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Protest Movements in the 1970s: The Long 1960s

Many histories of the American 1960s have centred on a dramatic tale of rise and fall. According to this narrative, the decade began with hopeful idealism — symbolized by the student sit-ins, the rhetoric of the Port Huron Statement (founding manifesto of the New Left), and John F. Kennedy's call to service. It reached its apogee in mid-decade with the Mississippi Freedom Summer, the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, and Lyndon Johnson's electoral landslide. Then, in the context of an escalating and bitterly divisive war in Vietnam and growing social dislocation at home, the idealism curdled into disillusionment and despair. The year 1968 — which witnessed the assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy, and the riot at the Democratic Party's national convention in Chicago — marks the symbolic end of 'the sixties': with the New Left and civil rights movements in decline and mired in factionalism, the liberal consensus unravelling, and Richard Nixon triumphant. The strains of 'We Shall Overcome' were displaced by cries of 'Burn, Baby, Burn'. When set alongside this 'brash, bruising blockbuster of a decade' with its 'passion, grandeur and tragedy', the 1970s have often seemed anticlimactic.

Historian Bruce Schulman has noted that 'most Americans regard the Seventies as ... eminently forgettable... an era of bad clothes, bad hair, and bad music impossible to take seriously'.

In recent years scholars have challenged this master narrative and its implicit 'good sixties/bad sixties' dichotomy. They have focused on local organizing, broadened out the chronology of 1960s social movements and political developments, and emphasized similarities, rather than differences, between the
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1960s and the decades that bookend them. This article explores two protest movements that were prominent during the 1970s—the struggle for gay rights, and the campaigns against the use of busing as a means to effect school desegregation. These movements tend to be analyzed separately and portrayed very differently. The former is often compared with earlier struggles for equal rights on the part of America's oppressed, and seen as drawing on the radical political tradition that emerged during the 1960s. The anti-busing struggle, in contrast, is usually viewed as symbolizing the new politics of 'backlash', exemplifying the strength of conservative grassroots organizing that augured the rise of the New Right. Although persuasive, this analysis overlooks significant similarities between the two movements. In important ways anti-busing campaigners drank from the same well of 1960s activism as gay rights protesters, even as they railed against the perceived 'excesses' of the so-called 'Age of Aquarius'. Both movements drew on modes of activism, styles of protest, political rhetoric and ideology that were de rigueur within 1960s freedom movements. Despite occupying very different positions on the political spectrum, activists in both movements were, each in their own way, children of the 1960s.

While the Stonewall Riot of 28 June 1969 is often seen as marking the start of the gay liberation struggle, the modern gay rights movement had important roots in the immediate postwar years. Emerging from the new, urban gay subculture that had been forged during the war against fascism, the homophile movement of the 1950s and early 1960s helped to lay the basis for future advances. This nascent gay rights movement was based around organizations such as the Mattachine Society, the Society for Individual Rights, the Daughters of Bilitis, and the Council on Religion and the Homosexual. These groups and activists worked to challenge the medical model that defined homosexuality as a 'sickness', provided social services to gay men and women, challenged discrimination, and helped foster a vibrant gay cultural life in many of America's major cities.
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The aftermath of the Stonewall riot — in which patrons of the Greenwich Village bar had fought back during a police raid — witnessed an explosion in gay organizing. By the end of July 1969, activists in New York had formed the Gay Liberation Front, while other groups began to spring up in cities and on campuses across the nation.9 The emergence of gay newspapers, speakers’ bureaus, telephone helplines, churches, sports teams, and bookstores signalled a flowering of gay culture and political activism. Whereas 50 gay organizations had existed in 1969, there were more than 800 just four years later, and tens of thousands of gays and lesbians became actively involved in the gay rights movement. This impressive growth was possible in part because activists were able to draw upon organizations, networks and resources that had been created and nurtured during the 1950s and 1960s. Rather than a decisive break, Stonewall marked the movement’s evolution from a ‘thinly spread reform effort’ into a ‘large, grassroots movement for liberation’.10

During the subsequent decade the gay rights movement won a number of important victories. New allies, such as the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Organization for Women, and the American Bar Association, offered their support. In 1973 the American Psychological Association removed homosexuality from its list of mental disorders. Two years later the Civil Service Commission ended its blanket ban on employing homosexuals. By 1976, 17 states had repealed their laws prohibiting sodomy.11

In 1968, 14 years after its historic decision in Brown v. Board of Education that segregated schools were ‘inherently unconstitutional’, the United States Supreme Court moved to bring an end to the tokenism, obfuscation and delay that had prevented meaningful integration from taking place.12 In Green v. County School Board, the nine justices ruled that school boards had an ‘affirmative duty’ to take steps to ensure that segregation was ‘eliminated root and branch’. Moreover, they declared, school boards had to produce realistic plans for desegregation that promised to ‘work now’.13 In 1971, in Swann v.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, the Supreme Court upheld large-scale busing as a means to achieve integration and stated that school boards would be judged on whether they had managed to achieve 'the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation'.

