

# Rapid #: -15132930

CROSS REF ID: **1887507**

LENDER: **UUM :: Marriott Library**

BORROWER: **KKU :: Watson**

TYPE: Article CC:CCG

JOURNAL TITLE: QED

USER JOURNAL TITLE: QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking

ARTICLE TITLE: Queering the Panthers: Rhetorical Adjacency and Black/Queer Liberation Politics

ARTICLE AUTHOR: Lisa M Corrigan

VOLUME: 6

ISSUE: 2

MONTH:

YEAR: 2019

PAGES: 1-25

ISSN: 2327-1574

OCLC #:

Processed by RapidX: 9/18/2019 9:24:36 AM



This material may be protected by copyright law (Title 17 U.S. Code)

---



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Queering the Panthers: Rhetorical Adjacency and Black/Queer  
Liberation Politics

Lisa M. Corrigan

QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking, Volume 6, Number 2, Summer 2019,  
pp. 1-25 (Article)

Published by Michigan State University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/733292>



# Queering the Panthers: Rhetorical Adjacency and Black/Queer Liberation Politics

Lisa M. Corrigan

## ABSTRACT

Using Stonewall as an anchor point, this article charts the coterminous relationship between the black liberation movement and the gay liberation movement with special emphasis on the relationship between the Black Panther Party and the Gay Liberation Front. It begins with an assessment of the political and social context of 1969 to discuss the importance of *rhetorical adjacency* in the collaboration between the movements. Rhetorical adjacency describes how movements borrow and share political frameworks, movement goals, terminology, and spatial sensibility as they navigate points of ideological contention, especially around identity issues. The rhetorical adjacency of these two movements is complicated by the early critiques of the gender politics of the Panthers, which the first section takes up at length. Then, the article turns to critiques of policing, imprisonment, capitalism, and colonialism absorbed and redeployed by the gay liberation movement from the black liberation movement to understand how activists during and after Stonewall conceptualized police power, resistance, and movement strategy. The article concludes with a discussion of the Black Panther Party Chairman Huey Newton's rhetorical defense of gay liberation as a revolutionary perspective in the wake of Stonewall to understand how and why the Panthers saw promise in intentional adjacency with gay liberation activists as well as to demonstrate why gay liberation activists praised Newton and collaborated with the Panthers. The rhetorical adjacency between the organizations amplified radical black and gay movement politics, circulating rhetorical tropes that continued to mobilize activism.

The Stonewall riots began on June 27, 1969, at the gay-friendly Stonewall Inn on Christopher Street in Greenwich Village, New York, after a police raid on drag queens, transgender persons, and gay patrons. The morning after patrons beat the police officers that entered the Inn harassing them, a message appeared scrawled on the boarded up windows of the bar that said: "THEY INVADED OUR RIGHT THERE IS ALL COLLEGE BOYS AND GIRLS AROUND HERE, LEGALISE GAY BARS, SUPPORT GAY POWER." Although grammatically troubled, this "GAY POWER" graffiti message spread all along Christopher Street in the hours and days after the riot. Young gays milled about on the street corners, angry and agitated. Eyewitness John Chesterman described the scene on Christopher Street on June 28:

Someone heaved a sack of wet garbage through the window of a patrol car. On nearby Waverly Place, a concrete block landed on the hood of another police car which was quickly surrounded by dozens of men, pounding on its doors and dancing on its hood. Helmeted officers from the Tactical Patrol Force arrived on the scene and dispersed with swinging clubs an impromptu chorus line of gay men in the middle of a full kick. [The chorines, hands on each other's hips, high kicked their way into the police lines, singing "We are the Stonewall Girls / We wear our hair in curls/ We wear no underwear / We show our pubic hair."] At the intersection of Greenwich Avenue and Christopher Street, several dozen queens screaming "Save Our Sister!" rushed a group of officers who were clubbing a young man and dragged him to safety. For the next few hours, trash fires blazed, bottles and stones flew through the air, and cries of "Gay Power!" ran in the streets at the police, numbering over 400, did battle with a crowd estimated at more than 2,000.<sup>1</sup>

Chesterman's account is important because it centers the "Gay Power" slogan in the resistance to police occupation of Christopher Street, demonstrating the radicalization of Greenwich Village queers, who were borrowing from the Black Power lexicon to articulate their anger at the constant police surveillance, harassment, and brutality in the Village. The "Gay Power" slogan portended an important moment in gay rights activism: the emergence of the Gay Liberation Front (GLF), a gay rights group that radicalized activism with strategies informed by U.S. and Third World liberation movements.

By the end of 1969, GLF activists were debating the utility of partnering with the Black Panther Party (BPP) to increase solidarity and visibility. In mid-November 1969, for example, activist John O'Brien introduced a motion at the GLF monthly meeting to contribute \$500 to the Panthers as a gesture of goodwill and solidarity. But, as David Carter has documented, the motion was initially defeated, with the argument that "the Panthers often employed 'virulently homophobic'" language.<sup>2</sup> After members urged to reopen debate, the motion passed, leading to the resignation of treasurer Jim Ows. Many GLF members

walked out after the vote, signaling a major shift in the organization because this contentious vote “marked the beginning of the end for the fledgling gay liberation organization, but the birth of another.”<sup>3</sup> Carter contends that the debate about collaboration with the Panthers was a critical turning point in radicalizing the gay liberation movement towards revolutionary praxis while also documenting how perceptions about the Panthers’ gender politics created conflict within the GLF. Martin Duberman’s *Stonewall* (1993) verifies Carter’s history of this meeting and recalls a moment when gay activist Michael Brown argued to Dick Leitsch, Mattachine Society president and the first gay journalist to cover the Stonewall riots, that “Stonewall had opened up the opportunity for an alliance between gays, blacks, and antiwar activists that could work to restructure American society.”<sup>4</sup> Martha Shelley agreed and proposed joining the Black Panthers in solidarity at a “power to the people” rally, and, barring that, holding a “Gay Power” rally much like Panther demonstrations.<sup>5</sup> This attitude informed many of the debates within the gay liberation movement, including those focused on whether or not to support the Panthers jailed in the Women’s House of Detention in the West Village or the Chicago Eight, demonstrating how imprisonment helped shape the contours of gay liberation/black liberation collaborations.

But the well-circulated assessments of the relationship between gay liberation and black liberation activists documented by Carter, Duberman, and others are not shared by all historians of Stonewall. Ann Bausum’s *Stonewall: Breaking Out in the Fight for Gay Rights*, for example, doesn’t refer to the Panthers individually or as a group.<sup>6</sup> Jack Fritscher’s *Stonewall: Stories of Gay Liberation* (2008) also makes no mention of the Panthers. In fact, many contemporary accounts of Stonewall or the gay rights movement in general do not mention the Panthers, but this omission is conspicuous given early accounts of the creative tension and sometimes open collaboration between the gay rights and black liberation activists. Likewise, many of the Panther memoirs and anthologies don’t mention collaboration with gay activists of any sort, including books by Panther leaders Bobby Seale, David Hilliard, and Kathleen Cleaver. The inconsistency of these accounts demonstrates the need for more scholarship about the relationship between movements of the period to help theorize both the excitements and the ambivalence of rhetorical collaboration between black liberation and gay liberation activists after Stonewall.

Using Stonewall as an anchor point, this article charts the coterminous relationship between the black liberation movement and the gay liberation movement with particular focus on the BPP and the GLF to understand how these groups were able to create new rhetorical and political strategies. Kevin J. Mumford explains that, “[i]n complicated and sometimes forgotten ways, the civil rights and black power movements continued to influence gay liberation” throughout

the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>7</sup> Thus, this article seeks to add to the emerging history of the period to unpack how the rhetorical collaboration between the movements helped to shape race/sex/gender ideology in leftist social movements.

