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A

Communities Under Attack

Britain's Moral Majority . . . . "They were the people who brought us Section 28. They were behind the recent Early Day Motion attacking lesbian mothers, and they have just successfully destroyed five years of health education work on AIDS."

(Chris Woods of Capital Gay on the extreme right wing pressure group "Family Concern")

The Early Day Motion tabled recently by Ann Winterton attacks the reproductive rights of lesbians and "single heterosexual women who are not infertile", going on to describe lesbian and single women's families by stating that they "undermine the status of marriage, corrupt the family unit and leave the ensuing children at risk of grave emotional harm." Our right to have children is now under attack, the implication being that it should only be white, middle class, married, able-bodied heterosexuals who are allowed to have families. Those who have tabled this motion are committed to attacking the reproductive rights of all women and there is currently concern about possible discriminatory amendments to the forthcoming embryoology bill.

Recent attacks in the press and media have also targeted and vilified People With AIDS/HIV, black people, lesbians and gay men, bisexuals, drug-users and women. The lies being spread about the AIDS crisis could lead to the deaths of thousands of heterosexuals who have been told that they are not "at risk". The rights of disabled people, trade unionists, the unemployed, students and single parents are also being threatened. Homeliness is tolerated with young people particularly targeted, yet the Tories continue to make hypocritical statements about their protection of the young.

We wish to propose the setting up of a group representing communities under attack to mobilise for a mass demonstration/day of action in 1990. A group of representatives should meet as soon as possible in January to discuss and launch this campaign. We need to unite our struggles to take action against these attacks on our rights and freedoms. Please respond to this as soon as possible.

Maureen Oliver
OLGA (National).

Tel: 01-833-3860 Fax: 01-278-3608
ITEM 2: Speech by Peter Tatchell to the Stop Clause 28 Rally. 30th Jan, 1989.

Text of a speech by Peter Tatchell to the Stop Clause 28 Rally
in Cardiff on Saturday 30 January 1989:

Sisters and Brothers,

We are here today to oppose Clause 28 of the Local Government Bill. This Clause is a bigot’s charter. It will give succour, comfort and encouragement to every bigot in the land. It will help create an atmosphere in which prejudice and discrimination will flourish.

Clause 28 is an unprecedented legislative proposal. Never, since the 1920s, has any European government ever attempted such a draconian threat to the human rights and civil liberties of lesbians and gay men.

By supporting this Clause 28, the Thatcher government is, yet again, dragging our society further down the road of intolerance and authoritarianism.

Fifty years ago, another government began by banning the promotion of homosexuality - that government was the government of Adolf Hitler.

That same government ultimately drew up ‘pink lists’ of known homosexuals and, using the Gestapo, it ordered the mass rounding up of gay people who were forced to wear the sign of the pink triangle and who were deported to the concentration camps where they were worked to death and exterminated en masse.

The Nazis succeeded because too many people stood by and did nothing. They succeed because too few people dared to resist.

We have to defeat Clause 28 because if we don’t, I fear for the future of lesbian and gay rights in this country.

Forty years ago, Britain fought and won a war against fascism in defence of democracy. Our country fought for a freedom which, even before Clause 28, lesbians and gay men were never allowed to share.

The reality is that for the last 40 years since 1945, lesbians and gay men have never enjoyed democratic human rights. Instead, we have been subjected to a degree of state repression which is tantamount to semi-fascist persecution:

- Gay men and women are sacked from their jobs and evicted from their homes and such discrimination is protected by law.
- Every year, at least 50 loving lesbian mothers are deprived of their children by the courts.
- Forty gay men are currently being held in prison for the ‘crime’ of loving another man contrary to Britain’s discriminatory age of consent laws.
- There has been a massive increase in violent attacks on lesbians and gay men over the last two years and nearly every week a gay man is murdered by ‘queerbashers’.

Almost every gay man and woman here today will have a personal story to tell about being abused in the streets, attacked in their homes, or having a fist or a glass smashed in their face.

Clause 28 will fuel this climate of hatred and violence and that is why it must be defeated.

In case the government has forgotten, Britain is a signatory to the United Nations’ Declaration of Human Rights. That Declaration proclaims that all citizens have the right to privacy, the right to freedom of opinion and expression, the right to protection from discrimination and persecution, and the right to equality before the law.

Clause 28 undermines these fundamental human rights and that is why we are here today – to proclaim that lesbian and gay rights are human rights and that we will never stop campaigning till Clause 28 is defeated and till lesbians and gay men win freedom, justice and equality.
ITEM 3a: Stonewall Group Minute Meetings. 27th Nov, 1988.

Stonewall Group minutes of a meeting on the 27th November at Homingford Road.

Present: Peter Rivas, Peter Ashman, Jennie Wilson, Fiona Cunningham Reid, Jan Parker, Lisa Power, Michael Cashman, Ian McKellen, Duncan Campbell, Debra Ballard.

Apologies: Douglas Slater.

1. Introductions: Jan and Fiona were introduced to the group and given its background.

2. Documentation: The papers have gone to the Charity Commissioners. PA ran through the Memorandum of the SG, which was agreed. He presented the Articles of Association to which the following changes were agreed-
   a. to change the legally discriminatory traditional language (i.e. from he to she), LP to retyping the document with changes.
   b. to change the general meeting quorum from 2 to 5 and to stipulate that both sexes must be represented.

   PA to register the company on receipt of the Articles.

3. Money: Fundraising subcommittee will convene at 11.45am the following Sunday at Morgan St, to arrange to open a bank account and begin the initial fundraising. FCB to work out this subcommittee.

4. Administration: Agreed that minutes should be taken of all full meetings in future and distributed in advance of the next meeting. MC to copy the major background documents for new members. DB to keep an archive of all documents and minutes.

5. Membership: Agreed unanimously to have a Christmas party to get to know each other. To be held at 7pm, 16th December at the Fallen Angel (upstairs). DB to provide food, please bring a bottle. DC to approach Stuart Hall re joining. All to keep considering more women, people with fundraising skills etc.

6. Employment: New subgroup to consider this, including job description, conditions, recruitment, temporary measures. LP and DB, IM to mention group to Colin Twedy.

7. Public Launch: MC, DC, JP, LP, JM to look at how to go public and when. To meet 8pm Thursday 15th at Burdett Road.

8. AGM: PA explained his work on a Bill of Rights emerging from the legislation conference of 1987. This has potential support from both Labour and the Democrats and the Group may want to take it up when ready. Agreed that the Group needs a schedule of planned activities for obtaining objects in which this should feature.

9. Next meeting: Sunday 18th at the FA to consider short report backs from subcommittees, then party, followed by a full meeting on January 8th, 4-7pm at Narrow Street.
ITEM 3b: Stonewall Group Minute Meetings. 10th Dec, 1988.

Stonewall Group - Employment Subcommittee

Saturday 10th December 1988 @ Fallen Angel

Present: BB, CT, NP.

1. After discussing the options, it was agreed to go straight away for a Director, rather than a temporary Development Officer (since they would in any case be de facto Acting Director) and to attempt to recruit admin support as soon as the budget allows - possibly part-time.

2. Agreed that we need to make a case to the Post and Office in the bank before recruiting. Since Director is expected to be paid £20,000 p.a. or thereabouts, we would need about £10k before recruiting.

3. After long discussion on the qualities of the person for the post, a job description (appendix) was drawn up. It was also agreed:
   (a) That the best person for the post must be appointed regardless of gender, race, etc; but that whatever their background they must demonstrate the ability to work with and have an understanding of other groups of people, particularly along the political spectrum.
   (b) That they need not have a strong history of lesbian and gay rights work but must be dedicated or gay and have some knowledge of our previous initiatives within a general civil rights context.
   (c) That they must have a track record of good work on their own initiative.

4. NP is to check the job description with Peter Ashman and Nick Billinghame at NEC.

5. These minutes and the job description to be discussed at the January 3rd meeting.
Stonewall Group

MINUTES OF MEETING ON 8 JANUARY AT 82 NARROW STREET

Present:
Debbo Ballard, Duncan Campbell, Paul Dickinson, Ian McKellen, Lisa Power, Peter Rivas, Douglas Slater, Colin Tweedy, Jennie Wilson

Apologies:
Michael Cashman, Fiona Cunningham-Reid, Simon Fanshawe, Jan Parker. (Simon Fanshawe had sent apologies for the last three meetings.)

1. Items arising from the previous meeting

Lisa Power reported that she had now retyped the Articles of Association as agreed, and had given these to Peter Ashman.

Peter Ashman reported that he had received a letter from the Charity Commission raising some routine queries on the Deed of Trust. He would reply within a week.

It was pointed out that both the Stonewall Group and the Iris Trust would need an address before they were formally registered.

2. Leaflet

The draft of the leaflet prepared by Ian McKellen and Douglas Slater was considered and amended. A number of points were made and incorporated into the revised draft (attached). Other points were made in discussion.

Paul Dickinson and Lisa Power would collaborate with Ian McKellen and Douglas Slater in preparing the leaflet for press. The Group would consider the design concept once more before the leaflet was sent to press.

The timing of the production of the leaflet was discussed. In general it was felt that it should not be produced until both the Trust and the company were registered.

The leaflet should be in a 8"x4" format suitable for use in standard envelopes.

The style of the leaflet should be classic, on good quality paper, possibly using monochrome. If an illustration by a notable artist could be obtained, the possibility of using four-colour printing should be seriously considered.
ITEM 3c: Continued.

Stonewall Group: minutes of meeting held on the 29th January 1989 at Hemingford Road.

NOTE: NEXT MEETING 17th February (details on last page).

Present: Peter Rivas, Peter Ashman, Duncan Campbell, Michael Cashman, Paul Dickinson, Simon Fanahave, Ian McKellen, Jan Parker, Douglas Slater, Jennie Wilson.


1) Leaflet.

much discussion over the wording of the leaflet of introduction. It was pointed out that the draft had been discussed in great detail at the previous meeting.

DS agreed to incorporate some minor amendments and IMc to rewrite his 'message'.

2) Launch of the two organisations:

JW and DC presented launch proposal in document form. After some discussion it was agreed that it would be unlikely to have a director in place until mid May. It was decided to hold off an official launch until the director is installed, the aims for the first year are established, and a firm financial base is secured. It was also agreed that the 'group' should be functioning before the launch so as to be able to present concrete proposal and objectives to the 'outside world'.

3) Charity status/Incorporation of th company:

PA thought a decision from the Charity Commissioners might be expected around mid April. DS would pursue his contacts to hasten the application.

Incorporation of the company was underway.

4) SPECIFIC AIMS OF THE GROUP FOR THE FIRST YEAR:

these were discussed generally and it was agreed that a separate meeting would be held at a later date which would focus solely on this issue.

DETAILS FOR INCLUSION IN THE AGENDA FOR THAT MEETING TO BE SENT TO DOUGLAS SLATER.

5) Finance:

'ventured' funds from within the group to be collected by MC and JW and a bank account to be opened. The bank account to be unincorporated until such time as the Articles and Memorandum of the company are available and registered at Companies House (this process is underway).

6) 'BENT'

it was announced that a benefit primarily for IRIS is to be staged on June 25th, in which IMc and MC will play the leading
ITEM 3c: Continued.

It was agreed that the leaflet was intended in the first instance as a brief introduction to the Stonewall Group and Iris Trust. The leaflet could not argue the case for the organisation; it could only provoke a response and provide the information necessary to follow up a positive response.

The possibility of using the leaflet as an insert in the New Statesman was canvassed. This would entail printing 30,000 copies. On the other hand, far fewer might be needed. On the whole, it was felt that more should be printed, on the basis that the leaflet should have a useful life of over a year, and beyond the launch of the organisation. It was agreed that the print costs of runs from 5,000 to 50,000 should be investigated.

It was pointed out that Clause 28 was in fact the first discriminatory legislation supported by a Government for over a century. This was a fact which should be used, though possibly not in the leaflet.

3. Membership

The need to continue to seek for new lesbian members of the Group was stressed. A report was held over to the next meeting.

4. Other contacts

Lisa Power reported from the ILGA conference in Amsterdam. ILGA had stressed the possible importance of 1992. ILGA was taking steps to monitor the stance of the members of the new European Parliament to be elected this year.

Ian McKellen reported that he had been approached by Chatto and Windus to write a 10,000 pamphlet on homosexual rights. He had also been asked to produce a 50 minute documentary on the attitudes of people in the United Kingdom to homosexuality. Both these approaches were welcomed.

5. Next meeting

Sunday 29 January 4-7 pm at 57 Hemingford Road N1.
ITEM 3d: Stonewall Group Minute Meetings. 5th March, 1989.

MEETING OF THE STONEWALL GROUP ON SUNDAY 5 MARCH AT 4.00 PM
AT FLAT 4, 202 KENNINGTON LANE, LONDON SE11
(202 is where Courtenay Street joins Kennington Lane)

* * * * *

1. It was agreed that the first year's programme for the
Stonewall Group would be discussed at this meeting, and that
as a basis for that discussion members of the group would
submit suggestions for the programme in writing, and that
these would be circulated. None have yet come in, but as a
contribution to the meeting the following may be helpful.

2. Others will no doubt make specific suggestions for
action. Those are crucial. The following are two slightly
different, but complementary, approaches to the
consideration of the programme of action:

(a) an appraisal of how much time the Director and the
office manager will have in the first year, and
what proportion of their time will inevitably be
spent in unavoidable basic activities;

(b) an appraisal, for the purposes of reviewing
progress, of what Stonewall should be happy to
have achieved in its first year.

3. These may help guard against, on the one hand, setting
unrealistic targets, or trying to take on too much in order
to try to meet all possible aspirations at once, and on the
other hand, being disappointed at the end of the year by
appearing to have achieved very little when, in fact, a good
deal may have been done. (These dangers are of course
linked.)

4. The calculations are very rough and ready.

PROPORTION OF TIME AVAILABLE

5. Stonewall will do well if in the first year the staff
get away with spending the following proportions of their
time on the following things:

  20 per cent establishing the office;
  10 per cent establishing links with other groups;
  30 per cent fundraising;
  20 per cent responding to events.

That leaves just 20 per cent of the time for specific
projects.

6. Neither the estimates themselves, nor the prospect of
devoting that much time to those ends, is pessimistic.
ITEM 3d: Continued.

TEXT FOR LEAFLET INTRODUCING THE IRIS TRUST AND THE STONEWALL GROUP

[In what follows the actual draft text is printed in bold; everything else is merely explanatory.]

The Group will seek a simple etching or painting of an iris from an artist - preferably one which would reproduce well at small sizes.

The design should seek to make clear the involvement of lesbians as well as gay men in the Stonewall Group, and guard against appearing to exclude different racial groups.

The leaflet will need to include contact details

Title:

Homosexuals in the United Kingdom: A new beginning for everyone

Personal message from Ian McKellen as follows:

"We homosexuals are not always popular with people who don't know us.

Ignorance of us breeds suspicion, misunderstanding and fear - then sometimes aggression and repression.

The debate over Clause 28 has encouraged me to try to understand how society at large might overcome this ignorance.

I can imagine no better instrument for this vital work than the new Stonewall Group. It has been created by a small group of us; lesbians and gay men who care about our country and who wish nothing more than to be free to contribute to its vitality on equal terms with all our fellow citizens.

I very much hope you will want to support the Stonewall Group."

[SIGNED] Ian McKellen

WHAT STONEWALL SHOULD BE GLAD TO HAVE ACHIEVED

7. Stonewall will not have done badly if it achieves the following:

(a) establishment of a permanent office;
(b) securing of next year’s funding;
(c) at least 5 specific TV interviews or appearances, and 5 radio interviews, on behalf of Stonewall, responding to particular lesbian and gay related issues.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PARTICULAR ACTION

8. In short, Stonewall’s scope for action may well be somewhat limited in the first year. In addition, it might be wise for the Group to aim, not only at what would be good things to achieve, but also at eminently achievable things. To be blunt, Stonewall needs some early successes.

9. Here are three specific suggestions for action in the limited time available – each of them should be tackled very adequately in under 5 per cent of time in the first year:

(a) organisation of a university-based conference (by the Iris Trust), for Spring/Summer 1991, on Homosexuality and Modern Society, or Homosexuality and Modern Morals, or some such theme. The conference should be on a generous scale. A major benefit of it would be that it would be an obviously charitable object; but, more importantly, it would provide a cast-iron pretext for writing to everybody from the Prince of Wales and Archbishop of Canterbury downwards immediately to ask them whether they would be willing to participate. This should give a means of setting a frightfully respectable tone, and getting some free establishment exposure, right away;

(b) establishing Stonewall as servicing an All-Party Parliamentary Group (of however informal and discreet a nature), with at least one meeting held;

(c) the production of the first Stonewall publication.

10. These may appear very pusillanimous and limited aims. It is not put forward as a total programme. Others will come up with much bigger and better and deeply-needed projects. The above are things which seem relatively economical in terms of effort, and good in terms of long-term, foundation-laying utility.