Beginning first in the South before moving north and west, busing — whether initiated by local school boards or mandated by the courts — was used as a tool with which to desegregate the nation’s schools. Busing, and especially 'two-way' busing (which involved the transfer of white children in addition to assigning black children to previously predominantly white schools), proved extremely controversial. Indeed, in numerous places where it was instigated, whites resisted by marching, petitioning and withdrawing their children from the public schools, or moving to unaffected suburbs. Sometimes the protests became violent. In Lamar, South Carolina, in March 1970, a mob of 200 whites attacked two school buses that were transporting black students to a newly desegregated school. A Newsweek report described how 'the whites broke through police lines and swarmed over the buses, smashing windows and ripping out ignition wires' as the terrified black passengers 'ducked behind seats and dived to the floor as rocks and clubs crashed through the windows'. As J. Harvie Wilkinson, a historian of school desegregation, has commented, the seemingly innocuous yellow school bus became the 'flash point of domestic policy in the early 1970s', as busing 'rubbed the raw nerve endings of American life'.

Boston, with its tightly demarcated ethnic enclaves and fiercely parochial neighborhoods, generated the nation's most virulent and most violent opposition to the busing of students to bring about school desegregation. The city's public school system was highly segregated — in 1972-3 over 80 per cent of African American pupils attended majority-black schools, and more than half were enrolled at schools that were 90 per cent black. This was despite passage of the state's Racial Imbalance Law in 1965, which had been designed to eliminate such segregation. Indeed, the Boston School Board's delaying tactics had actually seen segregation in the school system increase during the intervening years. In June 1973 Federal Judge Arthur W. Garrity ordered the city to desegregate its schools, and devised a comprehensive plan which involved the busing of some 18,000 students (almost half of them white) in order to achieve this. With the city's middle-class suburbs unaffected by the ruling, the white burden fell disproportionately on working-class and lower-middle-class Bostonians. Most controversially, Garrity's plan paired South Boston High

School, embodiment of the area’s working-class Irish heritage, with Roxbury High, a school that was situated in the heart of Boston’s black ghetto. This was an incendiary decision that, perhaps unsurprisingly, proved a ‘social and political disaster’. Between 1974 and 1976 Boston saw mass rallies, arrests, brawls, vandalism and incidents of serious violence. It was, in the words of one historian, a ‘national tragedy of the first rank’. A central characteristic of the 1960s was the widespread use of direct-action forms of protest: tactics that were pioneered and deployed with tremendous success by the civil rights movement. Both the gay rights and anti-busing movements drew heavily on this activist tradition. During the mid-1960s the nascent gay rights movement had adopted direct-action tactics for the first time. In the spring of 1965 activists in Philadelphia staged sit-ins and a series of demonstrations at a Dewey’s restaurant on 17th Street to protest: its refusal to serve homosexuals, eventually securing an end to discriminatory treatment. Between April and August 1965 a series of public protests were held in Washington, DC, New York, and Philadelphia. On 4 July, for example, about 40 activists demonstrated outside Independence Hall, carrying placards that declared ‘Homosexual Citizens Want: Equality Before the Law’, and ‘We Want: Equal Treatment By Our Fellow Citizens’. Known as the annual ‘Reminder’, Independence Day demonstrations were held in Philadelphia until

19 Formisano, Boston Against Busing, op. cit., 70.
1969. In Los Angeles, following a police raid in the early hours of 1 January 1967 on the Black Cat, a popular gay bar on Sunset Boulevard, activists launched a series of demonstrations and pickets to protest police harassment of homosexuals. Direct action, especially marches, sit-ins, and other forms of public protest, became more prominent after the Stonewall Riot of June 1969; such activities often involved thousands, rather than dozens, of people. In New York City on 28 June 1970 perhaps as many as 5000 took part in a ‘raucous, fun-filled march’ in order to demonstrate ‘the new strength and pride of gay people’. The marchers, holding ‘bright red, green, purple and yellow silk banners’, walked in the warm sunshine along the Avenue of the Americas to Sheep Meadow in Central Park for a ‘gay-in’, chanting ‘Gay Power Now’ and ‘Say It Loud: Gay and Proud’. This march, which commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall, launched a tradition of annual gay pride events across the United States. By the decade’s end, the gay movement was able to mobilize some 100,000 for the first national March on Washington for Gay and Lesbian Rights, held on 14 October 1979.