The article begins with a discussion of the importance of what I am calling *rhetorical adjacency* in the collaboration between the black and gay liberation movements. Rhetorical adjacency describes how movements reference one another by borrowing and sharing perspective(s) and terminology as they navigate points of tremendous contention, identity issues in particular. Then, the article turns to points or nodes of rhetorical adjacency between the movements including critiques of criticisms of policing and imprisonment as well as capitalism and colonialism to understand how gay liberation activists absorbed and redeployed black liberation notions of police power, resistance, and movement strategy beyond 1969. The article concludes with a discussion of the BPP's rhetorical defense of gay liberation as a revolutionary perspective post-Stonewall. With a particular focus on BPP Chairman Huey Newton's speeches and statements, the article examines the BPP's philosophical assessment of gay liberation as a primer on the liberatory politics of gay life and activism in the United States. Newton's description of the psychology of homophobia is particularly instructive because his positioning of gay liberation as revolutionary politics both resuscitates a progressive space for the Panthers on gender and refuses tolerance as a paradigm of engagement, modeling a radical gender paradigm for black activists. And, given the dearth of comparative social movement scholarship, especially in the field of communication, this kind of study opens up avenues to excavate how movements mutually constitute one another rhetorically and politically.<sup>8</sup>

### ))) Rhetorical Adjacency and Social Movements

*Rhetorical adjacency* is a term I've coined to examine issues of *proximity* in social movements. Adjacency is defined by the sharing of a border, wall, or point. Rhetorical adjacency describes closeness in terms of time/space/relationship when movements or rhetors borrow rhetorical devices from organizations and leaders because of some shared commitments, despite potentially fundamental concerns about ideology or strategy. Regardless of consonance or contradiction, rhetorical adjacency describes the propinquity of the ideas and collaborators across movements. Adjacency comes from the Latin *adjacentia*, which indicates "adherence," which speaks to *fidelity* or *commitment to causes*. Adjacency-as-adherence also suggests "stickiness," which, in the rhetorical sense, speaks both to the adhesiveness of ideology and the persistence of activists. Rhetorical adjacency elucidates how coterminous social movements approximate rhetorical devices, ideas, and

tactics in ways that leave room for play and innovation as well as critique. The contiguity between movements creates the conditions for dynamic interpellation. Rhetorical adjacency also encapsulates how movements link to one another to create new fields of interpretation by *amplifying vocabulary*, *circulating ideology*, and *mirroring tactics*. Because adjacency is closely related to immediacy, there is a *temporal dimension* to rhetorical adjacency that magnifies those resistance strategies as movements ebb and flow, surge and decline. This is particularly true among revolutionary movements in what I have elsewhere called the “cross-pollination” of rhetorical strategies.<sup>9</sup> Adjacency also refers to the notion of *embracing*, which is important for understanding political intimacy within or among movements as activists travel between often-discrete movement spaces and places. Here, adjacency acknowledges the *production and maintenance* of intersubjectivity as well as the incorporation of *the body* into social movement statements.

But rhetorical adjacency is also important because it can produce *political legitimacy*, even if (as in the case of social movements) that legitimacy is tentative and under assault. Given the intense ambivalence about proximity and distance between democratically elected politicians and their publics, the necessity of rhetorical adjacency in movements seems necessary because it is in the repetition and recalibration of rhetorical strategy that movements circulate and innovate new inventional possibilities, what Shannon Walters has called “proximal *kairos*.”<sup>10</sup> With rhetorical adjacency, there is less distance between rhetorical concepts, which accentuates how the concepts build upon one another. Rhetorical adjacency elaborates on notions of diachrony and synchrony in understanding how rhetorical inventions operate both across time and in one specific moment of time, between and through movement organizations and activists.

Rhetorical adjacency also necessarily entails shared ethics. Agamben, for example, sees adjacency as a precondition for *agape*, as “the empty place where each can move freely . . . the very place of love.”<sup>11</sup> But, although Agamben suggests social charity and cohesion as values promoting adjacency *among community members*, they also articulate what he calls *substitutability* as the space of overlap between freedom and love. Here, adjacency facilitates our ability to put ourselves in the place of our neighbors such that the ability to substitute creates the conditions for ethical praxis. Ackerman adds that, “substitutability helps to explain the mutual dependency and consequentiality of shared existence.”<sup>12</sup> In general, this is articulated through the trope of “friendship,” and this language suggests fidelity among political members, organizations, or movements. In a passage notable for its insistence on vision and visibility as important vectors of adjacency, Ackerman writes, “Adjacency, as the practice of measurements and analysis, forces our attention to the time and distance between people and places, in much the way that Mikhail

Bakhtin recognized the transgradient nature of dialogue as the measurement by distance and the acuity of our vision. It is the issue of seeing and hearing another person and more the issue of judging the distance between and developing an ocularity to define these relations.”<sup>13</sup> For black and LGBTQ Americans (but also for women and disabled citizens), visibility facilitates social violence against them and, likewise, it is ocularity that helps to represent and navigate the resistance necessary to survive and transcend state-sanctioned violence. But this visibility, as we shall see, is fraught with deliberate misreadings and unfortunate optics, in particular as they pertain to race/sex/gender.

Finally, rhetorical adjacency speaks to the *shared geographical space* between social movements. The gay liberation movement and the black liberation movement are important because they were/are primarily located in densely populated urban spaces where the struggle over meaning is also the struggle over property and sovereignty. In Chesterman’s account of Stonewall, for example, the signposts for the loitering bodies, graffiti, preemptive strikes, and retaliations against police brutality all indicate a way of reclaiming territory that is both rhetorical and geographical. Likewise, Chesterman’s account (and the dozens more like it) highlight how organizations like the Panthers captured both the imagination of urban residents and harnessed their organizational abilities, demonstrating why urban spaces facilitated rhetorical adjacency in movement activism by 1969 as they crossed movement spaces. Where, for example, the women’s liberation movement often worked in private spaces (such as consciousness-raising groups) to target micropower in the home or workplace, the black liberation and gay liberation movements occupied *public* space in more radical ways.<sup>14</sup>

### ))) Points of Rhetorical Adjacency

Between the black liberation and gay liberation movements, there were several major points of rhetorical adjacency that defined both movements after Stonewall in ways that shaped radical race/sex/gender politics. The first was the recognition of police brutality as a symptom of power and impediment to radical organizing. With the Black Panthers’ Ten-Point Program demanding an end to police brutality motivating Panther patrols of police profiling black motorists, the Panthers established themselves as a vanguard organization theorizing the connections among police, prisons, and anti-black repression.<sup>15</sup> BPP Chairman Huey Newton’s murder trial for the death of Officer John Frey of the Oakland Police Department in 1968 provided an important textual field regarding police brutality. Newton explained, “the key point in the trial was police brutality, but we hoped to do more than articulate that. We also wanted to show that

the other kinds of violence poor people suffer—unemployment, poor housing, inferior education, lack of public facilities, the inequity of the draft—were part of the same fabric. If we could organize people against police brutality, as we had begun to do, we might move them toward eliminating related forms of oppression.”<sup>16</sup> Although California Court of Appeals reversed the involuntary manslaughter conviction in 1970 due to a prejudicial error in informing the jury of the charges, Newton’s trial functioned (at least partly) in the manner he suggested. That is, it circulated a vocabulary that centered police brutality as a main form of state repression, mobilized specifically against activists and citizens that refused to conform to urban surveillance and harassment. It also elevated Newton and his public comments beyond the Bay Area, where they became part of the tapestry of the left even as far away as New York City. This was heightened after Newton’s release in August 1970 when he told reporters at Berkeley’s KPFA that the Panthers “would like to have unity with homosexual groups who are also politically conscious” and that gay people “were oppressed because of the bourgeois mentality and the bourgeois treachery that exists in this country tries to legislate sexuality.”<sup>17</sup> Newton’s exoneration and his exit from prison were indelibly connected to gay liberation, prompting Afeni Shakur in the New York Panther chapter to reach out to the GLF for a meeting at Jane Fonda’s house to discuss possible collaborations.