28 February 1989
Background and introduction

Why?

1988 was the year of Clause 28. Clause 28 shocked lesbians and gay men who, having believed that they had achieved a minimum degree of acceptance in Britain, suddenly felt themselves once more under attack. (35)

Clause 28 challenged everyone to consider whether homosexuality is acceptable in Britain today. Disturbingly, a majority of members of both Houses of Parliament answered the question by enshrining in the law measures against the undefined activity of "promoting homosexuality". (38)

Even some of those who opposed it suggested that lesbians and gay men had brought Clause 28 on themselves by "flaunting" their homosexuality. Lesbians and gay men - and many others - find this sinister. As homosexuality is not illegal, why should homosexuals not be as open as anyone else about their emotions, their relationships, their way of life? (57)

It cannot be healthy for lesbians and gay men to feel threatened, whether by a section in an Act or by wider social hostility. Equally, it cannot be healthy for others to feel that they are threatened by lesbians and gay men. (42)

Homosexuals should have the same rights as everyone in the community. Whether or not their contribution is explicitly homosexual, it can be to everyone's benefit. They do not wish to force or persuade or seduce anyone into being homosexual. Equally they do not wish to be forced or persuaded or seduced into pretending to be other than they are. (58)

In the end, this country will be a better place to live in if sexuality as well as gender, race, and religion is irrelevant to equality of opportunity and social acceptance. (38)

It is to work towards such a society that your support is asked for a new organisation, the Stonewall Group (and its associated charity, the Iris Trust). (27) (Total 322)

Now enacted as section 28 of the Local Government Act 1988. (Footnote in much smaller type)
The Stonewall 1990s Agenda

The Stonewall Group was born this year as Britain's newest lesbian and gay lobbying organisation. Tim Barnett is the Group's executive director. Pink Paper invited Tim to reveal the Stonewall agenda for the 1990s.

The start of one decade is also the end of another, a time for reflecting on past successes and failures and for making a range of provisions to ensure that our stories are not forgotten. The Pink Nineties were the era of an emerging gay rights movement, a time when there were few visible gains but a growing sense of hope and possibility. The Stonewall Agenda is a statement of intent, a vision for the future of lesbian and gay rights and an agenda for the 1990s.

The Lesbian and Gay Campaign Issues

Legislation

The SNP has long campaigned for lesbian and gay rights and has been at the forefront of many legislative initiatives. The SNP has been involved in a number of high-profile cases, including the fight for the civil rights of gay and lesbian people.

Anti-Discrimination

The SNP has been at the forefront of the struggle for anti-discrimination laws and has been a vocal advocate for the rights of gay and lesbian people.

Partnership

The SNP has been a leading voice in the campaign for equal rights for gay and lesbian people and has been involved in a number of high-profile cases, including the fight for the civil rights of gay and lesbian people.

The Pink Nineties

The Pink Nineties were a time of change and transformation for the gay rights movement. It was a time when there were few visible gains but a growing sense of hope and possibility. The Pink Nineties were a time of change and transformation for the gay rights movement. It was a time when there were few visible gains but a growing sense of hope and possibility.

The Stonewall Group was born this year as Britain's newest lesbian and gay lobbying organisation. Tim Barnett is the Group's executive director. Pink Paper invited Tim to reveal the Stonewall agenda for the 1990s.

Legislation

The SNP has long campaigned for lesbian and gay rights and has been at the forefront of many legislative initiatives. The SNP has been involved in a number of high-profile cases, including the fight for the civil rights of gay and lesbian people.

Anti-Discrimination

The SNP has been at the forefront of the struggle for anti-discrimination laws and has been a vocal advocate for the rights of gay and lesbian people.

Partnership

The SNP has been a leading voice in the campaign for equal rights for gay and lesbian people and has been involved in a number of high-profile cases, including the fight for the civil rights of gay and lesbian people.

The Pink Nineties

The Pink Nineties were a time of change and transformation for the gay rights movement. It was a time when there were few visible gains but a growing sense of hope and possibility. The Pink Nineties were a time of change and transformation for the gay rights movement. It was a time when there were few visible gains but a growing sense of hope and possibility.

Dear Friends

As you may know, over the last twelve months there has been a very substantial increase in the number of men charged with or convicted of public indecency or public order offences in or in the vicinity of public toilets in the UK. There are indications that this increase has resulted more from changes in police practice than from any other cause and in some instances the methods used by the police have been seriously questioned.

The Stonewall Group and Leicester Lesbian and Gay Action are jointly conducting a national survey in an attempt to establish as full and accurate a picture as possible of the extent and nature of police operations in this field throughout the country.

We are eager to discover examples of good practice which can be held up as models to be followed elsewhere as we are to uncover evidence of malpractice and harassment. So we would appreciate your help in providing us with any information you may have concerning your locality.

We enclose two survey forms. Survey A is very short for those of you who are pressed for time or have insufficient information to warrant completing the more detailed Survey B.

Survey B asks a comprehensive range of questions about many aspects of police operations against gay men. We do not expect anyone to be able to answer them all. Rather it is a check list and a reminder of things you might know but might otherwise not think of as relevant. Please fill in those things you know about and leave the rest. If there is anything else we may not have asked that may be relevant please tell us anyway.
Any information, even that you don’t know of anything happening in your locality, is valuable to us.

Leicester Lesbian and Gay Action has demonstrated that it is possible to take effective action at a local level and move from public confrontation with the police into constructive dialogue with the prospect, now, of resolving the problem. We are eager to assemble sufficient accurate information to see if it is possible to take equally effective action at a national level. That is why your help is so important.

We would like to thank GALOP, The Gay London Police Group, for their advice in drawing up the questionnaires.

We look forward to your reply.

With best wishes

Tim Barnett
The Stonewall Group

Bernard Greaves
Leicester Lesbian and Gay Action

1. The moral right in Britain works towards its social goals in complex, interrelated ways. It is possible to trace a "family tree" of groups and key individuals through a variety of issues and a considerable number of years. Different names and fronts are adopted in order to achieve different yet linked objects.

2. During the 1990s, for a variety of reasons, such organisations will improve the quality and quantity of their activity, concentrating on the destruction of the "liberal" agenda of personal freedoms. The reasons for this include:

- opportunities in Parliament to advance the moral Majority cause;
- advances for the "liberal" agenda within the manifestoes of opposition political parties;
- increased funding from supporters who have profitted from lucrative commercial sectors;
- increased American influence, combined with new opportunities for cooperation with organisations based in other European countries;
- a continuation of the 80s agenda of nationalism, prejudice and "family" concerns;
- a vigorous and crucial struggle taking place inside the Conservative Party about pre- and post-election direction;
- the political importance of the forthcoming General Election, in which American style campaigning and homophobic attacks on the "liberal" agenda are extremely likely;
- increased number of deaths of PWAs, and increased impact on public spending;
- continued moral right wing influence on the British press.

It is estimated that 60-70 MPs in the current Parliament broadly support the agenda of such groups.
ITEM 7a: Continued.

2. Although many groups do excellent work in this area, no
general, cross-sector response has developed. In part this
is because the targets of the moral right are diverse, and
may themselves perceive that they have little in common.
Also, the messages of the moral majority are themselves
deliberately) mixed, with its organisations secretive and
often short-lived. The political opposition seen as poorly
placed as ever to input to debates which touch on sexuality
and gender. Targets are likely to include:

- lesbian and gay rights
- the AIDS/HIV sector, and linked
- organisations
- pro-choice groups
- campaigns for reproductive rights
- campaigns for liberalisation of
- divorce
- campaigns for women priests in the
  Church of England
- "liberal" teaching methods

It is imperative that action against the moral right is
coordinated and effective, if we are not to be thrown yet
further on the defensive. The pre-General Election period
which we have now entered - is likely to be one of
particular danger, and so plans must be laid and action
taken before then.

4. It seems as though there are two ways forward:

- **activity in the media.** This might include the provision
  of briefings to key journalists, concentrating on
  television; the production of a resource booklet
  detailing links between the national press and the
  moral right; a re-born Press and Media Campaign.

- **detailed mapping.** This might include the creation of a
  detailed computer listing of the organisations and
  individuals involved, providing an early warning system
  to legislators, detailed briefing to those in a
  position to expose the beliefs of and links between
  elements of the moral right, and a base from which
  comparisons with other European and American movements
  can be made.

These and other ideas need to be discussed at the 1/2/90
meeting.

TAB
14/1/90

THE STONEWALL GROUP

15/1/90

Dear Colleagues,

MONITORING AND OUTMANEUVERING THE MORAL RIGHT

As you will already know, groups opposed to the agenda of equal rights and personal freedom are gathering strength as the General Election approaches. Alarm at the implications of this, a small ad-hoc group of concerned lesbian/gay activists has been meeting to determine how our communities might act as a catalyst for the creation of more vigorous opposition to these developments. The enclosed papers summarise our early conclusions.

We would now like to develop these thoughts further by discussing them with you at a meeting to be held in:

the LONDON LESBIAN AND GAY CENTRE
67 Cowcross Street
LONDON EC1
(nearest underground Farringdon)

on THURSDAY 1st FEBRUARY from 19.30 - 21.30

* Please let us know if you require a creche or overnight accommodation. The building is fully accessible for people with disabilities. *

The meeting will comprise an information presentation by two members of the ad-hoc group; questions and discussion; a presentation of the proposed ways forward; questions and discussion; and decisions at the end. It will be chaired by Lisa Power.

As you can see from the list on the back of this letter, this is an invitation-only meeting. We have selected a range of organisations with obvious concerns in this area. If you know of any other group or individual whose attendance is imperative, please let me know - and please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like further details. Please return the attached slip to let us know if you are coming.

Very best wishes,

Tim Barnett
on behalf of the ad-hoc Steering Group

5 Rector Street, London N1. TDQ. UK. Tel: 01-354 3187
The Stonewall Lobby Group Limited  Company Registration Number: 341 188
The Stonewall lobby group includes: Derek Baker, Nicholas Cardin, Joanna Wilson.

17/1 - Copy to all F.C.

MONITORING AND OUTMANEUVERING
THE MORAL RIGHT

MAILING LIST
ad-hoc planning group: Simon Watney
Chris Woods
Keith Allcorn
Lynn Power
Tim Barnett

Antony Grey
Black Lesbian and Gay Group
British Council of Churches
British Medical Association: Carmel Turner
British Medical Association Foundation for AIDS: Hilary Curtis
British Pregnancy Advisory Service
Campaign for Access for Donor Insemination: Angela Weir
Campaign for Homosexual Equality
Chris Smith MP
City Limits: Caz Gorham
Conservative Group for Homosexual Equality: Peter Campbell
Evangelical Christians for Racial Justice: Raj Patel
Family Planning Association: Doreen Massey
Family Pride: Alan Dickens

Feminists Against Censorship: Linda Semple
Mary McIntosh (also Feminist review)
Angela Stewart Park

GALOP: Vincent Beasley
Gay and Lesbian Equality Network (Ireland)
Gay and Lesbian Humanist Association: George Broadhead/
Denis Hall

Gay Times/MK: David Smith
ITEM 7d: Continued.

19/3/90

to: Chris
   Keith
   Lisa
   Simon

from: Tim

MONITORING AND OUTMANOUEVERING
THE MORAL RIGHT

Please find enclosed: i) a draft letter to go to all groups on the mailing list;

   ii) a redraft of the discussion paper

   iii) a revised mailing list.

Comments by 30/3/90 please, so that we can go ahead with the mailing, and then start contacting potential funders.

One other issue. What are we going to do about the Family Congress? It could be a useful catalyst for a lot of our activity, but any strategies to expose its real purpose need to start now. We have discovered that its office is shared by the Order of Christian Unity. Comments please!
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Lord Gifford
"Independent" (Andrew Brown)
Islington Anti-Racist, Anti-Fascist Action
Janet Batsleer, Manchester Polytechnic
Jewish Socialist Group: David Rosenberg
John Creedy
Labour Research: Neal Meister
Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement: Richard Kirker
Lesbian and Gay Medical Association: Richard Glaes
Jerry Walsh
LOBSTER: Robin Ramsey
Maggie Steed
Martin Barker, Bristol Polytechnic
Martin Durham, Wolverhampton Polytechnic
Mike Harwood
Movement for the Ordination of Women: Caroline Davis
Margaret Orr Deas
MEF (Manufacturing, Science and Finance): Martin Groombridge
NALGO Lesbian and Gay Sub Group: Hugh Robertson
National Abortion Campaign: Linda Adelson
National AIDS Manual: Peter Scott
NCCL/Liberty: Nettie Pollard
National Council of Voluntary Organisations: Usha Prashar
National Union of Journalists lesbian/gay sub committee
Neil McKenna
North West Campaign for Lesbian and Gay Rights
Northern Irish Council for Civil Liberties
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Organization for Lesbian and Gay Action: Martin Corbett
Maureen Oliver

"Out on Tuesday": Maggie Scaswell
Mandy Merck
David Braithwaite

Peter Tatchell
Pink Paper: Desmon Heaney
Richard Barker
Robin Cook MP
Professor Rowan Williams
Runnymede Trust: Ken Leach
Sara Maitland
Scottish Council for Civil Liberties
Searchlight

Seen Days: Simon Barrow
Shakti
Sophie Watson

Stonewall Group: Dorfan Jabri
Olivette Cole-Wilson
Elaine Willis
Jennie Wilson
Pam St Clement
Matthew Parris
Peter Ashman
Peter Kivus
Ian McKellen
Fr Cunningham Reid
Debo Ballard
Duncan Campbell
Simon Fanshawe
Michael Cashman

Terrence Higgins Trust: Nick Partridge

TUC: Anne Gibson (NWP)

Wales Council for Civil Liberties

Womens Reproductive Rights Campaign: Glynis Donovan
ITEM 7d: Continued

(revised following the 1/2/90 meeting)

MONITORING AND OUTMANEUVERING THE MORAL RIGHT

1. The moral right in Britain works towards its social goals in complex, interrelated ways. It is possible to trace a "family tree" of groups and key individuals through a variety of issues and a considerable number of years. Different names and fronts are adopted in order to achieve seemingly different objects, in fact linked by a tight moral code, often based on the traditional family unit, for some of the groups this is combined with a strict religious code - for others, the neo-conservatives, political belief is the motivating factor. A common strand is implicit or explicit racism, often combined with other key causes (e.g. opposition to single parenthood).

2. Their methods are unscrupulous - seemingly based on the principle that "if you throw enough mud, some will stick". They rarely use facts in their proper context. Common tactics include the release of fallacious "opinion polls" at opportune times; use of direct mail.

3. Among the successes of these groups and their methods was Section 28, justified by its proponents as discouraging "permissiveness". It directly reflected the deep hatred which they have for homosexuality. Aims of the key moral right groups include the recriminalisation of homosexual sex.

4. During the 1990s, for a variety of reasons, such organisations intend to improve the quality and quantity of their activity, concentrating on the destruction of the "liberal" agenda of personal freedoms and appealing to an audience far beyond the Conservative Party. Much is running in their favour, for example:

- there will be continued opportunities in Parliament to advance the causes of the moral right. They now have considerable Parliamentary influence (the support of c. 60-70 MPs), and an impressive lobbying machine;
- advances for the "liberal" agenda within the manifestoes of opposition political parties (laying them open to attack); and, conversely, the progress of the "family" approach to issues;
- increased funding from supporters who have profitted from lucrative commercial sectors;
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- increased American influence, combined with new opportunities for cooperation with organisations based in other European countries;

- new opportunities offered by television channels which develop after the changes led by the Broadcasting Bill;

- a continuation of the 80s agenda of nationalism, prejudice and "family" concerns;

- the vigorous and crucial struggle taking place inside the Conservative Party about pre- and post-election political direction. Linked, the critical importance of the forthcoming General Election, in which American style campaigning and homophobic attacks on the "liberal" agenda are extremely likely;

- the increased number of deaths of PWAs, and increased impact on public spending;

- continued moral right influence on the British press.

5. Although many groups do excellent work in monitoring activity in this area, no general, all-sector response has developed. In part this is because the targets of the moral right are diverse - they are, or will include:

- lesbians and gay men
- the Black communities
- the AIDS/HIV sector, and linked organisations; PWAs
- bodies promoting and adopting equal opportunities policies
- pro-choice groups; campaigns for reproductive rights
- campaigns for liberalisation of divorce
- campaigns for women priests;
- bodies advocating "liberal" teaching methods
- Third World development agencies
- public education
and may themselves perceive that they have little in common. Also, the messages of the moral majority are themselves (deliberately) mixed, with its organisations secretive and often short-lived. The parliamentary political opposition seems as poorly placed as ever to input to debates which touch on sexuality and gender.