The anti-busing activists of the 1970s also used direct-action tactics — holding rallies and marches, launching petition drives, and deploying other, more inventive forms of protest. In July 1975, for example, 34 demonstrators led by Boston anti-busing leader Louise Day Hicks held a sleep-in at the Boston Sheraton, which was hosting the national conference of mayors. That September, in a protest that echoed the Berkeley antiwar activists who had lain in front of troop trains, a group of anti-busing protesters lay down in front of trucks that were distributing the allegedly pro-busing Boston Globe. In December, 50 activists staged a sit-in at the offices of the state’s congressmen at the Federal Building. Marches, rallies, sit-ins, drive-ins and boycotts also took place in Canarsie, New York, Charlotte, North Carolina, Corpus Christi, Texas, Richmond, Virginia, and Wilmington, Delaware.
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The influence here of 1960s protest movements, and especially the civil rights struggle, is clear. At a February 1965 meeting of the gay rights organization New York Mattachine, for example, the group’s president, Julian Hodges, urged his members to ‘be as militant as other minorities and force the public to face honestly our just claims to equal treatment’. A report in the Mattachine Newsletter, meanwhile, explained that ‘other social protest movements’ had shown that direct action was ‘a potent means both of reaching the public and effecting social change’. Protesters outside the Stonewall Inn in June 1969, meanwhile, used slogans that appeared to be lifted directly from the African American freedom struggle. At a demonstration that took place the night after the riot, several thousand protesters in Christopher Park called for ‘Gay Power’ and chanted ‘We Want Freedom Now’. The civil rights movement’s influence continued to be felt well into the 1970s. On Saturday 20 May 1978, for example, a ‘Freedom Ride’ was staged in New York City by Lesbian Feminist Liberation (LBL) and the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Rights (CLGR). The protest, self-consciously modelled on the Congress of Racial Equality’s 1961 challenge to segregated interstate transportation facilities in the South, was designed to generate support for a proposed municipal gay civil rights bill. About 45 ‘freedom riders’ chartered a bus and travelled to Brooklyn and the Bronx, where they ‘staffed information tables, distributed leaflets, collected signatures on petitions... and discussed lesbian and gay rights with the public’. In the Bronx, the gay and lesbian activists were especially keen to emphasize the issue of ‘minority civil rights’. Many of those who joined the gay rights movement during the 1970s were veterans of 1960s social movements. John O’Brien, Jim Fouratt, and Martha Shelley — who helped found the GLF — had all been active within the New Left. Morris Kight, who founded Los Angeles GLF in December 1969, had organized high-profile demonstrations against the Dow Chemical Company, which manufactured napalm, while Kiyoichi Kuromiya of Philadelphia’s GLF had been involved in both the civil rights movement (participating in protests in Maryland and Alabama) and the antiwar movement. Moreover, the grow-
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ing militancy of the later 1960s had an important influence on the gay rights movement. In early 1969, for example, the leaders of Philadelphia’s Homophile Action League called on gays and lesbians to follow the example of the ‘black, the poor, and the student’ — who had ‘been actively confronting the systems which deny and demean them’ — by joining the ‘age of revolution’.77 New York’s GLF was rooted firmly in the late 1960s cultural and political milieu. Its name was modelled on South Vietnam’s National Liberation Front, it pledged solidarity with the Black Panther Party and the antiwar movement, and it called for revolutionary change. The organization’s founding statement, for example, declared that ‘Babylon has forced us to commit ourselves to one thing — revolution!’38