For Newton, the police raid at the Stonewall Inn was a moment of anti-queer police brutality that galvanized Gay Power and the radical gay liberation movement, creating an intimacy between the movements that is an example of rhetorical adjacency. Faderman reports that in the initial clash at the Stonewall Inn, police were forced to retreat *into* the bar, where they could hear the chants from outside: “Kill the cops! Police brutality! We’re not gonna take this anymore! Let’s get ‘em.”<sup>18</sup> Amidst cries of “police brutality” outside, patrons and bystanders pelted the police with pennies. Someone threw cobblestone and then beer cans and glass bottles and bricks followed. Marsha P. (for “Pay It No Mind”), a local black street queen, climbed the lamppost and shattered the window of a squad car.<sup>19</sup> Anecdotes like these proliferate accounts of the riots, demonstrating how police brutality exposed extreme disciplinary power against queer citizens. For the gay men, drag queens, and trans people that frequented the Stonewall Inn, the recognition of police brutality as a tool of gender oppression was a point of adjacency made possible by the prolific accounts of police brutality circulated and amplified by the civil rights movement in general, and the Black Panthers, in particular. “Gay Power” responses to police occupation at Stonewall highlighted the gendered dimensions of state violence against queers, though police brutality was not a major issue, in particular among white second-wave feminists.<sup>20</sup> Indeed, only the most ardent feminist socialists declared solidarity with the Panthers.<sup>21</sup>

Second, what I have elsewhere termed “the Black Power vernacular” also circulated within the gay liberation movement as gay activists used tropes found in Panther memoirs, speeches and the Panther newspaper.<sup>22</sup> That vernacular “emerged to force various publics to acknowledge and end the massive brutality perpetrated against black people in prison and in the streets in the name of law and order.”<sup>23</sup> In particular, gay liberation activists began using the Panther term “pig,” a derisive epithet for the police, in their printed materials and in their protest chants. For example, the Committee for Homosexual Freedom (CHF) handed out a leaflet at the BPP’s National Revolutionary Conference for a United Front Against Fascism at Bobby Hutton Park in Oakland in July 1969, which read: “Vice pigs in Los Angeles beat a homosexual to death a few months ago. In Berkeley, vice pigs shot and murdered another homosexual in his own car. In Oakland, a ‘straight’ professor the pigs thought was ‘queer’ was beaten, and later died. . . . The Homosexual Revolution is part of the whole street revolution fighting fascism in the US. By locking arms with our brothers and sisters in the movement, we can ALL win our freedom. POWER TO THE PEOPLE!”<sup>24</sup> In documenting the pervasive abuse of gay Angelenos by the police, the leaflet expressed the kind of adjacent violence connecting black and gay liberation ideologically and also confirmed that gay liberation activists actually participated in Panther events. Thus the GLF and post-Stonewall radical queers were indebted to the Panthers for their theorizing of the police and the use of imprisonment to undermine activism.

In addition, the GLF and other radical gay liberation groups began to use revolutionary language to describe the gay struggle, circulating the Panther slogan “Power to the People” and analyzing gay liberation in the context of the colonial idiom. Gay liberation organizations began theorizing about using nationalist idioms to think about the scope and reach of anti-gay praxis. Regardless of whether they were aiming for liberal reform or radical revolution, queer activists began to see nationalism as a central space of rhetorical adjacency to describe the sex/gender terrain of the United States after Stonewall.<sup>25</sup> Sovereignty, in particular, became a discursive terrain of the GLF after Stonewall in a way that it hadn’t with the homophile movement. Gay liberation activists adopted the “internal colony” thesis of black liberation to the cause.<sup>26</sup> “Appropriating a term from African-American discourse, GLF was the first group to talk of a ‘gay ghetto’ in Philadelphia’s City Center and thus offer a territorial conception of the gay community in the ‘City of Neighborhoods.’”<sup>27</sup> This analysis offered a geographic edge that connected racial and gender oppression in a way that had not been part of the landscape of liberation theorizing in the United States.

Finally, beyond their immediate contact with police brutality and imprisonment was a larger, organizational disdain for capitalism and colonialism that

smoothed out the adjacency between the movements. Figures like Angela Davis, whose memoir was on the bestseller list for months, helped popularize socialist ideologies within black communities but the vernacular inventions that the Panthers popularized to help characterize racist power structures are what created the stickiness among organizations in different movements.<sup>28</sup> “Off the pig” was certainly an expression of the symbolic violence in the Panthers’ anti-colonial vernacular but writings like Davis’s helped to place the person stories of black liberation activists into larger global contexts.<sup>29</sup> The Panthers’ global reach circulate ideas about guerilla warfare, colonial occupation, sovereignty, and Third Worldism in the United States to amplify the work of anti-colonial movements abroad.<sup>30</sup>

Radicalizing gay liberation this way meant moving beyond the tolerance politics of the homophile movement towards more structural critiques of liberalism and state power. For example, GLF activists wrote this manifesto to the famous underground newspaper, *Rat*: “We are a revolutionary homosexual group of men and women formed with the realization that complete sexual liberation for all people cannot come about unless existing social institutions are abolished. We reject society’s attempt to impose sexual roles and definitions of our nature. We are stepping outside these roles and simplistic myths. We are going to be who we are. At the same time, we are creating new social forms and relations, that is, relations based upon brotherhood, cooperation, human love, and uninhibited sexuality. Babylon has forced us to commit ourselves to one thing . . . revolution.”<sup>31</sup> This rhetorical choice to move beyond binaries, critique social institutions, and frame sexuality as a revolutionary commitment evidenced a profound shift in queer organizing that can be traced to the Panthers and their use of the Black Power vernacular.

An adoption of Black Power vernacular, anti-colonialism, socialist commitments, and critiques of state violence and nationalist politics cemented post-Stonewall gay activism around many of the organizing principles and ideological commitments of Black Power activists, which created the intimacy between the groups that allowed for the borrowing of vernacular also prompted actual physical collaboration.

### ))) Panther Gender Politics

These points of adjacency demonstrate how the movements were coterminous on substantial political theory and issues but the adjacency of these movements also operated with and against backlash from queer activists that the Panthers had a retrograde gender politics. This backlash focused primarily on critiques of

black macho, suggesting that the Panthers were bad faith actors because of their embodiment of black patriarchal gender roles.

### ))) Black Macho

Early critiques of Panther masculinity emerged around what Joseph A. McCafrey in his 1972 book *The Homosexual Dialectic* called “a super macho cult,” while ignoring the complexity and nuance of Panther gender politics.<sup>32</sup> Early retrospective accounts of the Panthers projected a conservative gender politics focused on representational critiques instead of deep engagement with the political interventions of, for example, the Party’s survival programs, the participation of women (especially in leadership positions), and the public statements about nonnormative gender practices by Panther leaders. Although some of the (mostly ocular) critiques were lobbed at the aesthetics of the Panthers—the berets, bandoliers, leather jackets, and boots—others were focused on making arguments about individual Panthers’ treatment of women as a way of minimizing their contributions to black activism and as a cautionary tale about radical (male) organizing.