6. It is imperative that action against the moral right is coordinated and effective, if we are not to be thrown yet further on the defensive. We need to guard against an obsession with certain individuals and/or groups, and more fanciful conspiracy theories, to a more reasoned analysis of the moral right. The pre-General Election period - which we have now entered - is likely to be one of particular danger, and so plans must be laid and action taken as a matter of urgency.

7. There is a lot of available information, and many actual or potential concerns, which remains best managed by individual organisations or networks. Any initiative needs to extract from the possible action, and real worries and threats, what would best be tackled on a collective basis. We need to respect the fact that many organisations targeted by the moral right will not be in sympathy with other causes likewise targeted. Ways must be found of coping with this.

8. We need to reduce and/or diffuse the power of the moral right. This is a two stage process:

* we need comprehensive and accurate information on their work and methods before we can predict what they will do, so making it more likely that counter action can be effective;

* the ensuing action has to have a tangible and lasting impact.

Chronologically, the following might be possible:

- preparation of a "sample" of maybe 20 profiles of individuals, detailing their links around certain issues, to show potential funders and involved organisations what the threat is like. This might become an interim three-monthly publication. Target for the initial one is 5/90.

- learning from the experience of other countries, especially the USA, in tackling the moral right;
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- receipt of some funding:

- detailed mapping. To centre on the creation of a
detailed computer listing of the organisations and
individuals involved. Ideally, to draw on the existing
databases: Capital Gay
LOBSTER
Institute of Race Relations
Evangelical Christians for Racial Justice
Labour Research
British Council of Churches
British Medical Association
Searchlight
Rannymede Trust
Charities Commission
other organisations in UK
organisations in Europe and USA
Universities/polys etc.
Interested individuals
This would provide the information needed for
briefings and other publications, and a base from
which comparisons with other European and American
movements can be made. The process of maintaining this
database will ease communication between participant
organisations.

- commissioning specific research/information gathering
around the myth of the "family" as fount of all that is
good

- briefings to MPs, MEPs and political parties about the
activities of the moral right

- briefings to key voluntary organisations about the
activities of the moral right

- activity targeted at the media. This might include the
identification of and provision of briefings to
supportive key journalists; concentrating on
television; the production of a resource booklet
detailing links between the national press and the
moral right; development and coordination of a system
of responding to press articles inspired by the moral
right

- development of an "early warning system" so that we can
predict and develop opposition to their initiatives

- investigate and develop means of improving the
performance of our own sector so that our message is
put over with the effectiveness which is a hallmark of
the moral right
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9. Four major issues arise from all this:

* funding. Possible sources include supportive trust funds in the UK, elsewhere in Europe and in the USA; individuals; local authorities; trades unions.

* coordination/leadership. Who takes on and runs the initiative from now on? How?

* common cause. Part of the reason for previous initiatives having faltered was the widely diverse nature of the causes being defended/involved. How can this diversity become a weakness, and not a strength?

* confidentiality. Should we be completely open, or highly confidential, or something between?

TAB
20/3/90
ITEM 8: Monitoring violence is ‘easy’ says police chief. Nov, 23rd 1990.

OutRage in Highbury march

Monitoring violence is ‘easy’ says police chief

A senior Metropolitan police officer has claimed it would be “easy” for the Met to monitor queerbashing attacks on gay men.

Chief Superintendent Hopkins made his remarks to representatives of OutRage during a 15 minute conversation outside Highbury Vale Police Station last Saturday afternoon.

“Very easy”

More than thirty OutRage demonstrators braved the homophobic taunts of hundreds of Arsenal football supporters to march from Highbury Fields to Highbury Vale Police Station to hand in a letter of protest to Chief Supt Hopkins.

The letter demanded tougher police action to curb the spate of violent queerbashing attacks in the area over recent months.

Chief Supt Hopkins came out of the station and spoke to representatives of the direct action group.

In response to one of OutRage’s key demands that police monitor hate crimes against gay people, the Chief Superintendent is reported as saying: “It would be very easy to monitor anti-gay attacks. It’s been done in the past in certain areas of London where there has been a history of this type of violence. With our modern computers we could log such incidents without any difficulty.”

OutRage later described Chief Supt Hopkins’ attitude as “helpful and encouraging”. The protesters then marched to Islington Police Station in Upper Street with a police escort provided by Chief Supt Hopkins.

They met further abuse from football fans as well as several gestures of support from the public. As the marchers gathered outside Islington Police Station, one man rustled up and made a donation of £20 to the OutRage coffers.

OutRage!
Lesbian & Gay action to fight homophobia.

PRESS RELEASE
PRESS RELEASE
PRESS RELEASE

KISS-IN

LESIONS & GAYS CALL FOR RIGHT TO KISS
Challenge To Anti-Gay Indecency Laws

WEDNESDAY 5 SEPTEMBER 1990, 6-8pm
Eros Statue, Piccadilly Circus, London

OUTRAGE PLANS TO BREAK ANTI-GAY LAWS

Scores of lesbians and gay men will rally under the Eros statute in Piccadilly Circus for a two-hour "Kiss-In" on Wednesday 5 September, from 6-8pm.

The protesters will challenge the way the public decency laws are often interpreted by police and judges to ban lesbians and gay couples from kissing, cuddling and holding hands in public places.

The organisers, the lesbian and gay direct action group, OutRage, cite the case of a Northampton man sentenced to 18 months imprisonment in July last year for "kissing and fondling" another man in a deserted church yard in the middle of the night.

OutRage!, 69 Cowcross Street, London, EC1M 6BP
Telephone 071-490 7153

Dear Friend,

As you may have heard, the first meeting of the Lesbian and Gay Policing Initiative took place on Sunday Sept 2nd. The Initiative has been set up by OutRage! and GALOP to bring together as many of London's lesbian and/or gay organisations, so that we can establish a common forum on policing issues.

As the Metropolitan police has indicated in recent weeks, through its liaison officer Inspector Brown, the police want to open up liaison work to 20 lesbian and gay groups. But the Met decides which group should take part, and when meetings should occur, which prevents lesbians and gay men from working effectively together on the issue.

By setting up a democratic forum, made up of as many of London's 90 or so groups as possible, we hope that the Policing Initiative will give us a forum in which to discuss policing issues which affect us.
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But it also gives us a strong negotiating position if we can begin to speak for the 30,000 or so lesbians and gay men we collectively represent.

At our first meeting we decided that the Initiative should be looking at the following issues:
1) To set up a democratic London-wide forum to negotiate with the police on issues affecting our communities
2) To ensure lesbian and gay representation on all of London's borough police liaison committees
3) To look into producing a wide-ranging survey into anti-lesbian and anti-gay attacks, and police harassment.

The next meeting of the Initiative is on Sunday September 30th at 2pm, in the 3rd floor meeting room of the Lesbian & Gay Centre in Cowcross Street. We would like your group to send two representatives. Please call OurRage! to confirm. If you can't make it, but want to stay involved, then please let us know.

That meeting will allow any groups there to help set down ideas for the October 2nd meeting with the Metropolitan police, especially those sections usually ignored or denied access to negotiations.

The Lesbian & Gay Policing Initiative will be most effective if as many groups as possible take part. Please come along! If you have any special needs, please let us know, but please remember that we have no funding at present.

Yours

[Signature: Lesbian & Gay Policing Initiative]

Lesbian & Gay Policing Initiative  
c/o OutRage  
The London Lesbian & Gay Centre  
67-69 Cowcross Street  
London EC1

Thursday September xth 1990

Sir Peter Imbert  
The Commissioner  
Metropolitan Police  
New Scotland Yard  
London SW1.

AN OPEN LETTER

Dear Sir Peter,

As representatives of sixty London-based lesbian and gay organisations, with a collective membership of 20,000 individuals, we are writing to express our increasing concern over the Metropolitan Police’s apparent apathy, arrogance and hostility towards our community.

We believe that unless rapid steps are taken to tackle our concerns, the police service in London could face an unprecedented break-down of relations with lesbians and gay men, which will have profound consequences for the policing of the capital. That is something which neither we, nor we believe yourselves, would wish to see happen, and we implore you to give urgent consideration to our views.

On Tuesday July 10th, five hundred lesbians and gay men marched peacefully through the streets of Ealing to protest at the prevalence of anti-gay violence in London today. The march and subsequent rally focussed on the fact that at least 32 gay men have been murdered for their sexuality in recent years, with 17 murders remaining unsolved. Concern was also shown at the high level of gay-bashing attacks in London, and the apparent reluctance of the Metropolitan Police to tackle such crimes. There was also anxiety expressed at the fact that last year, more gay men were arrested for consenting ‘sex crimes’ than in any year since 1955, when male homosexuality was still illegal.

That evening, BBC Television’s *Newsroom South East* carried a feature on the demonstration, in which Det Chief Superintendent John Shoemake of New Scotland Yard was presented as the Metropolitan Police’s spokesman. Asked if the police would be responding to demands for awareness training, liaison with the gay community and resources to combat anti-gay violence, he replied: “A person born with any sort of colour doesn’t have a choice in the matter. I would suggest that sexual preferences, however, are a matter of individual choice.”

Mr Shoemake later attempted to clarify his words, saying that he felt that some lesbians and gays are responsible for attacks on them, invoking violence because of the way they choose to dress. As lesbians and gay men, we are deeply insulted by Mr Shoemake’s comments, and demand to know whether they reflect the views of yourself and the Metropolitan Police Force as a whole.

Is it a matter of “choice” when a young person is beaten, rejected or thrown out of the family home because of their sexuality? Is it a matter of “choice” when a lesbian mother loses custody of her child because of her sexuality? Is it a matter of “choice” when a lesbian or gay man loses their job, their home, their right to insurance and mortgage services because of...
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...their sexuality? Is it a matter of "choice" when lesbians and gay men are verbally insulted or physically attacked for the 'crime' of being gay? And in the case of Michael Boothe, are we really to believe that he "chose" to be beaten to death?

There is no question of choice involved, and to suggest as much is to offer a simplistic and outdated view of sexuality that draws nothing but contempt from lesbians and gay men. In one breath we are patronised and insulted, whilst the Metropolitan Police lets itself off the hook by suggesting that if we all stopped being homosexual these problems will simply melt away.

Lesbians and gay men do not choose to be despised, to the point where we are killed for our sexuality. But lesbians and gay men we are, something we are proud of, and something which we demand respect for. The time for insult, apathy and patronising has stopped, and London's large community of lesbians and gay men is now demanding action.

Outside the headquarters of the Metropolitan Police today, a token picket of lesbians and gay men are holding a peaceful demonstration to call for action. Our demands are straightforward:

- A clear and unambiguous statement from the Metropolitan Police retracting the views of Det Chief Supi Shoemake that sexuality is "a matter of individual choice" and an apology for the insult and distress caused by his comments
- An immediate end to all illegal police operations using agents provocateurs to entrap gay men in public places, and an assurance that there is no official or unofficial policy to harass the lesbian and gay community
- The commencement, as soon as possible, of compulsory awareness training for trainee police officers on lesbian and gay life, especially in London, focussing on our specific needs as citizens and the wide diversity of lesbian and gay life which exists. This should be supplemented by in-force anti-discrimination training for existing officers and all probationers
- The introduction of a new disciplinary offence for officers guilty of homophobic remarks or behaviour
- The introduction of a specific equal opportunities statement encouraging the recruitment of lesbian and gay officers, and the amendment of the existing Internal disciplinary code to outlaw homophobia against gay or lesbian serving officers
- The creation, on a London-wide basis, of a new post of Liaison Officer for the Lesbian and Gay Community, and a supporting and representative Liaison Committee, which would open up a high-level and capital-wide formal and regular consultation process between the Metropolitan Police and lesbians and gay men to discuss mutual concerns
- Monitoring of anti-lesbian and gay crime in the Metropolitan area, and the compilation of annual statistics on such hate crimes, as already occurs with race-motivated crimes
- The participation of a high-ranking delegation of Metropolitan Police officers in the forthcoming Symposium on the Policing of the Lesbian and Gay Community in London, organised by the umbrella organisation Lesbian & Gay Policing Initiative

We do not believe that such demands are unreasonable. As we are sure that you are aware, lesbians and gay men account for a major segment of London's population, and we believe that it is a matter of urgency that our fears and needs are recognised.
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The Statement of Common Purpose and Values displayed in Metropolitan Police stations contains the following: "We must be compassionate, courteous and patient, acting without fear or favour or prejudice to the rights of others...We must strive to reduce the fears of the public, and so far as we can, to reflect their priorities in the action we take. We must respond to well-founded criticism with a willingness to change."

We are asking that this welcome statement of purpose and values be applied wholeheartedly to the Metropolitan Police’s relations with lesbians and gay men. As a community we have identified both our fears and our priorities for action, and now call on yourself and your officers to act on them.

We do not want conflict with the Metropolitan Police. As lesbians and gay men, we demand as always the right to live our lives free from harassment, bigotry and homophobia, and in peaceful co-existence with London’s multi-faceted communities. But our demands are urgent, and require immediate attention. And we are concerned that if yourself and the Metropolitan Police service do not begin to address the genuine needs of lesbians and gay men, London’s police service will witness a major breakdown in relations that will continue until action is taken.

That, we believe, is something which neither we nor you would wish to see happen. We look forward to a rapid and detailed response to the proposals outlined above, which we hope will lead to a constructive process of communication and co-operation between lesbians, gay men, and the Metropolitan Police service.

Yours sincerely,

Lesbian & Gay Policing Initiative, representing:

OutRage!
Galop
LesPop
ACT-UP London
The London Lesbian & Gay Centre
Shakti
Fusion
Ealing Lesbian & Gay Forum
Labour Campaign for Lesbian & Gay Rights
London Lesbian & Gay Switchboard
Lesbian & Gay Pride
West London Group for Homosexual Equality
Ealing Gay Association
London Gay Teenage Group
ITEM 12: Peter Tatchell - 5,000 gay men convicted. 2nd Jun, 1990.
Lesbian and gay rights under attack

Peter Tatchell profiles the latest attacks on lesbian and gay rights and urges us to “Get up! Get out! Get even!”

Clause 25 of the Tories’ Criminal Justice Bill is the biggest attack on homosexuals’ human rights since the mid-80s.

Even more dangerous than Section 28, Clause 25 will make more than 5,500 men a year liable to higher fines and longer prison sentences for victimless homosexual behaviour.

According to Home Office minister John Patten homophobia, procuring and indecency are “serious” sex crimes which require severe sentences. All these so-called offences involve consensual behaviour and neither soliciting nor procuring involves any actual sexual behaviour.

‘Soliciting’ can include anything from smiling and winking at other men in the streets to chatting up or exchanging phone numbers. Procuring could mean allowing two adult male friends to stay together overnight in your house or introducing two men who fancy each other at a party or disco.

As for “indecency”, it can be used to penalise kissing, caressing or hugging.

The government claims that the men who perpetrate these acts are dangerous sex criminals who must be given tougher sentences to “protect the public from serious harm”. What makes Clause 25 so outrageous is the government’s lumping together consented homosexual behaviour with serious sex crimes such as indecent assault, indecency and indecency towards children. To equate consensual gay sex with sexual violence and attacks on children is monstrous.

This legislation amounts to a back door normalisation of gay sexuality.

The lesbian and gay direct action group, OutRage, is calling on everyone opposed to Clause 25 to write urgently to the Home Secretary, Kenneth Baker MP, urging him to delete the three consenting homosexual ‘offences’ from Clause 25 of the Criminal Justice Bill. We are also protesting against the new guidelines to the Children’s Act which outlaw fostering by lesbians and gay men.

Join the mass demonstration in London on Saturday, February 16th at noon. Assemble at Embankment tube and march to Downing Street and Parliament. Our slogan will be: “Get up! Get out! Get even! Lesbian and gay rights now!” Contact OutRage at 071-480-7153.

From binbags to bills of rights

In Blackpool residents are forbidden to leave more than one bag of rubbish to the privatisation collectors. All rubbish must be placed in distinctive bags which residents must pay for.

Resistance to this Tory regime is individualistic. Some people dump their rubbish in (non-regulation) black bags in neighbour’s gardens, others sort through bin bags to identify the offending “dumpers”. As yet no collective action has been taken by residents to demand their rights to a decent bin collection...

This story, recounted by Pam Giddy, the Charter’s Bex speaker at the Convention for Democratic Rights organised by the Social Movement on January 12th/13th, summed up the problem facing democratic rights activists: how to move beyond a focus on the individual to a mass movement reflecting the concerns of working class people and oppressed groups.

Tony Benn outlined the Bill of Rights he intends to present in Parliament: others stressed that without vigorous campaigning on specific demands, bills of rights or charters of demands would get nowhere.

All agreed on the need to create a democratic and egalitarian culture. Attendance at the Convention was small due to the clash with the Gulf demonstration. But the response was positive. In workshops people really could discuss ideas and raise questions. We heard the day to day experiences of people up against the state. These included Fred Holmes, attached by the British secret state in Ireland, a speaker from the Trafalgar Square Defenders’ Campaign who described new the police’s new digital scanning techniques, and Orlando Gomez from the FSLN.