Anti-busing activists drew similarly on the example of the civil rights and other 1960s protest movements.39 In Charlotte, North Carolina, during the 1969–70 school crisis, Don Roberson, a local physician who was vice-chairman of the Concerned Parents Association, explained that the ‘silent majority’ was ‘about ready to take to the streets with tactics that have seemed to work so effectively for the vocal minority groups’.40 Writing in 1978, Boston activist and journalist Sal Giarratani drew a direct parallel between anti-busing protesters and the anti-Vietnam War movement. He explained that ‘The Anti-War Movement took a stand against the Vietnam War because they felt obliged to do so. So too with the Anti-Busers is forced busing opposed’.41 But it was the civil rights movement that was used more frequently by busing opponents to justify their cause. In Boston, for example, anti-busing leaders invoked the black struggle when promoting civil disobedience — pointing out that Martin Luther King, Jr, had risen to prominence ‘because he taught his followers to resort to civil disobedience . . . to refuse to honor or obey laws they considered to be unfair [and] unreasonable’, and urging opponents of busing to ‘take a leaf out of Martin Luther King’s book’.42 In March 1975 anti-busers even sought to replicate the August 1963 March on Washington.43 The language of the black movement was also co-opted — in Richmond, for example, Citizens Against Busing, which organized rallies, drive-ins and boycotts, claimed that
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white southerners were being treated as 'second-class citizens'.

Meanwhile, in one of history's ironies, 'We Shall Overcome', the iconic anthem of the black freedom struggle, was sung at anti-busing protests in several American cities, including Boston and Charlotte.

Many of the gay rights and anti-busing demonstrations that took place in the 1970s revealed a considerable debt to the countercultural activism and street theatre tactics that had become increasingly prominent during the second half of the 1960s. At the major anti-Vietnam War demonstration of 21 October 1967, for instance, countercultural activists Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin had attempted to levitate the Pentagon 300 feet in the air, where, they claimed, it would take on an orange glow and vibrate as the demon of war was exorcised. A few months earlier, Hoffman had caused chaos at the New York Stock Exchange when he threw fistfuls of dollar bills onto the trading floor. Hoffman also testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities while wearing the uniform of a soldier from the Revolutionary War. The 'zap', which became a central tactic of the Gay Activists Alliance — the most important gay rights organization of the early 1970s — was influenced by these earlier protests. Indeed, GLF founder Jim Fouratt, who went on to work with the GAA, was a close friend of Abbie Hoffman and has been credited with coming up with the idea for the Stock Exchange protest. Described by one historian as looking like a 'countercultural Billy the Kid' with his moustache, long blond hair and shiny leather pants, Fouratt and his GAA co-founders helped to bring a sense of theatricality to the heart of the gay rights movement's direct-action strategy. Used to confront public officials, force politicians to take stands, generate publicity, and empower homosexuals, 'zaps' could be colorful, humorous events, and they often provided excellent copy for news journalists. In the autumn of 1970, GAA members occupied the offices of Harper's Magazine, staging an impromptu tea party, after the magazine ran a cover story that condemned homosexuality as 'an affront to our rationality'. In early 1971, after Vincent Gillen, president of New York investigative agency Fidelfacts, boasted that his company was efficient in alerting clients that individuals were homosexual on the basis that 'if one looks like a duck, walks like a duck, associates only with ducks and quacks like a duck, he is...
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probably a duck', the GAA quickly arranged a zap. Sixty-five activists held a ‘quack-in’ outside the company’s headquarters in Times Square, where 12 activists dressed in giant duck costumes waddled, flapped their wings, and quacked for the cameras. Countercultural activism was not restricted to the GAA. In August 1968, following a raid on The Patch, a gay bar in Los Angeles, a group of activists had marched to a flower shop, purchased ‘all the gladioli, mums, carnations, roses, and daisies (but not pansies)’ and delivered several huge bouquets to officers at the nearby police station. Nor was cultural politics limited to the staging of entertaining stunts. The GAA used its ‘Firehouse’ headquarters in SoHo to host dances, cabarets, consciousness-raising sessions, and film shows, while Philadelphia’s GLF arranged social activities in coffee shops and organized dances. Such activities were reflective of a broader 1960s trend to utilize culture as part of the social and political struggle.