Still, much of the homophobia in the black left focused like a laser beam on James Baldwin and his writings because Baldwin was the most publicly out black American intellectual and his popularity made him a target for speculation and criticism. Black literary macho, even in the Panthers, focused on aggressive critiques of Baldwin as a way of overperforming heterosexuality to negate the banal harms of white supremacy and segregation, and later as a way of managing the anxiety and pressure of state repression. In *Soul on Ice*, Eldridge Cleaver famously wrote: “There is in James Baldwin’s work the most grueling, agonizing, total hatred of the blacks, particularly of himself, and the most shameful, fanatical, fawning, sycophantic love of the whites that one can find in the writings of any black American writer of note in our time.”<sup>33</sup> Cleaver described Baldwin as a “jive-ass” and he distanced his early praise for “the cover and camouflage of the perfumed smoke screen of his prose.”<sup>34</sup> But in his critiques of Baldwin, Cleaver mobilizes “white patriarchy’s dominant ideologies,” which “points towards the complex entanglement of race, sex and homophobia.”<sup>35</sup> This kind of criticism of Baldwin “had little to do with his politics, or his literary craftsmanship, or even, for that matter, his precise position on the race questions. The argument was that Baldwin’s homosexuality, his unconfident masculinity, is the hidden root of all his writing and completely disqualifies him as a representative spokesman,” writes Morris Dickstein.<sup>36</sup> But Cleaver went beyond this attack on Baldwin, arguing, “homosexuality is a sickness, just as are baby-rape or wanting to

become head of General Motors.”<sup>37</sup> This complicated landscape is what makes the rhetorical adjacency between the Panthers and post-Stonewall gay liberation activists so interesting but it also mimics the difficulties between GLF activists and Maoist-Leninists who saw homosexuality as a “bourgeois deviation,” “counterrevolutionary,” or a decadent expression of capitalism.<sup>38</sup> In fact, although GLF activists were moving left towards the Panthers, there were stirring debates among gay activists about Maoism and the homophobia of Third World communism that, it is interesting to note, the Panthers also critiqued.<sup>39</sup>

Nonetheless, Michele Wallace’s publication of *Black Macho and the Myth of the Black Superwoman* (1978) further muddies this context because this polemic vociferously condemned the Panthers for a regressive gender politics, lumping them in with Ron Karenga’s Us organization and the Nation of Islam.<sup>40</sup> Wallace argued, “Perhaps it was necessary for Huey Newton and the Black Panthers to make a public display of arming themselves. Their actions represented an unprecedented boldness in the sons of slaves and had a profound and largely beneficial effect on the way in which black men would regard themselves from then on. Yet the gains would have been more lasting if an improved self-image had not been so hopelessly dependent upon Black Macho—a male chauvinist that was frequently cruel, narcissistic, and shortsighted.”<sup>41</sup> This characterization of their masculinity painted all Panthers as hypermasculine, violent, and self-absorbed while obscuring the participation of black women in the organization, even those like Elaine Brown and Kathleen Cleaver, who served in leadership positions.

Wallace’s widely circulated condemnation ignored statements by Panthers like that by Huey Newton that articulated how the crucible of sex/gender/race psychologically victimized black men. For example, in his 1967 essay, “Fear and Doubt,” Newton explained that the black man was facing a crisis of manhood: “As a man, he finds himself void of those things that bring respect and a feeling of worthiness. . . . He ultimately blames himself. . . . He may father several illegitimate children by several different women in order to display his masculinity. But in the end, he realizes that he is ineffectual in his efforts. . . . He is asked to respect laws that do not respect him.”<sup>42</sup> Thinking through the psychology of domination that black men live under, Newton adds that the black man is “in a constant state of rage, of shame, of doubt. This psychological state permeates all of his interpersonal relationships. It determines his view of the social system. His psychological development has been prematurely arrested. This doubt begins at a very early age and continues throughout his life.”<sup>43</sup> Newton’s psychological assessment of how white supremacy shaped black masculinity created both a historical context and a psychological basis for their behaviors that was rooted in the work of black psychologists like Kenneth Clark and Herbert Hendin, who elaborated on the oppression psychosis thesis to explain how white supremacy

has shaped anti-black violence as well as black masculinity. Thus, Newton's discourses about black masculinity created the possibility for substitutability by creating *context* for contemporary iterations of black masculinity.

Refuting black macho with a more nuanced description on the sociological factors that uniquely repressed black men, Newton's rebuttal reached its apotheosis in *Revolutionary Suicide* (1973), published five years *before* Wallace's polemic and unreferenced by *Black Macho*. There, Newton addressed Eldridge Cleaver's gender politics explicitly writing, "I see now that Eldridge was not dedicated to helping black people but was in search of a strong manhood symbol."<sup>44</sup> Newton goes on to say that Eldridge was "probing for his own masculinity" as a way of disavowing Cleaver not just because of the internal rift precipitated by the FBI's counterintelligence programs but also to continue his own critique of Cleaver's problematic gender politics. In his 1973 essay "Eldridge Cleaver is no James Baldwin," Newton remembered a dinner that he shared with Baldwin in 1967. Cleaver was his companion and, according to Newton, "Cleaver and Baldwin walked into each other and the giant six foot three inch Cleaver bent down and engaged in a long passionate French kiss with the tiny (barely five feet) Baldwin."<sup>45</sup> Newton recalled Cleaver pleading with him to never mention the interaction but Newton described his shock at the encounter given Cleaver's scathing attack on Baldwin's homosexuality in "Notes on a Native Son." Newton wrote that he realized that Baldwin "who had neither written nor uttered a word in response to Cleaver's acid literary criticism, had finally spoken. Using nonverbal communication, he dramatically exposed Cleaver's internal contradiction and 'tragic flaw'; in effect, he had said, 'If a woman kissed Cleaver, she would be kissing another woman, and if a man kissed Cleaver, he would be kissing another man.'<sup>46</sup>

Describing Cleaver as "punk hunting," Newton both condemned Cleaver's repressed homosexuality and defended Baldwin, saying that he "is an admitted homosexual, but he is not a depraved madman."<sup>47</sup> This textual negotiation of black queerness is especially important because it marks Newton as gender progressive in managing the competing fields of embodied masculinity that Cleaver and Baldwin offered (and it partially exonerates Newton for inviting Cleaver to the dinner party in the first place). Newton's comments also reinforced space for Baldwin to articulate ("admit") his own truth about his sexuality, suggesting that sexual truth is personal. This kind of repeated public distancing from Cleaver is ultimately what made it possible for Newton to articulate gay liberation as a point of rhetorical adjacency for the Panthers. To say it another way: without the repudiation of Cleaver's gender politics after Eldridge left the Party, it would have been difficult for Newton to have had any credibility on the issue.

Still, in opposition to the striking politics of the widely distributed Moynihan Report, which blamed black women for undermining the integrity of the black

family, Newton's public speeches and writings like "Fear and Doubt" charted another argument about black masculinity that acknowledged how both *structural violence* and *black male vulnerability* were caused by structures of white supremacy and *not black women*.<sup>48</sup> Newton's own critiques of the apparatus of "the bourgeois family," which he described as "an imprisoning, enslaving, and suffocating experience," informed his assessment of marriage as an institution of repression, likening it to prison, because of its reliance on possessiveness and its insistence that men carry the financial burden of a family.<sup>49</sup> This critique of marriage as an institution of gendered domination highlighted the dilemmas for men, which also provided a point of radical departure for the Panthers' gender politics, one that went unacknowledged by feminist activists.