The conference dealt with areas on which the left has done little - animal abuse, Clause 25, thorough-going changes in the judicial system, as well as beginning to get to grips with the continuing debate on the role of a bill of rights or written constitution.

The organising group agreed to issue a pamphlet on topics covered at the Convention and to maintain a network of interested groups and individuals. Hilda Kean, 21 Clapton Square, London, E5 8HP can provide further details (but not extra bin bags for the frustrated of Blackpool...)

Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition

69 Cowcross Street, London EC1M 6BP (071) 490 7153

PARAGRAPH 16: WE WANT IN!

LESBIANS AND GAYS ARE FIT TO FOSTER

In December 1990, the department of Health placed itself at odds with virtually every fostering and adoption agency in the country when it issued guidelines to the Children’s Act which seek to portray lesbians and gay men as unfit foster parents because of their ‘lifestyles’.

Paragraph 16 of the guidelines states:

“Authorities and those interested in becoming foster parents must understand that an authority’s duty is, unequivocally and unambiguously, to find and approve the most suitable foster parents for children who need family placement. It would be wrong arbitrarily to exclude any particular groups of people from consideration. But the chosen way of life of some adults may mean that they would not be able to provide a suitable environment for the care and nurture of a child. No one has the ‘right’ to be a foster parent. ‘Equal rights’ and ‘gay rights’ have no place in fostering services.”

This attack on fostering comes after a spate of attacks on lesbians and gay men as foster parents by the moral right and Conservative MPs. On December 7th, 1990, Norman Tebbit protested that a Department of Health grant to the National Foster Care Association was being misused to organise training on ‘An Equal Service For Lesbians and Gay Peccs’. The following day, Health Minister, Virginia Bottomley ordered an inquiry. The training sessions went ahead however.

Two local authorities, Waltham Forest and Newcastle, have been attacked for allowing lesbians and gays to foster and adopt. The Manchester based Albert Kennedy Trust has also been attacked for providing support to lesbian and gay teenagers who run away from home.

Outrage spokesperson Gillian Rogerson says:

“Children who need fostering have the right to be placed with those people who have the best parenting abilities and can provide the most loving and caring fostering environment. It is in the interests of the child that if the most appropriate foster parents happen to be lesbian or gay, their sexuality should not exclude them from fostering. Society should value the compassion and generosity of homosexual foster parents, rather than seek to legislate against them.”

“Paragraph 16 contains assumptions about lesbians and gays and about parenting which are out of touch with the real world. It suggests that we are demanding the right to foster regardless of suitability as parents. Nobody has the right to foster, but no one should be denied the right to be considered as a foster parent either.”
"Paragraph 16 implies our sexuality is a matter of choice, denying the complexity of human sexuality. Related to this myth is the notion that lesbian and gay parents might influence the sexuality of their children. Lesbians and gay men are surely evidence that this is not the case!"

"Paragraph 16 attacks the notions of equal rights and gay rights as nothing more than the latest examples of loony leftism, and refuses to recognise why local authorities have worked long and hard to establish equal opportunities policies in fostering in the interests of children who might otherwise not receive the most appropriate parenting. Paragraph 16's reference to 'chosen way of life' is also an attack on the concerns of Black communities over fostering policy."

THE INTERESTS OF CHILDREN ARE PARAMOUNT

Outrage believes the interests of children are paramount, especially in cases where teenagers are brutalised or neglected by their parents because they are lesbian or gay. In such a case, fostering by an understanding homosexual couple could be of immeasurable benefit. Outrage also questions the belief that a child needs one mother and one father. The moral right is worried that lesbian and gay fostering is yet another attack on their very limited concept of 'family'. Even academic studies have shown what we have known all along: that sexuality is irrelevant to parenting skills and the welfare of the children we care for.

Outrage spokesperson Greg Taylor says:

"We believe the primary role of the 'family' should be to provide an environment of love and security, not a training ground for strict gender roles and compulsory heterosexuality. That the Tory government has chosen to ignore all the evidence now available in support of lesbian and gay parenting is proof that Paragraph 16 has nothing whatsoever to do with government concern for parentless children. This is clearly a sly and ruthless attempt to exploit an emotive issue in order to promote a vindictive bigotry."

William Waldergrave,
Secretary of State for Health,
Department of Health,
Richmond House,
Whitehall, London SW1.

Write in person to:

it's time we showed our
RAGE

The Lesbian and Gay Rights Coalition c/o Outrage, London Lesbian and Gay Centre,
67/69 Cowcross St, London EC1M 6BP

071-490 7153


Minutes

1. The meeting convened at 7:30pm with the minutes of the 20 December meeting accepted and Matthew F agreeing to facilitate for the rest of the night. No journalists or members of the police identified themselves. Approximately 80 people attending.

2. USE OF THE WORD "QUEER".
There was discussion about the implications of the word "queer", including its possible exclusion of lesbians and the word's homophobic tone in common use.
Agreed that within OUTRAGE!, members are free to use labels for themselves that are of their own choosing.

3. SUBGROUP REPORTS.
General outlines of the group's activities were given for the benefit of new members. A collection was also taken.

4. ATTACKS ON LES/GAY RIGHTS.
A growing list of these has emerged over recent months, each of which were detailed to the group:
* several items in cl 25 of the Criminal Justice Bill;
* s 16 of the Crimes Against Children Act;
* Operation Spanner and the recent G&M convictions;
* inaction on les/gay status in the latest periodic review of the military code; and
* City of Westminsters' use of by-laws to prosecute gays.

It was reported that the International Association of Lesbian & Gays (ILEA) have called for an international day of protest against such attacks, using the British flag in a culturally relevant way. The protests would be held on February 14 (St Valentines' Day).

Agreed that all of the above complaints of the les/gay community's criticisms of these attacks would be individually included as threads in any broad campaign of actions that OUTRAGE! mounts.

The meeting then took a short break and returned as working groups to discuss and plan networking; leaflets and written material; and possible actions. The general discussion resumed at 10:00pm.

Agreed that on Monday 14 January 1991 at 12:00 noon OUTRAGE! organize a small scale scrubbing of Parliament to cleanse it of homophobia. This date coincides with the opening of Parliament for the winter session.

Agreed that on Thursday 14 February 1991 OUTRAGE! mount a washing of the British flag in Trafalgar Square to wash out the homophobia in British society.
ITEM 18: Continued.

Several generic slogans were suggested for a broad campaign including "Hands off gay rights!" and "Get even!". A meeting has been called for 12 January 1991 to co-ordinate a les/gay response. It was agreed to take a tentative suggestion of a mass demonstration to that meeting as well as a 16 February 1991 date. It was also agreed that the initial co-ordinating meeting be open to lesbians and gays only, and that they be invited from relevant groups.

The meeting concluded around 10:30pm, next general meeting to be at 7:30pm on Thursday 10 January 1991.

(Minutes submitted by Craig Morony.)

OUTRAGE! GENERAL MEETING
Proposed Agenda - Thursday 10th January

19:15 Welcome to Newcomers

19:30 General Meeting Introduction - Matthew French
- Identification of Journalists
- Identification of Police
- Group Purpose
- Approval of last week's minutes
- Select Meeting Facilitator
- Approval of Agenda

2. 19:35 Subgroups Reports/Identification
   - Finance
   - Action/Media
   - Fundraising
   - Policing Initiative
   - Office

3. 19:45 Collection

4. 19:50 ACT UP Action

5. 19:55 Campaigns/Actions
   - Paragraph 16
   - Clause 25
   - S&M Case
   - Other Actions
   - National Demonstration Meeting, Jan 13

20:30 Small Groups

21:15 Report Back

6. 21:30 New Business

21:40 ADJOURN

OUTRAGE!
Press Release
69 Cowcross Street • London EC1

15 April 1991

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:
CONTACT: Dave Hurlbert (071) 250-1887
eves. (071) 284-4920, or
Peter Tatchell (071) 403-1790.

GAY ACTIVISTS TO BURN AT STAKE
PROTESTING ARCHBISHOP'S ENTHRONEMENT

Doctor Carey accused of stirring up anti-gay hatred

Friday 19 April 1991
4:45pm Christ Church Gate,
Corner Sun Street and St. Margaret St., Canterbury

A public burning at the stake will be staged today (Friday 19 April) by
the lesbian and gay action group, OutRage!, to coincide with the
enthronement of the new archbishop, Dr. George Carey.

George Carey, in an interview published in The Independent on 28 July
1990, indicated he intends to continue the Church's long-standing
intolerance towards lesbians and gay men. When asked in that
interview: "Is practicing homosexuality a scandal?" he replied: "Yes, it
is." Carey also stated last year that he is in full agreement with the 1987
Church of England Synod ruling that "homosexual genital acts are
sinful."
OutRage! spokesperson, Dave Hurlbert, says: "Dr. Carey's views stir up anti-gay prejudice, discrimination and violence. We find his views irresponsible and dangerous. Being gay isn't a sin; anti-gay hatred is."

The public burning will be the culmination of a two-hour demonstration against church homophobia carried out by approximately 50 costumed lesbian and gay activists. Some will be dressed as nuns, bishops and church inquisitors; others will be dressed as lesbian and gay martyrs. They will enact through a mock flagellation and burning at the stake the historic persecution of homosexuals by the Christian Church.

"Through the centuries the Christian church has widely persecuted lesbians and gay men. Until modern times men and women thought to be homosexual were burnt at the stake. Until the last century the Church supported the death penalty for homosexuality," says OutRage! spokesperson, Dave Hurlbert.

"Today the church habitually uses biblical teaching to justify and legitimise anti-gay prejudice. This continuing campaign of religious hate fuels widespread persecution against lesbians and gay men, providing a theological basis for discrimination by government and assaults and murders of gay men by queerbashing gangs."

Further information: Dave Hurlbert (071) 250-1887; evens. (071) 284-4920.

or Peter Tatchell (071) 403-1790.

Ends
ITEM 19: Continued.

FUNDRAISING REPORT  September 27

Fundraising Group meets every Monday at 7.30pm in the office, 3rd Floor LLGC.

**PROPOSAL** - We are offered two benefit nights; at the City Apprentice in Kings Cross on Wednesday November 7, and at the Market Tavern, Vauxhall, on Tuesday November 27. The terms are the same for both; we keep the door money, there are no restrictions on who can come in, and we provide a DJ and door staff. The City Apprentice benefit will be advertised in Capital Gay, but we will also be expected to do advertising/leafletting for both events.

Jeremy Joseph has offered to devise a quiz show/entertainment in the same style as the Kissathon for the City Apprentice. We need DJs and also ideas for the Market Tavern; Market regulars are especially invited to get involved with organising this one.

**WHISTLES** - We collected £173 from selling at The Bell and in Earls Court this weekend; a larger proportion of this than usual was donations.

This week: Tonight at ASIA (Paradise)
Sept 28 (Fri)  HEAVEN (William to co-ordinate)
Sept 29 (Sat)  David and Marcus will be co-ordinating visits to several venues by car; three more volunteers are needed tonight.

Next week: Thursday at BEYOND (Turnmills, near LLGC, free b4 11.30)

Friday: BRIGHTON (Shane to co-ordinate; accommodation available in Brighton; also Saturday)

Saturday: WOMEN’S CLUBS inc THE WORLD at Turnmills.

**BOOK SALE** - We made a profit of £20 on last Saturday’s book sale.

*WEDNESDAY MATINEE* BENEFIT - We expect to receive approx £400 from Homo-Promos; we have written formally to Eric Fressland and others involved in the production to thank them for their very generous support. We have also been invited to come and sell whistles at Eric Fressland’s play "Leather" which opens shortly.

"WELLS OF LONELINESS" - Fundraising group has agreed to take responsibility for arranging transport and accommodation when the forces of light are unleashed upon the Archbishop-elect; we will be going down to Wells shortly to reconnoitre. Shane is to co-ordinate.

WELCOME FOR COMMISSION CONDEMNATION OF “DAILY STAR” HOMOPHOBIA

Stonewall welcomes the historic Press Complaints Commission (PCC) adjudication* that the Press cannot “ride roughshod over the sensitivities” of lesbians and gay men. The PCC has decided that the “Daily Star” 17/5/91 coverage of a recommendation of the Special Select Committee on the Armed Forces Bill breached three clauses of their Code of Practice. The Committee recommended decriminalisation of homosexual activity in the armed forces. The “Star” responded with misleading and insulting front page, editorial and cartoon coverage (see attached).

The Stonewall complaint to the PCC* claimed that the coverage:

- breached clause 14 of the Commissions Code of Practice ("the press should avoid prejudicial or pejorative reference to a persons sexual orientation");
- breached standards on reporting lesbian/gay concerns established by the Press Council;
- incited hatred against lesbians and gay men;
- grotesquely distorted the work of lesbian/gay lobby groups.

Tim Barnett, Executive Director of the Stonewall Group, said today:

"We welcome the Commissions landmark decision. The "Daily Star" greeted a modest proposal for law reform with intemperate language, encouraging the persecution of lesbians and gay men as well as their families and friends.

The law already protects black people from such insults in the Press. As Britain faces an historic opportunity for homosexual law reform, the Press must report the issues accurately and without prejudice, abiding by the unequivocal instructions of the Commission."

ENDS

* copy available from Stonewall on request

CONTACTS:

Tim Barnett 071 222 9007 (Stonewall office)
081 881 2542 (home)
071 222 0525 (fax)

GATHERING STRENGTH AND GAINING POWER -
how lesbians and gay men began to change their fortunes in Britain in the Nineties

INTRODUCTION

Britain has had a visible and vocal movement for gay and (latterly) lesbian rights since the 1960's. From the small lobbying movement which achieved the 1967 Sexual Offences Act, which partially decriminalised male homosexual activity, it grew through the radical Gay Liberation Front activities of the Seventies into a diverse range of groups with varied approaches. Services such as helplines and youth groups were established; cultural activities such as magazines, drama and publishing houses flourished; and yet, in retrospect, it is clear that in terms of political organisation the British movement failed to develop beyond the early Seventies. Indeed, from the mid Seventies it declined and is only now recovering.

This decline was hidden by the constant founding of new gay organisations, or by the relaunch of old ones, each of which was heralded as the way forward and none of which involved more than a small proportion of potential movement activists, despite their claims to represent the aspirations of all. Each group, if it was at all active, was riven by political disputes in a movement which spent far more time on the issues that pulled them apart rather than the common enemy of homophobia. These self-destructive tendencies, common to oppressed groups and certainly echoed in the gay movements of other countries, drove many potential lesbian and gay political activists to either label themselves 'non-political' or to work only on social groups and helplines.

External factors, such as the rise of AIDS, added to the pressure on our communities and to the level of public hatred and misunderstanding of us. But, above all other pressures, Britain in the eighties lived under a government which provided an open door for the 'moral right'; a government which was, whatever their fine public words, contemptuous of human rights and actively hostile to any form of social deviation; a government with an overwhelming majority in Parliament and the support of most of the British press. This government outfaced and overthrew many previously powerful groups, such as the trades unions and municipal authorities; what chance then for a small and disunited group of social outcasts? Looking back, it is not so much surprising that lesbians and gay men became a scapegoat of the Thatcher government as that we escaped legislative attention from them for as long as we did.
ITEM 21: Continued.

MUNICIPAL HOMOSEXUALITY IN THE EIGHTIES

Given such a homophobic and socially repressive government, it was not surprising that human rights and minority concerns became associated with the opposition political parties. In particular, socialist groups from the Labour Party leftwards began to take on board the concerns of women, black people and lesbians and gay men in a very public manner. This approach was particularly pursued by municipal labour authorities. Local support for lesbians and gay men was provided in the form of community grants, equipment and premises; inclusion of sexuality in equal opportunities policies and training; appointment of Lesbian and Gay Officers or even the creation of Units within the authorities. It seemed, for a short while, as if lesbians and gay men were finally reaching power.

Although there are some lasting legacies such as projects (for example the London Lesbian and Gay Centre) and political allies (for example, some London Labour MPs), on the whole it took little time for the illusion to crumble. Under the Conservatives, local authorities did not mean power. In the face of grossly distorted hostile press coverage, many Labour politicians pragmatically retreated from supporting our rights in hopes of preserving their wider vote. Local authority spending was severely curbed by legislation, forcing many to drop community grants. Municipal authorities, including in the Greater London Council the most generous and widely publicised of all, were simply abolished by an all-powerful central government.

The collapse left much of the lesbian and gay movement in disarray. Many groups which had become dependent on local authority grants folded or went into funding crises. Tellingly, few who had called for the setting up of Lesbian and Gay Units mourned their passing or rushed to their defence; most seemed to feel that they had been run by activists for activists with little reference to the local lesbian and gay population. Political cynicism was rife. Our own organisations had not worked; our jump onto the socialist bandwagon had not worked; central government seemed impervious to criticism. The scene was set, and the victim mentality perfectly instilled, for the first legislative attack upon our existing few rights, when Clause 14 (later Clause and Section 28) was introduced into the Local Government Bill late in 1987.
ITEM 21: Continued.

