content. Include name, contact information, and a brief c.v. with all proposals.

Send proposals to Elyce Rae Helford, Conference Chair

Women's Studies Program, Box 498

Middle Tennessee State University

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

email: womenstu_at_mtsu.edu

Keynote Speaker: Jill Dolan

Places to Publish

DEADLINE: May 15, 2006 / June 30, 2006

Seeking contributors for a collection of essays on

BISEXUALITY AND THE BIOPOLITICS OF "FAMILY":
THEORIES AND PRACTICES IN ELECTIVE KINSHIP,
LOVE, EROTICISM, AFFINITY, AND PARENTING

In the past decade, the debate over what constitutes a healthy and functional family has acquired biopolitical proportions, as it has ranged across a variety of disciplines, cultures, and social groups, both in the West and on a global scale. In the context of the most recent US presidential campaign, some commentators have attributed Bush's alleged success to upscale neoconservatives' ability to catalyze impoverished Middle-America around the homophobic definitions of marriage. On the other hand, the recent legalization of gay marriage in Spain gives evidence of a country with conservative traditions attempting to stay ahead of the curve in the context of the European Union. Furthermore, in an effort to emphasize non-violent aspects of Muslim cultures, polygamy has been reexamined as a marriage style that often involves deep bonds of affection among co-spouses and half siblings. Finally, a similar impulse to move beyond exclusivity in sexual partnerships and parenting comes from various and recent subcultures within the West. In the postmodern era, the cultural trope of family seems to be undergoing some redefinition, from one based on the perceived necessity of biological reproduction and lineage to one based on the human need for love, affinity, community, and care.

Predictably, the biopolitical debate about family finds discussion of what constitutes marriage a major focus to expand in a number of interesting directions. On the political end, many observers comment on the domination of the scene in the United States by powerful political families who, by turning into de-facto dynasties, eat at the core of American democracy. Others have observed similar patterns in Europe, with Italian

politics dominated by a media tycoon determined to pass his financial empire on to his kinship family. On the cultural end, no-fault divorce has become a regular, non-dramatic practice in nuclear and extended families across Europe and North America. Hispanic and other Latino countries have imported extended concepts of family into North America, with a resulting inclusiveness challenging the normative model of a nuclear family. In united Europe, emigration from Africa has resulted in a high incidence of interracial marriages with children positioned in between races, cultures, and worlds. Furthermore, in both Europe and North America, Muslim practices of non-exclusive marriage have impacted conventional Western mentalities with their patterns of shared responsibility for children and partners. Finally, gays and lesbians of many countries have introduced the concept of marriage (or domestic partnership) between partners of the same gender, with its emphasis on mutual commitment and care, and on recognized forms of gay parenting.

While all of these groups have affirmed their right to access "family" in a variety of effective ways, it looks as if, regardless of how long (or how many) individual partners stay together, "marriage" persists as a central trope in the cultures of postmodernity. Furthermore, as globalization's fluxes move energies and people around the planet, "family" seems to become a trope just as in-flux as the streams of its putative members. Some read this potential instability as an indicator of crisis, while we propose to view it as an opportunity for change.

A bisexual perspective on the trope of family is very promising, for bisexuality assumes neither monosexuality nor monogamy, two central elements in normative modern concepts of family in the West. Indeed, as the potential and/or ability to love persons of both genders, bisexuality opens a new perspective not only the normative gender of a marriage partner, but also on the number of partners a marriage or core family unit can have. Bisexual practices often involve the sharing of lovers as well as various forms of

three-way and more than three-way partnerships. Bisexual practices also often take place in polyamorous contexts, which emphasize long-term relationships that often involve various forms of biological and affinity-based parenting. For example, Valerie White, an attorney in Vermont now in her late fifties, has had twin girls with her ten-year partners, Ken and Judy. Her biological contribution to the twins comes in the form of her biological daughter donation of fertile eggs to her partner Judy. Valerie is therefore the biological grandmother of the twins, plus their "third" parent.

This and other similar innovative postmodern configurations point to one of the absurdities of Western normativity with respect to sexuality and parenting. Most normative Westerners take for granted that a parent's affection can multiply for as many children as necessary within the biological family, but they feel that a lover's or spousal affection must be exclusive to be worthy of this name. Yet, thanks to effective birth control methods and based on a healthy ecological awareness of excessive population growth, most of today's parents have just a few children among whom to divide their affection. And, due to the serial monogamy patterns that prevail in today's hetero-normative world, most adults have a number of current and former lovers and/or spouses, whose total count is often higher than the number children they have. This, with all the rivalries and conflicts it generates, begs the question, why can't the affection of a lover or a spouse also multiply for as many lovers and/or spouses as can be included in a bisexual, polyamorous family? Of course, parents are expected to love their children in non-sexual ways, based on societal organization around the taboo of incest, and this presumption of a non-sexual love grants the potential for multiplication. However, erotic affinity is often present between members of a family, and some forms of erotic love between consenting adult members of a family can be seen as more ethical, chosen, and respectable than the widespread child prostitution practices typical of today's sexual tourism in Thailand and other impoverished third-world areas. For example, as Judith Levine has recently pointed out, teaching children about love, sex, and pleasure can be highly educational and caring. Furthermore, the pre-

sumption of exclusivity and the expectations it generates is cause for destructive conflicts in many blended families, while the widespread practice of "cheating" in monogamous relationship causes deep-seated rivalries and resentments.