Nonetheless, with dozens of these kinds of comments in speeches and writings, the dismissal of the Panthers as a brutal, thoughtless, hypermasculine organization is at best disingenuous, given Newton's persistent musings about the psychological dimensions of intersectional violence against black men and his increasingly progressive views about monogamy, marriage, and compulsory heterosexuality. But even later monographs about the Panthers articulated only a moderately more positive view of the group's gender politics. For example, Peniel Joseph argued that the Panthers' gender politics became "more progressive rhetorically" but "remained conflicted internally."<sup>50</sup> And although this isn't untrue, the extent of the range of opinions has only become more apparent with recent archival research, demonstrating that there were divergent expectations and habits across the active chapters. Although queer-hating was a part of some Panther discourse, especially early on, historian Amy Abugo Ongiri reminds us that the Panthers "challenged the status quo on gender and sexual issues so much that the BPP was the only political group to be named specifically in the initial 1969 manifesto of 'The Red Butterfly,' a radical breakaway group from the Gay Liberation Front that published some of the most important manifestos of the early Gay Rights Movement in the United States."<sup>51</sup> Recent history on Panther gender politics helps scholars uncover *why* GLF activists were able to collaborate with the Panthers as well as *how* the rhetorical adjacency between the groups operated.

### ))) Nonnormative Gender Roles: Domestic and Organizational Labor

Beyond Newton's own rebuttal of toxic masculinity (particularly as it was embodied by Cleaver), was the fact that the Panthers embraced radically non-normative gender roles in domestic and organizational labor. In the Panthers' "program to assert a revolutionary masculinity, black men were to become men

by standing up against and seeking to destroy the oppressive structure that was denying them their humanity.”<sup>52</sup> This revolutionary masculinity was not just rooted in aesthetics. Rather it centered on a radical critique of black masculinity from multiple standpoints that rejected many of the claims that black macho advanced. Newton’s comments and the Party’s own survival programs (breakfast programs, afterschool programs, prison busing, grocery drives, health clinics, etc.) stood as counterexamples of nonnormative gender performances, in particular when men consistently performed child care like they did in the breakfast programs and they led the Party to experiment with communal living and nonmonogamous sexual relationships.<sup>53</sup> Newton’s memoir, *Revolutionary Suicide*, includes several long meditations on the limitations of marriage and the problems that it creates, particularly for black families. There, Newton explains, “Marriage usually becomes one more imprisoning experience within the general prison of society.”<sup>54</sup> Newton’s rejection of compulsory marriage dovetailed with the GLF’s own critiques of marriage as an institution and monogamy as a cultural practice.<sup>55</sup>

In addition, where Michele Wallace’s denunciation of the Panthers shared white law and order critiques of the organization and functioned as a form of erasure of black women in the group, newer memoirs and monographs by and about Panther women have revealed a much more complicated gender dynamic within the organization. Books by black liberation activists like Kathleen Cleaver, Elaine Brown, and Assata Shakur have complemented the memoirs of male leaders in documenting how black liberation articulated an increasingly progressive agenda about women, from their 10-Point Program to the female leadership structures. In addition to the collection of essays edited by Dayo F. Gore, Jeanne Theoharis, and Komozi Woodard are the monographs by Ashley D. Farmer, Robyn Spencer, and Alondra Nelson that resituate Panther women to acknowledge the complicated gender dynamics in the organization and across the movement.<sup>56</sup> For example, Farmer writes, “Panther women boldly asserted that black women from all walks of life were revolutionary leaders” particularly as they “revitalized and revolutionized public education through [new] initiatives.”<sup>57</sup> New analysis highlights the ways that women in the Party had more mobility and freedom to participate and lead than in other contemporary liberation organizations.

In a slightly more sympathetic assessment of Panther gender dynamics, bell hooks writes, “It would be all too easy to blame these black males for their uncritical embrace of patriarchy even as they were so critical of The Man, yet they were and remain, even in death, victims of sexist socialization.”<sup>58</sup> This kind of casual assessment, devoid of context, recirculated opinions about the Panthers that have been undermined by actual Panther scholarship but it helped to fix

the Panthers as damaged, as an extension of the “damage thesis” scholarship that emerged from black and white psychologists of the 1950s to explain how slavery and domination had warped white–black race relations.

Nonetheless, the history of the Panthers demonstrates that the ideologies of Huey Newton, Bobby Seale, and Eldridge Cleaver actually changed over time. Although “black manhood” was a mid-1960s discourse that circulated early in the Party (due primarily to Malcolm X’s influence), by the early 1970s Panther recruits were memorizing and reciting the “8 Points of Attention,” of which point 7 read “Do not take liberties with women.”<sup>59</sup> Changes in Panther gender ideology, in particular among the leadership, was also reflected “in the statements and actions of the rank-and-file male members, who often abandoned overtly sexist and male chauvinist behaviors as a result of their interactions with Panther women, particularly those in leadership positions.”<sup>60</sup> Tracye Matthews argues, “The Party’s theory and praxis with regard to issues of gender and sexuality should be viewed as an ongoing, nonlinear process that was affected by factors both internal and external to the organization.”<sup>61</sup> The Panthers had a gender equity policy that was more progressive than any of the organizations of the New Left at the time: black women in the BPP pushed radical class critiques on the women’s liberation movements from leadership positions and from the rank-and-file, and there was public and private discussion and debate over changing gender politics in a way that was more radical than in New Left organizations. She adds, “The stories of the BPP cannot be reduced to a monolithic party line on ‘the woman question,’ or a linear progression from an overtly and overwhelmingly sexist organization to a pro-black feminist/womanist one.”<sup>62</sup> Instead, Huey Newton’s statements on gender politics and gay liberation had a tremendous impact on both black organizing and queer organizing by the end of the 1970s precisely because of the ongoing debates about gender inside the BPP.

## ))) Huey Newton and Gay Liberation

In light of deliberate readings of the Panthers as a monolithic macho organization and the new histories that have resuscitated the contributions of radical black women to the organization and expanded the gender politics of the Panthers to account for a wide variety of radical gender commitments, it seems useful on the anniversary of Stonewall to consider how Huey Newton’s sex/gender radicalism influenced both the Panthers and the GLF in ways that augmented both movements through rhetorical adjacency.

On August 15, 1970, in New York City, Newton gave a speech, “The Women’s Liberation and Gay Liberation Movements,” in which he articulated support for

both movements. Although the speech has garnered no attention in the field of communication because Newton has been understudied (along with most of the discourse of both black and gay liberation), it is remarkable for its awareness of the importance of rhetorical adjacency and for its clear critiques of hegemonic masculinity. He begins the speech with a recognition of rhetorical adjacency by acknowledging, “strong movements have developed among women and among homosexuals seeking their liberation” while describing how there also has “been some uncertainty about how to relate to these movements.”<sup>63</sup> This uncertainty among the Panthers regarding both movements contextualizes how black activists were managing the adjacency between the movements, given both the shared and divergent goals.