THE FAILURE TO PREDICT AND PREVENT SECTION 28

Section 28, as finally agreed, reads in part:

"A local authority shall not:

(a) intentionally promote homosexuality or publish material with the intention of promoting homosexuality;

(b) promote the teaching in any maintained school of the acceptability of homosexuality as a pretended family relationship".

The failure to pre-empt or to persuade Parliamentarians to reject, this Clause proved a watershed for the British lesbian and gay movement. Only now, four years later, can we see it as a disaster which pulled us into political reality.

Up until then, we had survived the Eighties relatively unscathed. Police entrapment, or 'pretty policing', as it became known, had been exposed by the inadvertent and (for both sides) embarrassing arrest of a rising young Conservative MP in a male strip show. Customs and Excise had been forced to withdraw from their attempt to use existing laws to ruin Gays The Word bookshop for importing gay literature. However, attacks in the tabloid press and by extremist Conservative MPs against positive images of homosexuality in the education system had stepped up dramatically. A prototype of Section 28 had been floated the previous year by Lord Halsbury in the House of Lords and tacitly approved by the Prime Minister herself. It should not have come as a surprise and yet, to all but a few, it was.

The insularity of the movement was exposed. Our total refusal to engage with those in power had led us to neglect the impact of legislation and to underestimate the ease with which it could be introduced against us. And although reaction was swift, with hundreds of people mobilising within days by word of mouth and thousands on the street within a few weeks, the major groupings began to split and fight almost from the start, breaking into factions and caucuses.
ITEM 21: Continued.

The automatic oppositional British politics of left against right meant that from the start the campaign, rooted in the political left, refused to negotiate with the government in any way. Lobbying of parliamentarians, the only people with the power to change the legislation, was left to a few individuals without support or input from the campaign. The movement’s longstanding rejection of “professionalism” meant that virtually none of us understood the intricacies of the lobby system, or had the contacts to pursue it had we wished to. We just assumed that everybody wrote letters to anybody they could think of who might help. So poor were our links with the Parliamentary parties that at the start the Labour and Liberal Democrat opposition political parties were equally unbriefed and failed to comprehend the scope and danger of the proposals.

Despite all talk of alliances and a broad coalition, radical orthodoxy drove many willing helpers to the margins of the campaign. The Gay Business Association, who brought masses of previously apolitical disco queens into the first march against the Section with their posters in every gay pub and club screaming “Get Off Your Arses And March!”, were hassled and abused when they came to a campaign meeting. Their crime was to have helped train police to be less anti-gay. Though there was a desperate shortage of role models for the politicians and media to relate to as gay and proud, the Arts Lobby attracted considerable criticism and outright jealousy for its use of famous actors to gain attention to the cause.

The campaign, though valiant, revealed our lack of resources. It sometimes felt as if we believed that if we marched enough and told enough people the legislation was unfair, the government would simply back down. There had been a consistent problem of lack of reliable documentation and research into the discrimination we faced and the lives we led. This made it doubly difficult to explain the impact that further discriminatory law would have on us. Financially, we had to start from scratch in raising money, exposing our lack of links with the significant community of wealthy homosexuals, many of whom failed to understand the danger of the legislation or felt alienated by the rhetoric of traditional lesbian and gay campaigning. Although much reliance was put on links with other oppressed communities and the unions, in practical terms we received little support from causes many of us had felt allied to and worked for; there was a lot of lip service but little action. In any case they were mostly weakened by 10 years of Thatcherism and had declining political power. Media coverage of the Section was extremely uneven, relying upon arrests and stunts and later individual sympathisers who began to come forward and even, in a few cases, out.
ITEM 21: Continued.

GATHERING STRENGTH IN THE NINETIES

The key political event of 1990 was the fall of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. The immediate catalyst was conflict within the Government about future development of the European Community, the more fundamental reason that her style of government was out of touch with reality. Her replacement, John Major, had risen through urban politics in a community (Brixton, South London) containing an active lesbian and gay movement. Within a year of taking office he had held a publicised meeting with Sir Ian McKellen of Stonewall and influential national newspapers were calling for homosexual law reform. It was a remarkable about turn.

Campaigning in 1991 was dominated by two issues which arose directly from the dying months of the Thatcher government. One was Clause 25 of the Criminal Justice Bill, a basically liberal piece of legislation which contained, as a sop to the right wing, a commitment to increase prison sentences for some people with a history of criminal convictions. One effect would have been to greatly increase the possibility of imprisonment for people convicted of more than one minor (gay) consenting sexual offence. It was either a deliberate attempt to further oppress gay men or an appalling mistake by civil servants who drafted the Bill.

The campaign by gay activists to amend the Bill was this time largely successful. While OutRage actions drew public attention to the injustices of the legislation, Stonewall lobbyists confronted Conservative Parliamentarians and civil servants with the consequences of their actions and suggested ways to amend it. Both groups successfully exploited their links with the media to obtain sensible coverage. Demands from the revolutionary and libertarian left for total opposition to otherwise reasonable legislation were largely resisted and there was genuine and informed debate within the gay press on the implications of the Clause. Most remarkably, government ministers and their staff met with Stonewall lesbian and gay activists and, while unwilling to concede all their demands, agreed to monitor the effects of the amended Clause and ensure it was not used in a discriminatory manner—promising to further amend it in that case.

One of the good effects of the Section 28 campaign had been the increased involvement of lesbians in what was essentially a legislative campaign. This higher profile for lesbians in mixed activism was put to good use in early 1991 when the Department of Health attempted to introduce childcare guidelines which would have effectively barred lesbians and gay men from fostering as part of a downgrading of equal opportunities. Paragraph 16, as it became known, was a direct reflection of the views of the Minister (Virginia Bottomley, coincidentally also responsible for HIV and AIDS), included in the draft guidelines against the advice of civil servants.
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The Stonewall Group, with its high level of lesbian involvement and a commitment to prioritise "family concerns", was the first to take it up. National fostering organisations and relevant local authorities were contacted and individually lobbied; the wider implications of the legislation for all equal opportunities were emphasised. Experts in childcare and fostering and researchers into lesbian and gay family life were sought out, briefing papers rapidly produced for Parliamentarians and personal links with civil servants exploited. This pressure rapidly led to a meeting with the Minister at which she was faced by a combination of campaigners, "experts" she was known to respect, a lesbian foster mother and an eminent member of the House of Lords who had been brought up in a lesbian household.

Though the issue failed to take priority for a gay press dominated by single male issues, other activists ensured that it received some coverage in the quality press. Outrage organized a postcard protest campaign and demonstration and a number of local groups organised joint 25/16 campaigns. When the final guidelines were published, not only had the offending line been removed but new clauses protecting the right of lesbian and gay teenagers to be given sympathetic foster placements had been added.

These were not the only examples of success. A number of London-based groups finally agreed to enter into negotiation with the Metropolitan Police after years of refusal. Within twelve months, the London Lesbian and Gay Policing Initiative could point to pilot projects to monitor anti-gay violence, training of officers to treat such issues more sympathetically, guidelines on the conduct of police operations against public "cruising" areas, new guidance and training on male rape and a cautious police welcome for the first Lesbian and Gay Police Association in Britain. A Parliamentary Select Committee of MPs had recommended reform of the Armed Forces prohibition on homosexual behaviour to bring it in line with civilian law after receiving written and verbal evidence from Stonewall. The new Press Complaints Commission ruled against homophobia after a flood of complaints by groups and individuals against one tabloid newspaper, the Daily Star. The UK government bowed to the threat of further embarrassment before the European Court of Human Rights in promising to impose homosexual law reform on the Isle of Man if it continued to ban male homosexual activity.
ITEM 21: Continued.

This transformation in character was not confined to new groups. Some of the longstanding service organisations also began to experience a renaissance of enthusiasm and energy at the turn of the decade. London Lesbian and Gay Switchboard, although it had operated to capacity throughout the Eighties, had experienced long periods of difficulty in staffing, leading to a steady decline in calls taken in the latter years of the decade. From 1990 numbers of volunteers and hours worked on shift both rose, along with a far higher involvement in back-up groups and a far stronger lesbian presence. While some of this must be attributed to changes in leading personnel, many volunteers spoke of a new atmosphere of practicality and dedication throughout the service.

This high profile for lesbian and gay rights led to renewed interest from all major political parties in us. By late summer in 1991, the three main parties were involved in what was to all intents and purposes a bidding war for our votes, as a General Election loomed within the year; the leader of the Liberal Democrats spoke to the gay press, Labour issued a new set of commitments to equality and the Conservative Prime Minister invited leading actor and Stonewall Group member Sir Ian McKellen for that highly publicised cup of tea and a chat about lesbian and gay rights. The arguments began to centre, not on whether we could get any law reform, but on what form that now inevitable reform should take.
ITEM 21: Continued.

REASONS FOR CHANGE

We would suggest that these changes occurred primarily because the lesbian and gay movement in the UK underwent a fundamental shift of approach and attitudes at the end of the 1980s, in an atmosphere of rapidly improving opportunities for reform. Key reasons were:

* the development of adequately funded, well defined and targeted groups prepared to work across diversity solely on specifically lesbian and gay issues;

* a new confidence that we could engage with powerful social forces and the belief that we had the ability to change them. Of particular importance in aiding this was the decline in power of the moral right and their media and Parliamentary friends with the departure of Margaret Thatcher;

* the refusal to tie our needs or cause to any one political party or philosophy. This involved particular rapprochement with elements in the Conservative Party. The support of a small group of Conservative backbench MPs was of particular importance through the initial victories of 1991. This in turn helped to reduce the political marginalisation of the issue; Parliamentarians could be seen to work on homosexual law reform without fear of being labelled eccentric;

* a new willingness to deal with and confront the press, even when hostile, and to provide good opportunities for stories. The extent and quality of television and radio coverage improved significantly in this period. Lesbian and gay issues provided good news; audiences for programmes such as the television "Out" series were numbered in millions;

* the growth of debate within the movement on political and philosophical issues, leading to a more sophisticated understanding of our struggle for power;

* the appreciation of the need for professional and disciplined ways of working within organisations, promoting consistent policies and ensuring active involvement by the maximum number of people;

* the fuller integration of lesbians within the mixed movement, especially on legislative issues. Although specifically gay male law reform concerns are likely to dominate the next few years, given the discriminatory state of criminal law, concerns of lesbians are now much more central to the movement;
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* * *

the growth in internationalism, particularly European integration, and the parallel increase in contact between lesbians and gays across the continent. British people have seen that there are more humane ways in which society and the law can deal with lesbian and gay concerns. Creation of links with other countries.

What comes next? We expect the 1992 General Election to determine the timescale rather than content of change. The new intake of MPs will, in general, be younger and more liberal, and will be more prepared to vote positively on such issues in the first couple of years of a new Parliament.

The gay male age of consent is of key importance, symbolic as well as real. There is likely to be a vote on a proposal to equalise it at 16 during 1993. The power of the lesbian and gay lobby at that stage will determine if we succeed. The "new" element in that lobby for Parliamentarians is the private and professional approach; the tension between that and much more public action is likely to be tested to the ultimate in the heat of the age of consent campaign.

Parallel to the consent issue, there is growing disquiet with a number of areas of sexual offences law in the UK. The Government has to consider 10 years of official reports calling for fundamental reform. Consensual gay sex offences will probably be included in that - and it may even offer a second opportunity (if needed) to equalise the age of consent. Anti-discrimination law is near certain to be introduced if Labour win the election; that approach is unpopular with Conservatives, and only pressure from the European Community would change their minds. The other key areas of reform - partnership, parenting - are likely to take much longer, although much could be achieved by growing awareness in the legal system and among supportive local authorities and voluntary organisations.

The movement has largely, however reluctantly, accepted the principle that lobby and direct action groups can co-exist. If each can continue to gather strength, particularly through resources for the former and people for the latter, and if they can continue to communicate with each other, however tentatively, then success is much more likely. The more difficult challenge may well be ensuring effective international cooperation as power moves to Brussels and towards Eastern Europe. These changes in the power structures of Europe are, as we write in late 1991, leading to a growth of fascism throughout the continent and a rise in racism and anti-Semitism. Since these go hand in hand with homophobia, we must be alert to moves against us in many countries. Our opportunities for legislative change in the UK must neither mask the real fear of right-wing backlash nor lead us to neglect other major areas of social justice.
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Perhaps, with the growth of a realistic and pragmatic approach by lesbian and gay groups of all kinds in Britain, we can begin to make the networks and alliances across our differences just as groups throughout Europe and the rest of the world have begun to work together in international networks such as ILGA. By the time you read this, perhaps judgement can be passed on our hopes for the Nineties. Because, if we don't learn to work together to gain and hold power over our own lives, you may not be able to read books like this at all.

Tim Barnett
Lisa Power
11/91

JOIN THE OUTRAGE! "EQUALITY NOW!" CAMPAIGN 1992

The run-up to the general election is the moment when the government and the political parties are most open to influence. Now is the time to step up our campaign for lesbian and gay equality. The aims of the OutRage! campaign are to:

(a) Expose and challenge State homophobia.
(b) Pressure the government and political parties to support reform.
(c) Promote public awareness and debate about homophobic discrimination.
(d) Get our demands for equality on to the general election agenda.

If you believe that lesbian and gay human rights are worth fighting for, we urge you to participate in the following OutRage! actions:

1) Thursday 20 February 1pm
Theme: STOP MILITARY HOMOPHOBIA. - Repeal the ban on lesbians & gay men in the armed forces.
Action: Meet at the Army Careers Information Office in The Strand (opposite Charing Cross Station) at 1pm, followed by the rededication of the statues of famous gay military commanders and a wreath-laying at M.o.D. for personnel witch-hunted by the military.

2) Thursday 5 March 1pm.
Theme: REPEAL SOLICITING LAWS.
Action: Mass WINK-IN at Piccadilly Circus at 1pm and then march to New Scotland Yard Broadway SW1 for sit-in outside main entrance. Exchange of giant cards with names & telephone numbers, followed by frenzied bonking in portable Wendy House.

3) Thursday 12 March 1pm.
Theme: LEGAL RECOGNITION & PROTECTION FOR LESBIAN & GAY PARTNERSHIPS.
Action: Mass application to register partnerships by lesbian & gay couples at Westminster Registry Office, Westminster Council House, corner Marylebone Rd & Gloucester Pl. NW1 (near Baker St tube) at 1pm.

4) Thursday 2 April 1pm.
Theme: MARCH TO DEMAND THE OUTLAWING OF ANTI-GAY JOB DISCRIMINATION.
Action: Meet at Dept. of Employment Caxton House, Tothill St, SW1 at 1pm, followed by a one hour vigil outside St.Stephen's entrance. Action to expose discrimination against Alison Halford, Deputy Chief Constable of Merseyside because of her alleged lesbianism.

5) Thursday 16 April 1pm
Theme: MARCH FOR EQUAL AGE OF CONSENT.
Action: Assemble at Home Office, corner Queen Anne's Gate & Tothill Street SW1 at 1pm for teenage KISS-IN. March to Parliament, led by lesbian & gay teenagers. Finish with a one hour vigil outside St.Stephen's entrance.

6) Thursday 30 April 1pm.
Theme: MARCH FOR REPEAL OF SECTION 28
Action: Assemble at Tory Party H.Q. Smith Sq. SW1, 1pm, to "PROMOTE HOMOSEXUALITY", and proceed to Parliament for a one hour vigil outside St.Stephen’s entrance.

Further information available from OutRavel. 67-69, Cowcross St., London EC1M 6BP (071-490-7153)

Press Release

GAYS PROTEST MILITARY HOMOPHOBIA

GAY MILITARY LEADERS TO BE "RE-DECORATED" IN CEREMONIES

At Statues Of Haig, Montgomery, Kitchener and Mountbatten

WREATH TO BE LAID AT MINISTRY OF DEFENCE TO
COMMENOBRATE LESBIAN & GAY VICTIMS OF MILITARY WITCH-HUNTS

1pm - THURSDAY, 20th FEBRUARY 1992

ARMY CAREERS INFORMATION OFFICE, THE STRAND, LONDON WC2

In a protest against the military ban on lesbians and gay men serving in the Armed Forces, the homosexual rights group, OutRage!, will publicly "re-decorate" four of Britain's most famous military leaders who were homosexuals/bisexuals: Field Marshals Kitchener, Haig and Montgomery, and Admiral Mountbatten.

Among those participating will be lesbian and gay ex-service personnel who have suffered victimization by the military.

The ceremonies - which will take place at the statues commemorating these men in central London - form part of OutRage!'s continuing civil disobedience campaign: "Equality NOW".

The police have threatened to arrest everyone taking part in this action for violating the sessional orders which forbid protests near Parliament while MPs are sitting.