In our proposed collection on "Bisexuality and the Biopolitics of Family," we intend to provide a forum for the debate of the above mentioned issues, and more. We envisage the book as a contribution to the process of reconfiguring "family" as a cultural trope functional to the development of a mode of social organization where ecological forms of globalization prevail. When the primary implications of being a family are love, affinity, pleasure, community, and care, a family's health and functionality can be measured precisely based on its ability to include shared and former members, as well as children, lovers, exes, and elders. The call for papers we've designed for this project opens the space for contributions inspired by this vision. Our job will be to edit the book in the most inclusive and effective way.

We are interested in theoretical, critical, and research articles, reports from the field, personal narratives, reviews, poems, and interviews. For articles, we welcome a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives, including those based in disciplines like critical theory, philosophy, sociology, psychology, legal studies, literature, cultural studies, anthropology, and medical science. For the more experiential submissions, we welcome expertise in the healing arts, the creative arts in general, the new spiritualities, polyamory, paganism, fetishism, DBSM, as well as past and/or non-Western modalities.

Please email all inquiries, abstracts, and submissions to both Serena Anderlini-D'Onofrio and Nan Wise at the following

serena1@coqui.net

thelovecoach@aol.com.

Abstracts and/or inquiries by May 15, 2006.

Complete submissions (including text, abstract, keywords, and bio) on June 30th, 2006.

Serena Anderlini-D'Onofrio, Ph.D.
Professor of Italian and Humanities
University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez
Mayaguez, PR 00681-9264 (USA)

DEADLINE: Submissions are always welcome.

Outskirts: feminisms along the edge is a feminist cultural studies journal published online twice yearly. It provides a space in which new and challenging critical material—from a range of disciplinary perspectives and addressing a range of feminist topics—and issues are brought together to discuss and contest contemporary and historical issues involving women and feminisms.

Recent articles include:

Gender Transition Stories

Representing Muslim Women in the Australian Media

The Gendering of Police Organisational Culture

Women's Decision Making about Work and Family

Women's Doctoral Experience

Leadership discourses

Outskirts welcomes submissions from all feminist researchers; in particular we encourage postgraduate researchers to publish with *Outskirts*. We welcome scholarly articles; commentaries on feminist projects or issues; and reviews of feminist publications.

Contact: Dr Alison Bartlett
bartlett@arts.uwa.edu.au

Outskirts is a part of the Centre for Women's Studies at the University of Western Australia and is a fully refereed academic journal. It is produced in collaboration with Women's Studies at the University of Adelaide.

<http://www.chloe.uwa.edu.au/outskirts>

Upcoming Events

Transcending Boundaries Conference

Worcester, MA



*Celebrating
the Spectrum
of Sexuality,
Gender, and
Sex*

October 27-29, 2006

WHAT IS TRANSCENDING BOUNDARIES? **The Transcending Boundaries Conference** is for bisexual/pansexual, trans/gender queer, and intersex people and our allies. TBC is for and about those who do not fit into the simple categories of gay/straight, male/female, and we couldn't be more excited! We are pleased to announce that this year's conference will be held in conjunction with the **PFLAG Northeast Regional Conference** for family, friends, and allies from across the region. We'll take over DCU Center to foster community, educate ourselves, and overcome societal sex, gender, and sexuality boundaries! The conference begins with a reception Friday evening and we're planning workshops all day Saturday and Sunday, a Halloween party, and a keynote luncheon with nationally known speakers.

STAY TUNED FOR DETAILS!

For more information, contact transcendingboundaries@gmail.com.

The 9th International Conference on
Bisexuality, Gender, and Sexual Diversity
(aka 9icb)

June 15th - 18th, 2006
Ryerson University
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

<http://www.9icb.org/>

19th Annual Creating Change Conference November 8-12, 2006

The National Gay and Lesbian Task Force is coming to Kansas City, Missouri! Please join us at the Westin Crown Center from November 8-12, 2006 for our 19th Annual CC Conference.

Creating Change is for you if you are:

- An activist organizer in your community, campus or workplace;
- A board member, staff member or leader in a LGBT organization, community center or foundation;
- An elected or appointed official;
- An advocate for our communities;
- An agent for justice, freedom & equality for all.

Creating Change™ the premier national grassroots organizing and skills building LGBT conference. Each year the conference is held in a different region of the United States and attracts 2,500+ participants from within and outside of the LGBT community. The conference is well known for providing a unique environment where activists and leaders come together from diverse places and backgrounds to create a community that is both strengthening and inspiring to the participants. For more information, see our website:

www.thetaskforce.org/ourprojects/cc/index.cfm