The tone of the speech was a reproach to insecure masculinity—what today we would call “fragility.”<sup>64</sup> Newton told the audience, “Whatever your personal opinions and your insecurities about homosexuality and the various liberation movements among homosexuals and women (and I speak of the homosexuals and women as oppressed groups), we should try to unite with them in a revolutionary fashion.”<sup>65</sup> For Newton, this meant collaboration. However, he describes the limitations of collaboration from the perspective of black men, describing how these gender insecurities propel men into reactionary violence: “. . . sometimes our first instinct is to want to hit a homosexual in the mouth, and want a woman to be quiet. We want to hit a homosexual in the mouth because we are afraid that we might be homosexual; and we want to hit the women or shut her up because we are afraid that she might castrate us, or take the nuts that we might not have to start with.”<sup>66</sup> Newton elucidates the fantasies and subsequent instances of violence that encode fragility for (black) men as they navigate the changing gender landscape. His acknowledgement of the fragility surrounding the overlapping and sometime antagonistic political and personal agency of women and gay men suggests an awareness of how race and gender overlap as part of what Patricia Hill Collins has called the “matrix of domination.”<sup>67</sup> Newton’s sophisticated analysis both situated the oppression of women and queers as a problematic commitment of modern masculinity and created a structure of accountability about physical violence against women and queers by conceding that violence against other oppressed groups is a weak substitute for political commitment. Rather, Newton’s central thesis is that Panthers need to support *all oppressed groups*.

But Newton also provides a primer on the rhetorical sensitivity necessary to navigate the newly emergent adjacency between the movements, saying: “‘faggot’ and ‘punk’ should be deleted from our vocabulary, and especially we should not attach names normally designed for homosexuals to men who are enemies of the people, such as Nixon or Mitchell. Homosexuals are not enemies of the

people.”<sup>68</sup> For Newton, the refusal to participate in punk-hunting or gay-hating needed to begin with the language used to describe the struggle against enemies that benefit from structures oppressing both the Panthers and GLF activists.

Beyond his admonishments about Panther behavior, though, is the fact that Newton spends the bulk of his speech discussing the psychology of freedom and oppression, suggesting that the Panthers’ “recognize the women’s right to be free” and that homosexuals “might be the most oppressed people in the society.”<sup>69</sup> Newton goes so far as to say “maybe a homosexual could be the most revolutionary” position in American culture.<sup>70</sup> Newton’s comments acknowledged that although the BPP had strived to build an emergent revolutionary values structure, it was not complete and it had much to learn from the newly constituted gay liberation movement. This admission created the space for rhetorical adjacency because it spoke to the need for the Panthers to integrate a broader *gender* perspective into their structural analyses of power.

But Newton’s comments on rhetorical adjacency moved towards a more intimate association between the movements and towards coalitional praxis as he explicitly challenged “revolutionary conferences, rallies, and demonstrations” to include “full participation of the gay liberation movement and the women’s liberation movement.”<sup>71</sup> In this vein, Newton suggested that the antidote to fragility was humility. He explained, “We should never say a whole movement is dishonest when in fact they are trying to be honest. They are just making honest mistakes. Friends are allowed to make mistakes. . . . [T]he women’s liberation front and the gay liberation front are our friends, they are potential allies, *and we need as many allies as possible.*”<sup>72</sup> The language of political friendship here is a trope of intimacy and indicates Newton’s interest in the shared values of the movement augmenting and amplifying the values and goals of the BPP, clearly demonstrating his investment in the adjacency of the movements and his support for their influence on Black Power activism. Newton was later asked about the closeness of the three movements and Newton explained the importance of coalitional politics, acknowledging how the Left isolated women and queers while highlighting that the movements were stronger when they worked together, suggesting that contradictions between men and women or queers and straights “. . . should be resolved within the community. Too often, so called revolutionary vanguards have tried to resolve these contradictions by isolating women and gay people, and of course, this only means that the revolutionary groups have cut themselves off from one of the most powerful and important forces among the people. We do not believe that the oppression of women or gays will end by the creation of separate communities for either group. We see that as an incorrect idea, just like the idea of a separate nation.”<sup>73</sup> This explicit condemnation of isolation as a tactic of the New Left and the embrace of

proximity and collaboration speaks to revolutionary goals of the BPP in ways that would influence more people and distribute political agency more equitably. But it also showcased a broader sense of gender repression than most of the other movements of the period while simultaneously providing critique of the separatist language and politics that informed the masculinist nationalism of groups like Ron Karenga's Us organization and the Nation of Islam, advocating for coalitional politics instead.

Unlike the early feminist anthologies of the early 1970s, Newton's letter was reprinted in most of the gay liberation readers and edited collections of the period, including the groundbreaking anthology, *The Gay Liberation Book*.<sup>74</sup> It has also been a part of more inclusive collections like *American Protest Literature*.<sup>75</sup> It was circulated widely in the United States, and he had it translated into Spanish and mimeographed whereby "he sent that all around Cuba."<sup>76</sup> In circulating this particular speech in its entirety in Cuba, where homosexuality was still punished by jail time, Newton demonstrated his commitment to gay liberation beyond U.S. borders in a way that no other leftist organization of the time came close to matching, demonstrating how what I have called cross-pollination created rhetorical adjacency in North America. But its absence from feminist anthologies suggests that gay liberation activists felt more fidelity with Newton after 1970 and saw his statements as more significant for their fledgling movement, suggesting there was a greater propensity for rhetorical adjacency in the gay liberation movement than in the women's movement. This is likely because of the circulation of polemics about black macho that for decades ignored the progressive politics of the organization and its leadership, including Newton.

Activists noted that Newton's reading of the open letter at the Revolutionary Peoples' Convention marked the moment where *gay liberation activists* showed up to support *black liberation activists* (a move not echoed by women's liberation activists). Activist Aubrey Walter recalls that Newton "gave clear support for the gay cause, saying that homosexuals were maybe the most oppressed group in American society, and could well be the most revolutionary."<sup>77</sup> Gay leaders in Chicago commended Newton for his commitment to gay visibility and solidarity at the Convention, writing that the Panther Party, "personified by its Supreme Commander Huey P. Newton, is the first national organization to give us such warm, public support, as well as official recognition. For years, many of us have worked in radical organization always hiding our identities, always working the struggles of others. . . . Failing to recognize our grievances as legitimate, these 'revolutionaries' and 'radicals' are not only inhumane but also counter-revolutionary."<sup>78</sup> Newton's speech did not totally resolve the inconsistencies between individual BPP members and the organization as a whole, as

Robyn Spencer has argued.<sup>79</sup> It did, however, make the key distinction about *all movements* that their memberships would always have disagreements that did not fundamentally alter the ideological agenda of the organization. Newton's point was that individuals could be critiqued for being counterrevolutionary but that the entire point of the liberation movements was radical and could not be undermined by individual actions. Of course, given Cleaver's comments and the behavior of some individual Panthers, this was self-serving for Newton even as it showed a kind of grace and inclusiveness notable for its corrections of the most problematic gender dynamics of the Party.

As the only radical named in the Chicago Gay Liberation's statement on revolutionary organizing, Newton is hailed for his complete embrace of gay liberation activism. For the activists writing this manifesto, Newton functioned as a foil against the so-called radicals of the (white) New Left. Echoing Panther language, the manifesto explained that the true enemy of the gay liberation movement was "the pigs," writing, "We are beaten, entrapped, enticed, raided, taunted, arrested and jailed. In jail we are jeered at, gang-raped, beaten and killed, with full encouragement and participation by the pigs. Every homosexual lives in fear of the pigs, except that we are just beginning to fight back!"<sup>80</sup> They added, "The pigs must be fought, but we must see beyond them to ultimate sources of power—an elite of super-rich, white males who control production and therefore the prevailing ideology."<sup>81</sup> This language borrowed heavily from Panthers like Newton wrote about the police and prison politics that guarded America's class/race dynamics.