Street theatre was also deployed by anti-busing forces. An October 1970 ‘Fathers’ March’ in Mobile saw protesters carrying caskets labeled ‘Freedom of Choice’ and ‘Neighborhood Schools’. A boy aged 14 ‘played [the funeral revelle] Taps as the caskets were placed on the steps of the Federal Building’. A popular tactic in Boston was to hold large, loud convoys as an expression of community solidarity. In South Boston, on the afternoon of Sunday 15 September 1974, for example, ‘hundreds of people gathered on street corners as a horn-honking procession of cars from other sections, led by a hearse, drove through in an expression of solidarity’. Boston also saw anti-busing forces co-opt the antiwar slogan ‘Hell, no! We won’t go’, and T-shirts bearing the slogan ‘Hell, No, Southie Won’t Go’ became fixtures at local anti-busing rallies. In a further reflection of the 1960s influence, police in both Boston and Louisville were subjected to the ‘pig’ epi-


that by anti-busing protesters. All this was not lost on perceptive contemporary observers. As one Indianapolis resident, Charles A. Modernne, explained in a letter to Time Magazine, 'during the antiwar years, protesters were called subversives and Commies for speaking out against the Viet Nam War and turning the American flag upside down.' But now 'those people who supported that . . . war (silent majority, etc.) are out protesting busing, burning buses, turning cars and the American flag over'.

For many commentators, the 1960s stand as a turning point: a moment when many on the left, fuelled by bitterness and despair over America's war in Vietnam, abandoned an Americanism that they viewed as inherently flawed. In its place they extolled ethnic and sexual difference and embraced a rhetorical anti-Americanism. As the writer Julius Lester noted in 1970, 'American radicals are perhaps the first radicals anywhere who have sought to make a revolution in a country which they hate.' Nevertheless, at a time when the nation was preparing to celebrate the bicentenary of its birth, both the gay rights and anti-busing movements sought to ground their protests in patriotism; and both appealed to the nation's founding ideals when advancing their cause.

During the second half of the 1960s the gay rights movement adopted Americanism as a central weapon of protest. In July 1965, at the first open meeting of Mattachine Midwest, the group's president, Robert Sloane, linked the struggle for gay rights with the Revolutionary struggle for liberty and Abraham Lincoln's appeal, at Gettysburg, for Americans to continue the founders' 'unfinished work'. Sloane concluded, 'We have an appointment with destiny in our generation, just as the patriots of 1776 had in theirs.' Appeals to American principles also played a fundamental part in the early direct-action protests. At the 1965 demonstration in Philadelphia, for instance, the ECHO coalition (East Coast Homophile Organizations) called for a large turnout as a means of urging 'the United States government to implement all the provisions of the Bill of Rights for all citizens, including homosexuals'. They pointed out that the closing of gay bars was a denial of the right to free assembly and that the criminalization of homosexuality was a denial of the 'right to the pursuit of happiness'. In her report of the demonstration in the Daughters of Bilitis' The Ladder, Kay Lahanas declared that 'this dignified protest, which startled many a citizen into fresh thought about the meaning of
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Independence Day, might well have been applauded by our Founding Fathers. 64

The emergence of the gay liberation movement in 1969 has sometimes led historians to focus too heavily on discontinuities between the pre- and post-Stonewall eras. But despite the appearance in 1969–70 of organizations and activists that used militant, sometimes revolutionary rhetoric (the GLF for instance denounced the ‘dirty, vile, fucked-up capitalist conspiracy’), appeals to Americanism retained an important place in the movement’s tactical armoury. 65 Kiyoshi Kuromiya of Philadelphia’s GLF may have attacked what he termed America’s ‘sexist, racist, hateful society’ and pledged to challenge the ‘Protestant ethic, apple pie and Mother’, but his group’s founding statement also declared that ‘Our fight against homosexual oppression is one with the revolutionary struggle of all oppressed people for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness’. 66 The constitution of the GAA, meanwhile, demanded that homosexuals ‘be the bearers of social and political rights which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States’. 67 According to journalists Dudley Clendinen and Adam Nagourney, the ‘grand sweeping language’ of the GAA constitution was ‘deliberately, almost presumptuously, evocative of the Bill of Rights’. 68

Perhaps the most prominent gay rights leader to emerge during the 1970s was Harvey Milk. Milk, a former supporter of the conservative Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater, had become involved in gay rights activism shortly after moving to San Francisco from New York in 1972. He was elected to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (city council) in 1977 at his third attempt, and quickly formed an effective alliance with the liberal Mayor George Moscone. 69 In 1978 Milk led the counter-attack against attempts by conservatives to undermine the progress that had been made on gay rights (such as Anita Bryant’s crusade against equality laws in Miami, and State Senator John Briggs’s attempt to exclude homosexuals from teaching in California’s schools). 70 On 25 June 1978 Milk delivered the keynote speech at the annual Gay Freedom Day parade. Speaking before a crowd of 250,000 outside San Francisco City Hall, Milk expertly wove demands for gay rights
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into a wider framework that emphasized America's historic commitment to liberty and equality:

Let me remind you what America is. Listen carefully.