"The military witch-hunts against lesbian and gay service personnel are sheer hypocrisy," says OutRage! spokesperson Nick Cave.

(Continued...)
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2.

"Four of Britain's most famous military commanders have been either homosexual or bisexual. It's good enough for the top brass, ordinary lesbian and gay service personnel should not be penalised".

The OutRage! protest, which is demanding the repeal of the military regulations excluding lesbians and gay men from membership of the Armed Forces, will take place this Thursday, 20th February, commencing at 1pm outside the Army Careers Information Office in The Strand, London WC2.

"To be lesbian or gay, even if the person never has sex, is grounds for automatic dismissal from the Armed Forces. Consenting homosexual relations involving service personnel are punishable by up to two years imprisonment - even if the relations take place with a civilian outside of barracks during off-duty hours," says Nick Cave.

"From 1987-90, 306 lesbians and gay men were dismissed from the Armed Forces," according to OutRage! co-organiser Aamir Ahmad.

"Thirty-two of these were imprisoned, some for up to two years for consenting homosexual behaviour which is not a crime between civilians".

OutRage! accuses the Armed Forces of witch-hunting lesbian and gay service personnel:

"This involves the searching of rooms, seizure of diaries, mail interception, telephone-tapping and surveillance off-duty," says Nick Cave.

"Suspects are interrogated and sometimes tortured by means of sleep deprivation, despoiling of food and physical beatings," he added.

The OutRage! protest will begin at the Army Careers Information Office (which is currently being refurbished).

The protesters will then march to Whitehall where they will "re-decorate" the statues of each of the famous homosexual/bisexual military commanders: Haig, Montgomery, Kitchener and Mountbatten. This will involve "dressing up" the figures in question.

The protest will conclude with the laying of a pink triangle wreath on the steps of the Ministry of Defence to commemorate lesbian and gay service personnel witch-hunted by the Armed Forces.

(Continued...)
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3.

OutRage! condemns the military for hypocrisy and double-standards:

"During the Gulf War, the Armed Forces knowingly called up lesbian and gay reservists. Yet in peacetime, they automatically exclude homosexual servicemen and women," says Aamir Ahmad.

"The Armed Forces are quite willing to sacrifice the lives of lesbian and gay people during wartime, but they won’t even employ homosexuals during peacetime," he added.

"It’s outrageous that lesbian and gay service personnel risked their lives in the Gulf War only to face dismissal on their return to Britain," says Nick Cave.

OutRage! is urging the National Union of Students to organise a nationwide ban on military recruitment stalls at "freshers’ fairs" until the Armed Forces agrees to allow lesbians and gay men to serve in the military without discrimination.

OutRage! says the anti-gay military regulations:

* Encourage abuse and maltreatment
* Cause a loss of talented personnel
* Waste public money spent on training
* Reinforce social prejudice
* Discourage effective HIV prevention education
* Contradict the policies of other NATO countries

Further Information

Nick Cave 071 490 7153 (2pm - 5pm)
Aamir Ahmad 0628 39151 (Tues/Weds)
Peter Tatchell 071 403 1790

Dear Friend

The Stonewall Group works for legal equality and social justice for lesbians and gay men in the United Kingdom. I enclose some information on our work.

We are currently lobbying for a reduction in the age of consent for gay sex from 21 to 16. You may have seen speculation in the press to the effect that John Major intends to allow parliamentary time for a free vote on this issue within the next year.

There are three ways in which we hope that your organisation might be able to help with this campaign:-

1. Letter-writing.
   Stonewall runs a letter writing campaign, SPAN. I enclose a copy of a circular recently sent to its members. It would be really helpful if members of your organisation and their friends could write letters of this kind to their MP and to the Prime Minister.

2. Case histories.
   Within your organisation, you may have worked with men who have suffered through the effects of the current law. We are keen to gather details of such people for use in our briefings. I enclose copies of two such case histories. Are you able to provide further examples? If necessary, the author can use a pseudonym. Although the stories of young men will be particularly useful, older men could also describe how the existing law has affected them, both before they were 21 and since.

3. Media coverage.
   There is likely to be extensive media coverage and debate on this issue over the next year or so. Stonewall is often the first port of call for the media, but we are not always able to provide Stonewall speakers or interviewees, particularly for the local press and radio. Would you be prepared to help with this work? We hope to provide media training for anyone who volunteers.

Again, we believe it particularly important that the case should primarily be put by young gay men; those aged 16-21 (or even in their early 20s) would make ideal speakers. Young lesbians may also want to speak out, and we will suggest the media also interview them wherever possible.
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Even if you anticipate that you will work directly with your local media on this issue, we should still like to hear from you with details of any willing speakers/interviewees so that we can respond quickly to requests from the media and from other organisations in your area.

I enclose a copy of a short briefing which we have prepared on the age of consent, which has an appendix summarising the position in other EC countries. Please let me know if we can provide you with any further information, either on this issue or any of the other work of Stonewall.

If you would like to discuss the contents of this letter, please telephone me at this office.

Yours sincerely

Anya Palmer
Research and Information Officer

Stonewall is organising an Equality Week which will take place just before the formal opening of Parliament. It will be our chance to set out our agenda for the next Parliamentary session.

The coming months will be particularly significant for us as the government have indicated that they would give time for a debate on the age of consent. This will probably come as an amendment to the Criminal Justice Bill for which there is all party support.

But although many MP’s would accept that 21 is indefensible many do not yet accept the argument for equality.

We hope in Equality Week to start setting this agenda and to mobilise support for an equal age of consent.

The week will begin with a lobby of Parliament and an all party meeting in the House of Commons on 18th. October.

During the week we are also encouraging people to organise meetings and events around the country. There will be major debates at the Oxford and Cambridge Unions and in London at LSE. Meetings are also being arranged in Manchester, Southampton, Edinburgh, Cornwall, Sheffield.

The week will end with a grand variety Equality Show at the London Palladium with many guest stars including Lily Savage, Julian Clary and the Pet Shop Boys.

We are also producing a new pamphlet giving all the arguments for an equal age of consent.

I very much hope that you will become involved in Equality Week and would ask whether you would be able to hold an event or meeting in your area to mobilise support for this vital change. We would, of course, try and help out with speakers and other arrangements. We also have a database of all MP’s and are recording their views on the issue so please contact us if you need information about your MP.

I hope you will agree with me that the continued criminalisation of gay sex is a continuing outrage which we must challenge. The principle of equality is important for us all, lesbians and gay men. Please support Equality Week and let us know what events you are planning.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Angela Mason, Executive Director.

Letters,
THE PINK PAPER.

Alex Dunlop demands that OutRage publicly state its reasons for "opposing Stonewall".

The truth is that OutRage values Stonewall's contribution to the campaign for equality. What we object to is the way Stonewall demigrates everyone else. It's leaders dismiss direct action as "the ghetto of purely protest politics" and as "hysterical, huckstering and shocking". They claim all the credit for every change in the law, without ever acknowledging the contribution of other lesbian and gay organizations. Their book, Stonewall 25, rewrites the history of our community to devalue the efforts of every group except their own. They condemn activists like Peter Tatchell in the straight press.

For five months, OutRage did not respond to this petty sniping from Stonewall. Indeed, we asked for a meeting and appealed for a halt to their attacks. Our requests were ignored. Faced with such intransigence, it is hardly surprising that OutRage has finally felt compelled to publicly defend itself from the increasingly embittered slurs of Stonewall and its supporters.

Martin Corbett
OutRage, London W1

5 Peter Street, London W1V 3RR
Phone & Fax 071-439-2381

The Stonewall Group's absence from the huge march against the Criminal Justice Bill in July was symptomatic of its creative complicity. The clothes of Stonewall, the gay rights organisation that was founded by into the police (which was an act of non-cooperation) would have been denied it)

Enraged by the political and economic elites who drive the creation of Stonewall, the gay rights organisation that was founded by into the police (which was an act of non-cooperation) it was the same political and economic elites who drive the creation of Stonewall. Stonewall's role is to provide a proxy for those who are acting in their own interests, not for the public good. Stonewall's success is not about Stonewall, it is about Stonewall.

Times Sat 18 Mar 1995

OutRage! challenge to the Church on homosexuality

From Mr Grant Buckley
Sir, Britain, compared to many countries, has relatively liberal legislation for homosexuals. Unfortunately legislation does not change public attitudes and this is where the brave efforts of Mr Peter Tatchell start to become effective (reports, March 14, letters, March 15).

Of homosexuals, like myself, must lead a life of denial if they wish to avoid alienation by certain members of the community, job restrictions, and being an object of occasional ridicule.

Many know that if they wish to exhibit openly a desire to share their life with a partner of the same sex they will be forced to endure certain restrictions that are not prevalent for heterosexuals.

Mr Tatchell is endeavouring to challenge this situation. I suspect that the reality of the life for these individuals may be as liberated as the legislation appears to provide for.

Yours faithfully,
GRANT BUCKLEY,
9 Brewery Walk,
Barbourne, Worcester.

From the Executive Director of Stonewall
Sir, There are many reasons for concerning myself with Peter Tatchell’s latest attempt to "out" the Bishop of London. Moral panics are always indefensible. The ends do not justify the means. But for many lesbians and gay men the sight of Peter Tatchell ponting as the moral policeman of the movement also belies the very basis of our arguments for civil rights.

The changes that have occurred in the last 25 years, and they have been very real, have happened because more lesbians and gay men are themselves coming out. This re-definition of "normal" or "sinful" any longer means that lesbians and gay issues have gained a new visibility in our society. There are now lesbians, gay men and bisexuals in all walks of life who have come out and are making the case for change and arguing for recognition and respect.

"Coming out" is most dangerous because it threatens this very process. Political correctness is substituted for open discussion, the threat of public exposure for respect for the diversity of our human sexuality and the privacy of all individuals. "Coming out" invites a backlash and already in the Church of England the fundamentalists are gathering force. Let's hope it won't happen here, but in America the Christian right is a powerful and growing force.

There is a desperate need for an open and informed discussion on homosexuality within the Church. Despite the attacks and threats from OutRage! the Bishop of London still seems to be mainly committed to that process. On this occasion we should applaud his integrity and oppose the intimidation to which he has been subjected.

Yours faithfully,
ANGELA MASON,
Executive Director,
Stonewall, 2 Greycoat Place, SW1.

From the Bishop of St David and Man
Sir, I was encouraged to read (report March 18) that the primates of the Anglican Communion, meeting in Windsor, had issued a letter supporting the Bishop of London ("Churchman's commend move to OutRage").

I would hope that in due course the House of Bishops would attempt to make some similar statement affirming what was written in their report Human Sexual Identity (December, 1991) and declaring categorically that we are opposed to homophobia and discrimination, as endorsed by the Archbishop of Canterbury (report, March 17). At the same time I hope that we would make it crystal clear that we will not be to what I consider intimidation or threats perpetrated by some gay activists.

I believe that we should continue to stand by what we agreed with regard to clergy when Issues in Human Sexuality was produced. This is why I am disappointed to read (report, early editions, March 19) that the Bishop of Southwark "would be happy to ordain to the priesthood someone who is openly homosexual, as long as that relationship was stable."

In view of the monstrous behaviour of some representatives of the OutRage lobby I sincerely hope that he will think again.

Yours faithfully,
W. J. TROTMAN SOOTOF AND MANN,
Bishop's House, Quartermile Road,
Douglas, Isle of Man.
March 17.

From the Right Reverend Derek Rawcliffe
Sir, I would like to correct some impressions in your page 1 report about Bishop Hope (March 14). My decision to give the interview which appeared on Newsnight last week was in response to a request from Ted Harrison of the BBC. There was no coercion by OutRage! or anyone else.

I had not been in correspondence with Peter Tatchell as your report suggests; neither has he at any time urged me to "come out." The only contact I had had with him was a telephone call some days before the "outing" of the bishops at General Synod. I realised later that he was checking up on me to make sure that I was sufficiently "out" not to be included among the ten bishops.

My own view is that no one should be coerced to come out. Each person's situation is so different that he or she must make his or her own decision.

Yours faithfully,
DEREK RAWCLIFFE,
Killainty, Wetherby Road,
Barstall, Leed's, West Yorkshire.
March 18.

From Mrs Margaret James
Sir: In her article on the Church and homosexuality Janet Daley questions why the gay lobby is locked in conflict with the Church (article, March 9). Perhaps I can enlighten her.

Religious beliefs are an influence over society and the psychological damage inflicted on lesbians and gay men is under the sway of Catholicism, Judaism and other religions is inevitable. Janet Daley raises the question of what if the sincerity of homosexual feelings is to be used as a "moral test", the sincere feelings of those who find homosexuality repugnant should be respected also. But gay activists are not motivated by the desire to change those feelings of repugnance. It is the effects of such feelings when they are translated into hostile behaviour that activists are most concerned about.

Whether one agrees with "outing" or not, it is not done purely on the basis that hypocrisy is evil. It is done to challenge the legitimacy the Church gives, through its teaching that homosexuality is sin, to individuals who not only find homosexuality repugnant, but go on to indulge their response in legal (discrimination) and illegal (violent) ways.

Yours faithfully,
MARGOT JAMES,
1 Seabow Terrace, SWI.
March 9.

---

**OUTRAGE!**

5 Peter Street, London W1V 3RR
071 - 439 2381

Veronica Norburn
Institute of Psycho Therapy
and Social Studies
18 Laurier Road
London NW6 1SG

8/7/94

Dear Ms Norburn,

Homophobia is the irrational fear of homosexuality. In a person who is homosexual this disorder can be very damaging to the sufferer's self-esteem. In the most severe cases the disorder can lead to violence, usually aimed against someone the sufferer perceives as homosexual.

It has long been recognised that many disorders exist not because of physical damage to the brain but in a broader social context. Since most societies continue to discriminate against homosexuality a person expressing anti-gay/lesbian sentiment might be regarded as normal. However, we feel that a person that attacks, maims or possibly murders another solely because he/she is gay/lesbian is stepping beyond such considerations.

Such a person should be regarded as ill and that the psychological/psychiatric establishment should give serious consideration to ways of helping them overcome their phobia.

We would be grateful on your views on this matter and would like to know whether your institution has, or would be prepared to offer treatment to a homophobe desirous of a cure.

Yours sincerely

Alastair Williams
For OutRage!
ITEM 1: The Sunday Times Magazine - Peter Tatchell Speaks Out. 23rd April, 1995.
ITEM 1: Continued.

Indecent exposure

Peter Tatchell loves to shock, and OutRage!, the gay rights group notorious for its kiss-ins, queer weddings and mass trouser drops, is just that. But now Tatchell and his colleagues have started 'outing' bishops, MPs and judges, American-style. So has the Citizen Smith of pink politics finally gone too far in his battle to bring public figures out of the closet? Lesley White reports. Photograph by Cindy Palmano.
ITEM 1: Continued.

The government encouraging more young men to be gay by
defining the role culture is taught: youth is not an
eonate as one you like by the ""11 Queer Nisei Now"
Tender. His signature will not raise a boat.

In the war of microbes that has so far been the nation's
best tactic, Toshell still has many to conquer. On
the platform with him that night, a lesbian activist spoke of
love and joy and even the right to privacy. Someone else
said they had no desire to reduce gay homophobia from
the community, which needed role models like the
Honourable Members answer. Most of the squatters were
well attended and had frequently been brunt by
both sides, and then Toshell, who neatly enters from the
stage, told something more revealing: the defiant
bedfellow of gay culture can find a position of anarcho
and that they must guard against it all the same. As
he spoke he brought to mind, with his pale skin and dark,
longish coarse hair full of earnest intent, the slightly published
in the Christian Labour Movement papers on drugs, he
would become. Very, childish, vestigial he has been
called, and worse, but when he talks, sincerity always
breaks forth like a beaver, slicing through the usual fog
of political correctness and triviality.

But certainly, says Ralph Vago Gresy, who had
debated with Toshell on ""tires"" over messes that he is not
wrong. He believes he is working for the good of gay
people, but he is an acolyte of anyone who thinks they
know best what is right for others. As the crowd flies
across the pages of reality he may have done some of a
diservice. My feeling is, don't do to others what would
be horrible for you if you were in their position."

But tonight the crowd is buying for faces, not
feelings. Come on, Pren, they say, give it the ease. It is
what follows him as a grizzly as it does the infatuated
couple where it is you. Here is no one, will the
crowd of homemade diversions stir up beyond all
manner of doubts? As one point, revealing, to his remorse of
defiency, he read out a list of 200 books he wrote against equalising
the age of consent last February and are known, he
says, for their covert gay lives. The Destiny Dreams, he calls
them. These names are etched on his brows, an
untranslated alienism whose duplicity echoes the persecution of
race, class, conscience, creativists, a couple of shadow
lessees. He is commonly asked for defini-
tions, does not feel, but he is a boy, an
organization. He is the subject of no
death of the summer. Toshell
tells us he is a detective or an

institute, tying together traditions and evidence until
he is in as much as he can be. ""We're treating (e.g.) gay people
in public life who support anti-poll politics,"" he says
simply. He says he has seen acts on unconscionable-ty, in
suspicion of all information that arrives too easily,
misses instead on a counterfeited network of reputations
and infonnation. The next time.