This dynamic, whereby Newton's denunciation of anti-queer oppression motivated the inclusion of Panther language in gay liberation ephemera while reframing the position of the Panthers' leadership, is precisely how rhetorical adjacency magnifies and strengthens radical praxis through the revolutionary idiom. Historians Karla Jay and Allen Young write that because of Newton's speech and the solidarity shown by the BPP to the GLF the year after Stonewall, "[g]ay liberation became associated with support for the Black Panthers, the insistence on linking the fate of gay people to a broader 'revolutionary' movement, especially the commitment to Marxist-Leninist ideology with its notions of a vanguard . . . the voicing of feminist concerns (directed in part against the behavior of gay men), and the whole idea that gay people as well as straight people must undergo transformation."<sup>82</sup> Newton's speech inspired his inclusion in GLF documents and helped to circulate the notion that black liberation pedagogy and activism needed to be inclusive of radical sex/gender politics, though it's impossible to hold him solely accountable for the implementation of this shift in the BPP, given the political shifts of the early 1970s.

## ))) Revolutionary Language in the Liberal State: A Rejection of Tolerance

The rhetorical adjacency linking the gay and black liberation movements hinges on the deployment of critiques of a liberalism that pivots on the state's reliance on the police and prison to manage dissent, the revolutionary vernacular as a method of interrogating arrangements of power, and a political perspective attentive to race/sex/gender politics all at once. These three points of adjacency amplified Black Power vernacular and ideology but also helped Black Power activism include a broader conceptualization of radical identity politics. Kobena Mercer explains the appeal of the Panthers to other liberation movements, writing that their rhetoric "had an empowering effect in extending the chain of radical democratic equivalences to more and more social groups precisely through their dramatic and provocative visibility in the public sphere."<sup>83</sup> Although this dynamic was certainly present, the amplification of minoritarian critiques of the liberal state's repression of minority communities was incredibly important.

This positionality favored radical perspectives and rejected *tolerance* as the political practice of managing dissent. Pointing to the paradoxes of liberalism that prevent what Wendy Brown has called "shared citizen power," these nodes of adjacency helped to chart the structural arrangements of governmentality that undermine political participation in minority communities.<sup>84</sup> Rather than an articulation of tolerance (as yet another regulatory discourse of liberalism that undermines truly radical imaginaries), Newton's comments and the GLF's embrace of the Panther Party and its revolutionary idiom, provided new extensions of revolutionary politics that sought to intertwine the movements to make the tapestry of radical activism stronger. Instead of assimilation or disappearance, the Newton's embrace of gay liberation *heightened* radical queer visibility in the face of political erasure (especially when they appeared at rallies and events *together*), motivating the GLF to embrace the Panthers despite the unfortunate sexism of some Panther members. But the collaborations between black and gay liberation activists after Stonewall were ultimately the apex of rhetorical adjacency before Reagan's rabidly anti-black, anti-gay public policy rejected all revolutionary claims in the public sphere.

For scholars of social movements, the rhetorical adjacency between the Panthers the gay liberation movement after Stonewall should change their assessments of the Greenwich Village riots in 1969 by demonstrating how Stonewall prompted a radical reassessment of race/sex/gender in social movement dynamics. Rather than seeing the movements as independent or at best coterminous, a perspective that accounts for rhetorical adjacency is one that can pinpoint

ideological nodes and critiques that can help to demystify state power in the regulation of geographic territory and political agency through the creation of ideal citizen-subjects and the demonization of minority subjects.<sup>85</sup> This kind of analysis will be especially fruitful for new histories of ACT UP or #BlackLivesMatter, because it offers an analytic to help understand how adjacency propels rhetorical circulation of tropes and vernacular.

## NOTES

1. John Chesterman, quoted in Stuart Feather, *Blowing the Lid: Gay Liberation, Sexual Revolution, and Radical Queens* (London: Zero Books, 2016), 120.
2. David Carter, *Stonewall: The Riots That Sparked the Gay Revolution* (New York: St. Martin's, 2004), 232. See also Betsy Kuhn, *Gay Power! The Stonewall Riots and the Gay Rights Movement, 1969* (Minneapolis, MN: Learner Books, 2011), 82; Mark Segal, *And Then I Danced: Traveling the Road to LGBT Equality* (New York: Open Lens, 2015), 42.
3. Carter, *Stonewall*, 232.
4. Martin Baum Duberman, *Stonewall* (New York: Plume/Penguin, 1993), 216.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Ann Bausum, *Stonewall: Breaking Out in the Fight for Gay Rights* (New York: Penguin, 2015).
7. Kevin J. Mumford, "The Trouble with Gay Rights: Race and the Politics of Sexual Orientation in Philadelphia, 1969–1982," *Journal of American History* 98, no. 1 (2011): 53.
8. Although the Panthers were collaborating with GLF activists, both groups have varying adjacency to the women's liberation movement, the Young Lords, the American Indian Movement, the Chicano labor movement, the anti-war movement, and the student movement, though there is not space here to unpack all of the overlap or tensions that characterized their polyvalence. Still, this article provides a template for further clarification about ideological affinity versus actual rhetorical adjacency (evidenced by movement organizations' cooperation). In the case of the Panthers and the GLF, movement activists actually referenced the other movement to call attention to points of adjacency as a means of amplifying their message or augmenting their political power.
9. Lisa M. Corrigan, "Cross-Pollinating the Revolution: From Havana to Oakland and Back Again," *Journal of Postcolonial Writing* 50, no. 4 (2014): 452–65.
10. Shannon Walters, *Rhetorical Touch: Disability, Identification, Haptics* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2014).
11. Giorgio Agamben, *The Coming Community* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 25.

12. John Ackerman, "Teaching the Capital City," in *The Locations of Composition*, eds. Christopher J. Keller and Christian R. Weisser (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007), 125.
13. Ibid.
14. Although the coextensiveness among women's liberations activism and both gay and black liberation needs to be assessed in a longer project, this article focuses primarily on how sex/gender theory influenced the nonnormative theories of the Panthers.
15. See Dan Berger, *Captive Nation: Black Prison Organizing in the Civil Rights Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).
16. Huey Newton, *Revolutionary Suicide* (New York: Penguin, 2009), 202.
17. Quoted in Sherry Wolf, *Sexuality and Socialism: History, Politics, and Theory of LGBT Liberation* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2009), 31.
18. Lillian Faderman, *The Gay Revolution: The Story of the Struggle* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2015), 180.
19. Ibid., 174.
20. Prominent histories of second-wave feminism barely mention police brutality or incarceration (if they mention them at all) as prominent issues of liberation ideology or activism. Comprehensive histories by Alice Echols, Finn Enke, and Stephanie Gilmore include a reference or two to these issues, but mostly in the context of black or Chicano activism. Even Anne M. Valk's wonderful *Radical Sisters: Second Wave Feminism and Black Liberation in Washington* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2008) only mentions these issues in the context of SNCC activism. The takeaway is that second-wave feminists, white ones in particular, did not encounter police brutality, surveillance, or harassment because of their *womanness* and thus did not have the same praxis about resistance (physical or ideological) as the GLF and BPP.
21. For example, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom passed a resolution in Philadelphia during their annual meeting in 1970 stating, "We reaffirm our support of those, like . . . the Black Panther Party, who courageously assert their constitutional rights in the face of unlawful and oppressive governmental interference." (Quoted in Joshua Bloom and Waldo E. Martin, Jr., *Black Against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016], 256.) Nonetheless, this kind of adjacency pointed to the faith that socialist feminists had by 1970 in the ideological disposition of the Panthers.
22. Lisa M. Corrigan, *Prison Power: How Prison Influenced the Movement for Black Liberation* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2016).
23. Ibid., 6.
24. Jared Leighton, "All of Us Are Unapprehended Felons': Gay Liberation, the Black Panther Party, and Intercommunal Efforts Against Police Brutality in the Bay Area," *Journal of Social History* 52, no. 3 (2018), 1, <https://doi.org/10.1093/jsh/shx119>.
25. Marc Stein, "'Birthplace of the Nation': Imagining Lesbian and Gay Communities in Philadelphia, 1969–1970," in *Creating a Place For Ourselves: Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Community Histories*, ed. Brett Beemyn (New York: Routledge, 1997), 275.

26. Emily K. Hobson, *Lavender and Red: Liberation and Solidarity in Gay and Lesbian Left* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016), 12. Hobson's book (the best on the topic) locates the internal colony thesis as a device that Panthers used and GLF members took up to bridge the movements.
27. Stein, "Birthplace of a Nation," 266.
28. Angela Davis, *Angela Davis: An Autobiography* (New York: Bantam, 1975); Angela Davis, *Women, Race, and Class* (New York: Random House, 1989). See also Ahmed Shawki, *Black Liberation and Socialism* (New York: Haymarket, 2006), 212; Earl Ofari Hutchinson, *Blacks and Reds: Race and Class in Conflict, 1919–1990* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1995).
29. Sean L. Malloy, *Out of Oakland: Black Panther Party Internationalism during the Cold War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2017).
30. Elaine Mokhtefi, *Algiers, Third World Capital: Freedom Fighters, Revolutionaries, Black Panthers* (New York: Verso, 2018).
31. Quoted in Wolf, *Sexuality and Socialism*, 128.
32. Joseph A. McCaffrey, *The Homosexual Dialectic* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1972), 213.
33. Eldridge Cleaver, *Soul on Ice* (New York: Delta/Dell, 1999), 124.
34. *Ibid.*, 125.
35. Douglas Field, "Looking for Jimmy Baldwin: Sex, Privacy, and Black Nationalist Fervor," *Callaloo* 27, no. 2 (2004): 465.
36. Morris Dickstein, *Gates of Eden: American Culture in the Sixties* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), 168.
37. Cleaver, *Soul on Ice*, 136.
38. Wolf, *Sexuality and Socialism*, 130–3.
39. See *Ibid.*, 73–115.
40. For a contemporary assessment, see Keisha N. Blain, *Set the World on Fire: Black Nationalist Women and the Global Struggle for Freedom* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018).
41. Michele Wallace, *Black Macho and the Myth of the Superwoman* (New York: Verso, 1999), 73.
42. Huey Newton, "Fear and Doubt," in *The Huey Newton Reader*, ed. David Hilliard and Donald Weise (New York: Seven Stories, 2002), 131.
43. *Ibid.*, 132.
44. Newton, *Revolutionary Suicide*, 142.
45. Huey Newton, "Eldridge Cleaver is No James Baldwin," in *The Huey P. Newton Reader*, eds. David Hilliard and Donald Weise (New York: Seven Stories, 2002), 287.
46. *Ibid.*
47. *Ibid.*, 287–8.
48. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "The Negro Family: A Case for Action" (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, 1965). Also known as "The Moynihan Report."
49. Newton, *Revolutionary Suicide*, 93.
50. Peniel E. Joseph, *Waiting 'Til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of Black Power in America* (New York: Holt, 2006), 244.

51. Amy Abugo Ongiri, "Prisoner of Love: Affiliation, Sexuality, and the Black Panther Party," *Journal of African American History* 94, no. 1 (2009): 73.
52. Joshua Bloom and Waldo E. Martin, Jr., *Black Against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 95.
53. Newton, *Revolutionary Suicide*, 93.
54. Ibid.
55. See Martin Duberman, *Has the Gay Movement Failed?* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2018). Duberman's newest book includes sections discussing how the GLF refused monogamy and marriage as frames for LGBTQ liberation unlike the modern gay rights movement.
56. Dayo F. Gore, Jeanne Theoharis, and Komozi Woodard, eds., *Want to Start a Revolution? Radical Women in the Black Freedom Struggle* (New York: New York University Press, 2009); Jeanne Theoharis and Komozi Woodard, eds., *Groundwork: Local Black Freedom Movements in America* (New York: New York University Press, 2005); Ashley D. Farmer, *Remaking Black Power: How Black Women Transformed an Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017); Robyn Spencer, *The Revolution Has Come: Black Power, Gender, and the Black Panther Party in Oakland* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016); and Alondra Nelson, *Body and Soul: The Black Panther Party and the Fight Against Medical Discrimination* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).
57. Farmer, *Remaking Black Power*, 89.
58. bell hooks, *We Real Cool: Black Men and Masculinity* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 55.
59. Reprinted in Eric Foner, *The Black Panthers Speak* (New York: De Capo, 2002), 98–99.
60. Tracye Matthews, "No One Ever Asks What a Man's Role in the Revolution Is: Gender Politics and Leadership in the Black Panther Party, 1966–67," in *The Black Panther Party (Reconsidered)*, ed. Charles E. Jones (Baltimore, MD: Black Classic Press, 1998), 232.
61. Ibid.
62. Ibid., 233.
63. Huey P. Newton, "The Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation Movements," *The Huey P. Newton Reader*, ed. David Hilliard and Donald Weise (New York: Seven Stories, 2002), 157.
64. See Robin DiAngelo, "White Fragility," *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy* 3, no. 3 (2011): 54. Although DiAngelo describes how fragility applies to white people, it's clear that segregation and anti-black violence create a precarity that also promotes fragility among black people and other people of color.
65. Newton, "The Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation Movements," 157.
66. Ibid.
67. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Routledge, 2000).
68. Newton, "The Women's Liberation and Gay Liberation Movements," 159.
69. Ibid., 158.

70. Ibid.
71. Ibid.
72. Ibid., 159. Emphasis in original.
73. Louis G. Heath, *Black Panther Leaders Speak* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1976), 219.
74. Len Richmond, ed., *The Gay Liberation Book* (San Francisco: Ramparts, 1973).
75. Zoe Trodd, ed., *American Protest Literature* (Boston: Belknap, 2008).
76. Reprinted in “On the Venceremos Brigade,” in *Out of the Closets: Voices of Gay Liberation*, ed. Karla Jay and Allen Young (New York: New York University Press, 1992), 234.
77. Audrey Walter, “Introduction,” *Come Together: The Years of Gay Liberation, 1970–1973*, ed. Audrey Walter (New York: Verso, 1980), 10.
78. Chicago Gay Liberation, “Working Paper for the Revolutionary People’s Constitutional Convention,” in Jay and Young, *Out of the Closets*, 348.
79. Robyn C. Spencer, *The Revolution Has Come: Black Power, Gender, and the Black Panther Party in Oakland* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), 97–98.
80. Chicago Gay Liberation, “Working Paper,” 348.
81. Ibid.
82. Karla Jay and Allen Young, “Introduction,” in Jay and Young, *Out of the Closets*, xxxviii.
83. Kobena Mercer, “‘1968’: Periodizing Politics and Identity,” in *Welcome to the Jungle: New Positions in Black Cultural Studies* (Routledge: New York, 1994), 303.
84. Wendy Brown, *Regulating Aversion: Tolerance in the Age of Identity and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), 89.
85. This is certainly the case for #BLM scholars; see Keeanga Yahmatta-Taylor, *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation* (New York: Haymarket, 2016).

)))

**Lisa M. Corrigan** is an associate professor of communication and director of the gender studies program at the University of Arkansas. Her research focuses on race and gender politics in the Long Sixties with a particular emphasis on the Black Power movement in the U.S. and abroad.