When he wanted to see the tabloids for like he said, they
saw, despite his, perhaps, uncontrollable Roman,
Bismarkian he said to those who saw his
outfitting, or so he had been. He had been for..."" Please
don't go on about it..."" He left by 12:000 voices in a
previously soft and retreated public while he is
still abroad for being Labour's traditional strength and
recently he had to read an account of the physical
assault when he reached 300 he stopped again
reporting to the police. There were never any percus-
sions on public grounds. Greenhorn Centre 10, there is no window in the flat that has not been
broken, and course deciding the war in the summer of
Death dreams, dog menacing and a bullet, ""It makes you
frightened, above your fear, you are not so confi-
dent about walking the streets as I used to be."
She is next in the phone is trapped by Special
Brutus and nose the postal service horrible, dis-
arming, no suspect, all other methods of
communication. It is interesting to me a service
pigeon would make the perfect gift, even bet-
er would be the more loose on a quiet street with a
gentle that he covers and will proba-
bly never leave. Or perhaps a boyfriend. In his
ento 45, he lives alone, and permuta-
tion must find it hard to share the social, and
the relationships. Conspiring for the sex-
ual freedom of others while he sleeps about
easy makes him look more instead. ""Here is
everyone's way to a fellow soiling, not to recognize
any boundaries in life. It's all 100% for the
cause. He stricks to face people who have homes and pattern, things to do
that have nothing to do with Outrage!""

Toshell would have become someone's
man, a forgotten demon from the days 40-23

76
ITEM 1: Continued.

While Bold and Kinnock during the 1982 general election campaign for Labour, Labour Party leaders continued from the home front politics of the 1970s. But in the 1980s, they moved away from the traditional Labour Party's civil disobedience role and towards more mainstream tactics. This move was partly due to the success of the Conservative government in 1980, which made it harder for the Labour Party to be seen as a credible alternative. Nevertheless, the Labour Party continued to use its traditional methods of protest, such as demonstrations and picketing, to challenge the government's policies. However, the party also began to adapt its tactics to the changing political climate, with a greater emphasis on issue-based campaigning and a more strategic approach to elections. This helped the Labour Party to regain some momentum in the 1980s and set the stage for its eventual return to power in the 1990s.
ITEM 1: Continued.

For years Tischell has meddled with gay politics to the detriment of his public life. The left is not a mere social or political entity, but a serious political force capable of making a real difference. The right, on the other hand, is a collection of ideologues and reactionaries who are willing to use any means necessary to maintain their power. The struggle for gay rights is not just a matter of personal freedom; it is a fundamental human right that must be defended at all costs. The times we are living in are dark and dangerous, but we must not give up hope. We must continue to fight for our rights and for a world where all people are treated with dignity and respect. 

— Tony Tischell

For years Tischell has meddled with gay politics to the detriment of his public life. The left is not a mere social or political entity, but a serious political force capable of making a real difference. The right, on the other hand, is a collection of ideologues and reactionaries who are willing to use any means necessary to maintain their power. The struggle for gay rights is not just a matter of personal freedom; it is a fundamental human right that must be defended at all costs. The times we are living in are dark and dangerous, but we must not give up hope. We must continue to fight for our rights and for a world where all people are treated with dignity and respect. 

— Tony Tischell

For years Tischell has meddled with gay politics to the detriment of his public life. The left is not a mere social or political entity, but a serious political force capable of making a real difference. The right, on the other hand, is a collection of ideologues and reactionaries who are willing to use any means necessary to maintain their power. The struggle for gay rights is not just a matter of personal freedom; it is a fundamental human right that must be defended at all costs. The times we are living in are dark and dangerous, but we must not give up hope. We must continue to fight for our rights and for a world where all people are treated with dignity and respect. 

— Tony Tischell
ITEM 1: Continued.

Since the 1950s, says Tischler, there has also been a significant increase in the number of social issues that have come before the Social Issues Committee of the National Association of Realtors. This growth has been driven by a variety of factors, including the increased awareness and concern about environmental issues, housing affordability, and the impact of social policies on the real estate market.

In the 1960s, the Social Issues Committee began to focus more on issues related to social justice and equality. This was reflected in the committee's work on issues such as housing discrimination, fair housing policies, and the impact of social policies on minority communities.

In the 1970s, the committee continued to expand its focus to include issues such as urban revitalization, community development, and the impact of social policies on the environment.

In the 1980s, the committee continued to evolve, focusing on issues such as affordable housing, environmental sustainability, and the impact of social policies on the economy.

In the 1990s, the committee began to focus more on issues related to technology and the environment, as well as the impact of social policies on the global economy.

In the 2000s, the committee continued to expand its focus to include issues such as climate change, social inequality, and the impact of social policies on the health of communities.

In conclusion, the Social Issues Committee of the National Association of Realtors has played a significant role in shaping the real estate industry's understanding of social issues and the impact of social policies on the real estate market. Through its work on a variety of issues, the committee has helped to shape the industry's approach to social issues and has contributed to the development of policies that promote social justice and equality.
ITEM 3: Peter Tatchell is accused of forcing homosexuals out. 15th March, 1995.

**Gay Issue Roils Church of England**

Bishop Wins Praise in Resisting Pressure by Militant Group

By JOHN DARBTON

LONDON, March 18 — For years the Church of England has been reeled by an internal debate over homosexuality: Is it morally reprehensible and a cause for repentance? Or is it acceptable and, when accompanied by love and fidelity, as positive a form of human expression as heterosexuality?

This week the debate exploded into the public arena as the Bishop of London, the church’s third most senior cleric, revealed that he had been pressed by a militant gay rights group to proclaim himself a homosexual “voluntarily.”

Instead the Bishop, David Hope, held a news conference on Monday to condemn the tactics of the group trying to pressure him. He said that his sexuality was “ambiguous” and that he was celibate.

His stand drew praise from the church’s highest authority, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Most Rev. George Carey, who also issued a special plea for tolerance.

“We reject homophobia in any form,” the Archbishop said at a press conference on Thursday. “Homosexuals must be treated as people made in the image and likeness of God.”

The issue never receded beyond the Church of England. For this happened to be the week that leaders of the Anglican Communion, representing some 70 million worshippers in 35 self-governing churches in 164 countries, were holding a meeting in Windsor Great Park near London.

Once every three years the 36 Anglican Primates convene for mutual support and consultation. This year the issue of human sexuality and the churches’ traditional biblical condemnation of sex outside the bounds of matrimony — and homosexual sex in particular — was high on the agenda.

At the end of the conference the Primates issued a pastoral letter, intended to guide discussions in the Communion’s 198 dioceses, which called for a full and reasoned debate on the whole issue of human sexuality. The discussions will presumably range across questions that have long vexed the churches in various countries, including everything from extramarital sex to polygamy.

The issue of sexual morality is especially controversial in the United States where the Episcopal Hope’s disclosure that a group called OutRage! had threatened to go public with an allegation that he was gay unless he himself did so.

At his news conference, Bishop Hope released the text of a letter handed to him in January by Peter Tatchell, O, a founder and spokesman for OutRage! It said he should proclaim himself a homosexual “voluntarily” so that he could speak for “the millions of lesbian and gay people who are victimized by our homophobic society, often with the collusion of the church.”

Bishop Hope condemned the tactics as “seriously intimidating or worse.” He said he found “this campaign profoundly disturbing in that it would seem to be based almost entirely on rumor, attributable sources and an intimidating nature.”

“To what extent should any person be subjected to such intrusion in their personal and private lives carrying with it unspoken threats — purely on the basis of such rumor.

Bishop Hope’s statement ahead of time and strong backing him both privately and publicly, church officials said.

Though its influence has declined at home in recent decades and the percentage of regular churchgoers among the general population is in the single digits, the Church of England still has more followers than any other church in England.

The church’s position on homosexuality is evolving slowly. In 1987, the General Synod, the church’s legislature, with 574 members, adopted a motion put forward by the Rev. Tony Higton, a rector in Essex, that was traditional in its condemnation. Homosexual genital acts “fall short” of the “ideal of heterosexual intercourse between married partners” and are “to be met by a call to repentance,” it stated.

In 1991, the House of Bishops, which constitutes one-third of the General Synod, produced a report on “Issues in Human Sexuality” that liberalized the stance. Among other things, it allowed practicing homosexuals to be accepted in certain circumstances “within the Christian fellowship.” But it called on “homosexual clergy and ordinands not to enter into sexually active relationships.”

That report is theoretically still under discussion. It has not been adopted by the General Synod.

In the aftermath of the controversy over Bishop Hope, Bishop Roy Williams of Southwark pushed the boundaries further. He said in an interview with the BBC that experience had taught him that proclaiming homosexuals in stable relationships could lead lives of spirituality. He might ordain a priest in such a relationship, he said.

The remark upset other clerics, including Mr. Rigden. The Bishop of Southwark’s stand “is a very serious development,” he said in a telephone interview. “My reaction is to deplore it.” At the same time, he condemned OutRage! as “homosexual terrorists” who “should be condemned by all, including the moderate gay lobby.”

OutRage! was founded in 1990 in response to the killing of a gay activist by a gang in West London. It borrowed the strategy of “outing” prominent people — publicly revealing that they are homosexual — from American gay rights organizations.
ITEM 5: Church between devil and deep blue sea. 17th February, 1995.

Bishop resign threat over gay clergy

A senior bishop has said he will resign if the Church of England decides to ordain openly gay clergy. In an outspoken attack, the Bishop of Chester, the Rt Revd Michael Baughen, a leading evangelical, said the church was in danger of being split over the issue.

"If priests who are practising homosexuality are going to be visibly ordained, that will be a catastrophe for the Church of England. It would mean the end of the Church of England as we know it," he said last week.

Baughen has a history of opposing homosexuality in the church and holds significant sway in the church since he drafted the House of Bishops' official 1987 resolution condemning homosexuality. He continued his criticisms by suggesting that the issue of gay clergy could dwarf the controversy over the ordination of women priests.

This week both lesbian and gay Christians and the Church of England branded Baughen's comments "empty threats."

Richard Kirk, secretary of the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement, said: "If he does, then it would suggest he has lost all sense of judgment. The LGCM was in the process of drawing up a list of gay candidates for the next elections to the General Synod, as the church's governing body. A spokesperson for the Church of England admitted that the ordination of gay clergy could cause problems among the Church's evangelicals, many of whom publicly declared their opposition to the ordination of women. But, the spokesperson added that "A church debate on homosexuality will happen and it just seems now that everyone is marking their territory ready for when that happens."

Church between devil and deep blue sea

Outrage's outing of Anglican bishops has undoubtedly succeeded in forcing the Church of England to make some placatory moves.

The Church has clearly been severely embarrassed by such revelations, following soon after those about the outing Bishop of Durham, and it has succeeded in pressure from what its House of Bishops has disparagingly described as "homophobes" who make "exaggerated claims and demands".

The poor old C of E now finds itself between the devil and the deep blue sea. Although its more liberal wing might like to be more accommodating to lesbian and gay activities, mainly of course to remove their thorn from its side, it has its evangelical wing to contend with. So the most likely outcome, in the short term, is that it will try to walk a tightrope between the activities and the hard-liners it harbours in its midst.

The big question mark is over the long-term outcome: how far can the Church possibly go in ending its homophobia and supporting the repeal of anti-gay laws, as Outrage demands?

Unlike the Salvation Army, the C of E officially supported the law reform enacted in 1967, though not in the more recent attempts to lower the age of consent for gay men to 16. Unlike the Roman Catholic Church, which has distanced itself from such a document, to justify discrimination against lesbians and gay men, the Church of England has refrained from doing so.

It could be argued, therefore, that the C of E's homophobia is not nearly as aggressive as that of some other Christian Churches and institutions, and that it might be persuaded to back further law reforms - even partnership legislation, provided this does not include the right to a church wedding.

But what about the thinking on which its attitude to sexuality in general, and homosexual practice in particular, is based? An issue in Human Sexuality puts it: "It has been a theme of Christian tradition, ever since St Paul's words in the first chapter of Romans, to classify certain sexual activities, those of homosexuals most particularly, as being unnatural or contrary to nature."

This is the crux of the matter. Can the C of E really be expected to cast aside the Biblical teachings on sexual morality which it has adhered to since its founding, teachings moreover which all other mainstream Christian Churches, as well as the para-Christian sects, follow? I think not.

George Broadway, Secretary, Gay and Lesbian Humanist Association, Wimbledon.

Send your letters, Gay Answers and Questions to Pink Paper, 13 Harborne St, reserves the right to edit or abridge letters. All letters must be accompanied...

O UTTOMS have ended an era in which the church has been a safe haven for the gay community.

The issue of the gay community splits the church, and it is time for the church to change.

The issue is more complex than it appears, and it is time for the church to face it head-on.

It is time for the church to come to terms with the fact that it has been complicit in the harm that has been done to the gay community.

It is time for the church to take responsibility for the harm that has been done.

It is time for the church to make amends for the harm that has been done.

It is time for the church to change.

**Another View** Peter Tatchell

Outright hypocrisy

The Anglican church has decided that an attack is the best form of defence, never mind the truth. The accusations of threats and intimidation against OutRage by the Bishop of London, David Hope, are a clever diversionary tactic to deflect criticism from the hypocrisy and homophobia of the Church of England.

While our private, courteous appeal for the bishop to stop has been universally denounced, no one has uttered a word to condemn the church's vilification of lesbian and gay people. Priests in loving homosexual relationships lose the sack. The Church of England Children's Society bans lesbian and gay foster parents, denying young people the opportunity of a loving home. The Courage Trust is getting Anglican resources to "cure" homosexuals and turn them straight. Dr Hope has been complicit in this church homophobia. He has opposed an equal age of consent for gay men and has supported the Children's Society but on fostering by gay people.

If the church were not homophobic, our campaign would not be necessary. Years of polite lobbying got us nowhere. It is only since OutRage named 10 Anglican bishops last November that the church has begun a serious dialogue with the lesbian and gay community. In January, Anglican bishops held an unscripted discussion on homophobia, which resulted in one of the church's strongest condemnations of homophobic discrimination. Officials have privately admitted that none of these developments would have occurred if OutRage had not "provoked a crisis".

In addition to the 10 bishops we named, there were five others we did not name because we were privately attempting to persuade them to come out of their own free will. Two of these five have come out - Derek Read with great honesty and dignity, and David Hope, half-heartedly and with bitter reprimands.

Our combination of outing and private persuasion has worked. However, we now stand accused of behaving unfairly because we refuse to be a part of the squallid, deceitful conspiracy of silence that keeps homosexuality in public life hidden and invisible. While some may choose to hide their homosexuality, they do not have the right to demand that other lesbians and gay men collude with their deception. We have simply called on the bishops to be truthful about their sexuality.

In contrast, those who oppose our methods turn the normally cherished value of integrity upside down. They elevate collusion with a disliked person's lying and deceit into an act of high moral principle. Those of us who decide to be honest about homosexuality in public life are consigned as if truthfulness was a monstrous immorality.

Who is really acting immorally? Those who are truthful about homosexuality hypocrite and homophobia in the church? Or those protecting cloistered gay bishops who support homophobic policies that damage the lives of lesbian and gay people?

The writer is spokesman for OutRage.

Moderate gays find outing offers way in
ITEM 9: Outing is a catalyst - Peter Tatchell. 21st April, 1995.

The Outrage outing campaign has achieved more in fifteen months than the Lesbian and Gay Christian Movement has been able to achieve in 17 years, according to the secretary of the LGCYM, Richard Kirker.

Six months ago, the Anglican Church's leadership was refusing to discuss homosexual issues because policy making had failed. Outrage felt more challenging tactics were necessary.

Last November, we named ten Anglican bishops and implored them to tell the truth about their sexuality. Within two weeks, senior Church leaders began serious discussions with liberal and gay organisations for the first time. Within a month, the bishops issued one of their strongest condemnations of anti-gay discrimination.

Last week, the world conference of Anglican leaders called on the Church to rethink its policy on homosexuality, and the Archbishop of Canterbury declared that “theologically and morally, homosexuals are made in the image and likeness of God” and that society must reject homophobia.

Although the Bishop of London came out as “grey” and, unthinkably, it was nevertheless a great achievement to get the (then) third most senior bishop to admit his homosexuality was “ambiguous”. A few months earlier, such an admission may have resulted in his resignation.

Now, however, because Outrage has succeeded in making church homophobia less acceptable, the Bishop of London has been promoted to Archbishop of York.

Our plan worked like a charm. We wanted the Bishop of London to come out and for the Church to accept and support him. We created a situation where the entire Anglican leadership felt compelled to rally round the bishop and give him his official blessing.

With the Bishop of London having been accepted by the Church, this will now make it easier for other clergy to come out and make it harder for the Anglican hierarchy to take disciplinary action against them.

Already, our campaign has inspired some parish priests to come out. It has generated valuable discussions on homosexual issues in many congregations. Indeed, we got the whole country talking! None of these developments would have occurred if Outrage had not “proposed a name” in the Church by naming the bishops.

Outing has been a catalyst for social change. It has pushed the Anglican Church further towards accepting gay clergy and supporting lesbian and gay human rights. It has also put the hypocrisy and homophobia of the Establishment at the centre of public debate.

* Peter Tatchell is an activist, journalist and author.
ITEM 10: Continued.
**ITEM 11: Capital Gay - Flush out the closets sleaze committee told.** 7th April 1995.

**Flush out the closets’, sleaze committee told**

The old soldiers of lifelong and gay politics, fresh from a meeting with Stonewall last week, have turned their guns on undisclosed MFA.

A diverse yet serious coalition gathered last week to address the “impossible” sleaze committee for its secrecy and public condemnation of Peter Tatchell’s outing strategy.

Now, the gay war has taken up the question of top people’s identity with the official committee as standard in public life.

The group, led by Antony Grey, former secretary of the Homosexual Law Reform Society, have asked the High Court to release the names now, “flush out these MFA”.

**Sleaze**

Mourners, another old-timer group, the Campaign for Homosexual Equality, has solemnly joined the outing song.

The group of militant homosexuals, formed in the 1960s, has been the latest opposition to join in the attacks on Stonewall this week.

What is on the minds of the current row brewing?CHE has been so much of a whisper that being involved is being heard by a wider than usual, probably correct coalition group which is undecided.

That no-one can join Stonewall’s’ MFA statement themselves on this.

But neither was Antony Grey, an old political stalwart, ever to have to peruse the sources. The statement stated that he had “mixed with traders the idea in the mid-60s that gays should take a night out into Hyde Park and speak up for gay rights and a change in the law.

“Now even (he) is leading the present war that won’t end.”

A stale.

Letters

**Disgust at Stonewall**

Can I be the only one dis- 
gusted by Stonewall's response  
to the whole Peter Tatchell 
outing media-frenzy? I understand, of course, that Stonewall have no choice but  
to be anti-outing - their very  
existence depends on their  
eagerness to suck up to those  
in the establishment closet.  
But is it really fitting for  
members of an organisation  
supposedly committed to les-
bian and gay rights to line up  
behind the homophobes in the  
British media to savagely at- 
tack Tatchell as a "terrorist"? I  
have yet to hear them utter a 
single word against the real  
terrorists in this scenario - the  
cowards and hypocrites who  
derode the homophobic  
 teachings of the Church, and 
who routinely vote against les-
bian and gay equality.  

Paul Burton, London SW9

**Law reform a 'long 
and slow road’**

Peter Tatchell deserves to  
be defended from attacks in  
the bourgeois media. But let's 
not mistake their characterisa-
tion of him for ours. He is a  
moderate reformer who wants 
to tinker with the system a bit.  
It is a long way from lesbian 
and gay liberation but it is, in 
general, worthy enough.  
Whether his tactics of "outing" 
have serious support amongst 
lesbians and gays who would know? This, in its- 
self, is the point. For Tatchell 
changing society is all about 
pressuring individuals and  
publicity stunts.  

These things have their 
place. But for fundamental  
change to be achieved in the 
area of sexuality there is no  
 substitute the long, often 
slow, and definitely unglam-
orous work of combating dis-
 crimination in the workplace 
and the community.  

Keith Flett, London N17

**The arrogance 
of Peter Tatchell**

May I suggest that our an-
nual celebration be re-named 
in honour of Peter Tatchell 
and his great achievement in 
 forcing the Bishop of London 
 to publicly discuss the "grey 
area" of his sexuality. Gay 
Shame, Gay Self-Flaunted, but 
Pride... surely not.  

Where heterosexuals have 
 failed to diminish my Pride, 
Peter Tatchell in his breath-
taking arrogance has succeed-
ed, with his politics of fear and 
his tactics of victimisation and 
 homophobia. This society 
teaches us to hate lesbians and 
gays, and Peter seems to have 
learnt this lesson well. The big-
ots and homophobes have 
been confirmed in their preju-
dice and have been handed 
another stick to beat us with.  
Being lesbian or gay is hard 
in this ignorant society. Most 
of us have suffered in one way 
or another and it is to our en-
during credit that most of us 
 bear this with courage and dig-
ity and not a little ingenuity 
without in any way diminishing 
our integrity or our pride.  

There is a time for anger, 
 rage and frustration, and it is 
certainly time for action, but 
 our anger and frustration may 
 not be the most effective tools 
for the change we seek, the 
change we deserve.  

Beth Davies, Brighton
As OutRage claims another victim, ALLAN MASSIE deplores the skewed thinking of its campaign to force homosexuals out of the closet.

THE NAZIEST of the French Revolutionaries, the journalist Marat, boasted that "no power on earth can prevent me from seeing into features and unmasking them." Carlyle sarcastically asked how, and answered with a rhetorical question, addressed to Marat: "how superior.
Every generation is marked by a unique generation identity. Each one has its own form of oppression and resistance. What was the oppression and resistance of the previous generation? What will be the oppression and resistance of the next generation?

ITEM 13: Continued.

Terror tactics of the Tarnelli gang

Every generation is marked by a unique generation identity. Each one has its own form of oppression and resistance. What was the oppression and resistance of the previous generation? What will be the oppression and resistance of the next generation? What is the relationship between the two?

Star raps ‘blackmail by gay sex cops’

FORMER EastEnders Michael Cashman told
Peter Toshell a “moral mistake”.

The actor – who played gay Collin in the top soap – said he considered the
“outing” of homosexuals as blackmail
intimidation that achieved nothing.

He spoke out after the Bishop of Lichfield, David Hope, revealed on
Mirror that he was “ambivalent” about
left-wing morality.

The senior cleric was a target of gay activism group
Outrage, which had tried to force him to reveal his
alleged homosexuality.

Gossip

Michael, chair of gay
rights lobby group
Outright, said last night:
“I consider outing a
supreme act of moral
cowardice.

“The victim is thrown on
to a bête noire of discrimi-
nation: spied by fear,
hated and ignored.

In church,” he added, Peter
Toshell and Peter
Collins see themselves as the sex
police of the gay world.

“How dare they? Espe-
ically when they are reply-
ning on half-truths, gossip
and half-truth chatter.”

**We are all outraged**

ANY FORM of blackmail is evil. The way in which Peter Tatchell, the leader of the militant homosexual group OutRage, pressured the Bishop of London, Dr David Hoyle, into making public his “ambiguous” sexuality seems to have been carefully calculated to avoid falling foul of the law. But no one reading Mr Tatchell’s letter to the bishop — claiming that the group had “a lot of detailed information about your personal life” which it had chosen not to publish in the “sincerity” that he would voluntarily declare himself homosexual — can be in any doubt about the vile intentions of OutRage and its leader.

This is, of course, not the first time that Church leaders have been subject to intimidation. MPs too may face the threat of ‘outing’ — the pernicious practice of claiming, perhaps on the basis of little more than hearsay, that prominent figures are homosexual. It is doubtful whether the Bishop of London should have deigned to reply to Mr Tatchell’s letter. OutRage and its ilk are best treated with contempt. They appear impervious to reason, and likely to interpret any attempt to deal civilly with them as a sign of weakness. But it is greatly to Dr Hoyle’s credit that in his reply, he called OutRage’s bluff, revealing not only details of his own self-disciplined sexuality, but also the modus operandi of his tormentors.

Mr Tatchell, while acknowledging that the bishop has shown “private kindness and understanding to gay clergy”, sought to justify OutRage’s action by claiming that “the time for purely private acts of goodness is past”. That is cant. “Outing” is a monstrous invasion of privacy; no more nor less.

Homosexuals should be particularly sensitive to any attempt to embarrass or humiliate individuals by exposing their sexual orientation. But OutRage, like all single-issue fanatics, appears to believe that any means which might advance its cause is justified. Most homosexuals must be horrified by its activities. In this country today they do not, by and large, suffer from overt hostility. Nothing could be better calculated to diminish public tolerance than OutRage’s campaign of threats and intimidation against the Church.

The Bishop of London’s personal conduct has been a model of dignity, but the Church as an institution cannot escape all blame in this matter. While still officially teaching the sinfulness of homosexuality, it has shown itself unwilling squarely to address the issue of homosexual clergy, and thus laid itself open to persecution by the likes of OutRage, and to unease among the large numbers of lay Christians who cannot reconcile themselves — rightly, in our view — to the acceptability of practising homosexuals as clergy.

But while the Church may be guilty of muddle and moral vacillations, OutRage’s behaviour is nothing less than homosexual terrorism.
ITEM 16: Capital Gay - Gay vets slam Stonewall over outing row. 31st March, 1995

Gay vets slam Stonewall over ‘outing’ row

THE gay community’s old soldiers came out to defend Peter Tatchell this week — and to condemn the “deplorable” attacks on him by Stonewall.

Led by veteran activist Anthony Grey, founder of the Campaign for Homosexual Equality, a group of eleven seasoned campaigners have written an open letter expressing support for the OutRage activist and dismissing “the current fad” of the Westminster-based lobby group.

They accuse Stonewall of using media opportunities presented by the ‘outing’ row to “shame up the closet” instead of trying to raise public awareness of prejudice and discrimination. The letter is published in full on page 2.

The veterans, who claim to have 200 years’ experience of activism between them, include George Broadhead of the Gay and Lesbian Humanist Association, Dudley Cole of the Bereave-ment Project; Maureen Colquhoun, the Labour MP who lost her seat after being ousted as a lesbian; Jan Dunn of Outright Scotland; journalist and media correspondent Terry Sanders and Dr. Elizabeth Stuart, author of the Catholic Prayer Book.

Publication of their protest has exposed long-running antagonisms between the signatories and continued page 3

the lobby group.

Grey, for example, is known to have been angry that he was not invited by Stonewall to take a more active part in last year’s age of consent campaign.

But chief target of the signatories’ wrath is the group’s chair, actor Michael Cashman, who caused fury when he took part in a debate on ‘outing’ with Tatchell two weeks ago on Radio Four’s PM programme.

The debate ended in a slanging match after Cashman made a personal attack on Tatchell.

“People were disgusted by it. They felt Peter was being got at,” Grey told Capital Gay.

“Peter has been under the most enormous pressure and there is a serious risk that he could become ill or destablised by personal attacks on him are contemptible.”

Public figures who are gay have a duty to come out, he added.

Angela Mason, Stonewall’s executive director, said the lobby group wanted to criticise ‘outing’ as a political strategy.

“We have used every opportunity to emphasise the importance of coming out voluntarily because that is the most effective way of challenging discrimination,” she said.

“One bishop coming out is worth twenty who are published out. ‘Outing’ detracts from the process of coming out. There are deep divisions with the lesbian and gay community over ‘outing’ and we shouldn’t spend the next ten months arguing about it instead of tackling discrimination.”

Tatchell readers’ poll

result: page 13

C.H.E.

Reply to letter from

(30/11/94) 15/11/94

Dear David,

Thank you for your letter of the 26th October, which I received today. I feel I should make a few points clearer and try to explain our group's attitude towards Outrage.

I am glad to hear that Sebastian Simons is not one of your members, and would hope that, having identified him as a "loose cannon," you would dissociate yourselves from his allegations and you would tell the Guardian so. However, it seems that you oppose his action; so I had better say a little more about why I do not.

- CHE does not agree with "outing" under any circumstances.
- I have been given to believe that the allegation is highly improbable by the convenor of Cambridge Ethical Group, Christian Harms, and
- by Director of Communications, Mr. Abrahams.
- I would not expect an elderly, sickly monk to reply to the allegations, so I do not think that "silence is golden" applies in this case.

Our group discussed its attitude towards Outrage at its 6th Annual Exceptional General Meeting (12/1/1994); we felt that Outrage was genuinely unethical and not prepared unconditionally to support its action. It is clear that as regard "outing" we have a major, technical difference of opinion. We also seem to have a major difference of opinion about the leader of England: Cambridge College regards the C. of E. as a discreditable organisation, not as a contemptible enemy. We believe that if the C. of E. addressed the general population on moral issues of sexual morality, we would not feel to engage in debate with it, but we see no reason for continuing this form of defence.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Stamp]
Outrage has always pride[d] itself on being the leading ver[i]sible of gay activism, but the recent furor about putting out some campaigns has pro-voked order[s] to distance them-selves from the direct-action group.

It is, in fact, one of the more remarkable that respected figures in the history of the lesbian and gay rights movement, including Jackie Forest, Ian Dunn and Terry Sanderson, have voiced wholehearted support for Peter Tatchell (see front story and letter, below).

Tony Grey, one of the signatories, spent over ten years in research and parliamentary lobbying in an effort to legalise sexual acts between men over the age of 21. It seems curious that Grey calls the Stonewall Group, which works within the same tradition, “despicable” in its recent condemnation of Outrage.

“Tatchell has raised the issue of homophobia and gay rights to a much higher level than ever before,” said Grey. “But Stonewall are playing ‘Uncle Tom’ to the press, and using access of media coverage to attack Peter instead of homophobia in politics and the Church. I’m amazed at the arrogance with which they lack of progress since the par-tial decriminalisation of gay sex in 1967. Many of them are highly critical of the failure to achieve an equal age of consent.

“The tactics of lobbying and quiet persuasion were useful in the 50s, when the closet was still necessary, but not now. Anyone with self-respect should come out, with Out-}

At odds: Outrage’s Peter Tatchell and Stonewall’s Angela Mason represent opposing strategies

canic approaches to cultural and legislative change which have characterised sexual rights ac-tivism throughout the 20th century. The dividing question is whether homosexuality presents a radical challenge to society, or whether it can be accommodated within existing ideology by simply changing a few rules and adjusting a few

difference. All the debate he-ritage is good and has plumbed into the key issues of privacy and integrity.”

In the past the two groups have shared a mutually respectful relationship, each indicating the necessity for the other’s existence. So why has Stonewall and the Labour Party signed the recent Early Day Motion condemning in-trusion into privacy. The last thing New Labour needs is the press reminding the public of the “loony Left”.

The media focus on outing has made the question of who represents the public face of homosexuality a crucial matter for lesbians and gay men.

Stonewall wants to represent the most respectable face, but is it effective? Supporters of Outrage argue that its tactics are raising powerful closet doors.

Stonewall, of course, has for six years privately consulted closeted MPs, trying to persuade them not necessarily to be honest about their sexuality, but to back, at least quietly, anti-homophobic legislation. These critics argue that Stonewall has made little progress.

Lesbian and gay campaign-ers who have already changed history are saying that the anti-establishment approach of Outrage has for the first time forced the issue of gay rights into the mainstream debate of Britain. Maybe, they say, the time is right to stop wasting in the lobbies and embrace a more radical agenda.
ITEM 19: Carey slaps down gay rights claims. 1st May, 1995

Archbishop denies plans to ordain homosexuals or accept ‘marriages’

Carney slaps down gay rights claims

By ANTHONY DORAN

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has dealt a major blow to the ambitions of gay activists.

Dr George Carey strongly denied campaigners’ claims that the Church of England bishops were about to approve the ordination of practising homosexuals.

He also insisted that there were no plans to treat marriage and same-sex relationships as equal.

It was Dr Carey’s toughest statement yet on the issue and came as gay campaigners were holding an enormous rally. Only a few hours earlier, Peter Tatchell, leader of the homosexual-pressure group OutLoud, boasted that the group had ‘unleashed the tides’ on Church leaders.

In a speech to a gay Christian conference in East London, he threw down the gauntlet to Dr Carey. Tatchell said it was a ‘great achievement’ to get the Bishop of London, David Hope, who ranks third in the Church hierarchy, to admit six years ago that his sexuality was ‘ambiguous’.

Any hint of anti-gay policy by the Church would now be

Lesbians spray professor pink

GAY militants attacked a controversial psychiatrist who says homosexuality is a curable mental illness.

They stormed a college where Professor Charles Socarides was lecturing and sprayed him with pink foam.

He had to be rescued by security guards before police removed 20 activists – calling themselves ‘Gay Gone Mad’ — from Regent’s Park College, London. They claimed that his research was ‘part of a political war against the gay community’.

But Professor Socarides, 73, whose son is a homosexual, said that the militants were trying to silence scientific discourse.

He said later he continued with his lecture and added: ‘It was very useful to the students who had not heard some of the views expressed’.

Professor Socarides, of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York, is due to give several lectures about his theories in London.

Astonburgh’s disruption came after homosexual activists prevented him from delivering a lecture to the Association of Psychosurgical Psychotherapy in the NHS.
ITEM 20: Photo of General Synod.