On the Statue of Liberty it says: 'Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.' In the Declaration of Independence it is written: 'All men are created equal and they are endowed with certain inalienable rights.' And in our National Anthem it says: 'Oh, say does that star-spangled banner yet wave o'er the land of the free.' For Mr Briggs and Mrs Bryant ... and all the bigots out there: That's what America is. No matter how hard you try, you cannot erase those words from the Declaration of Independence. No matter how hard you try, you cannot chip those words from the base of the Statue of Liberty. And no matter how hard you try you cannot sing the 'Star Spangled Banner' without those words.71

Anti-busing activists, meanwhile, attempted to portray theirs as a 'red, white, and blue' struggle rather than a 'black and white' one.72 The movement's leaders sought to define the terms of the debate in a way that demonstrated that they were standing up for quintessentially American ideals (liberty, freedom and justice), while busing itself was 'un-American'. At a meeting of the Mobile School Board on 23 July 1969 to discuss school desegregation, for example, W. B. 'Bill' Westbrook declared, 'We are willing to go to jail by hundreds if necessary to back our wishes and demands for freedom-of-choice.' 'This', he said, 'is what America was founded upon and we ... will settle for nothing less.' Westbrook, one of the city's leading anti-busing activists, concluded, 'This is still America, we are still free, and we intend to remain free.'73

In March 1970 some 1,500 parents crammed into Nashville's War Memorial Auditorium for an anti-busing rally. There, they heard council member Casey Jenkins, a leading opponent of busing, denounce it as an 'ugly creature' that was 'unconstitutional ... [and] deprives us of our freedom of expression, of our freedom of choice, of our property rights and our civil rights'.74

The anti-busing movement's allegiance to patriotic dissent can be seen clearly in the numerous public protests that were staged. In Charlotte, North Carolina, for example, a major rally was held at the county fairgrounds to the north of the city on Tuesday 8 September 1970: the day before the new school year, and the city's comprehensive busing plan, were to start. The rally opened with prayer and the playing of both 'Dixie' and 'The Star-Spangled Banner'. A New York Times reporter noted that the cheering crowd of 10,000 was told that it was their 'patriotic as well as their strategic duty to peacefully disrupt the busing plan by keeping their children home'. Dressed in red, white, and blue, Jane Scott, the wife of CPA Vice-Chairman Jack Scott, declared that she
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believed busing violated the Constitution and that she would therefore be keeping her sons at home. She then closed the rally by leading the crowd 'in a rousing version of “God Bless America”'.

Given its prominent role in the American Revolution, it was perhaps inevitable that Boston, the 'cradle of liberty', provided the richest evidence of anti-busing's engagement with Americanism. US flags, the singing of 'God Bless America', and recitations of the Pledge of Allegiance were all commonplace at the numerous rallies that took place during 1974–6. One of the largest demonstrations took place on Monday, 9 September 1974, shortly before the city's busing plan came into effect. Between eight and ten thousand assembled on Boston Common, before marching to City Hall Plaza for a rally. One reporter described a 'forest of American flags', with speakers making 'many references to Constitutional rights — nothing very specific. The Constitution means the government is not supposed to tell you what to do — it's a free country.' Another noted that 'several women wore small flags or tea bags in their high, sprayed hair-dos as protest symbols'. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited several times, with particular emphasis being placed on the final two words of the phrase 'with liberty and justice for all'.

Louise Day Hicks, whose political odyssey had taken her from the Boston School Board to the US House of Representatives and Boston City Council, has been described as the 'Mother Superior' of anti-busing. Hicks was consistent in her attempts to portray the busing protests as a form of patriotic dissent. Testifying before Congress in 1972, for instance, she explained that America was the 'land of the free' and argued that court-ordered busing was 'certainly never intended by the Bill of Rights'. Four years later, she urged her fellow Bostonians to travel to Washington, DC, on 24 April, for a planned anti-busing march and rally. Writing in the Boston News Digest, an anti-busing publication, Hicks couched her call in patriotic language. Pointing out that the 'Monday preceding the march and rally is, of course, Patriot's Day here in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts', she stated that there was 'no greater way to honor the 201st Anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, than
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for the modern-day besieged patriots of the City of Boston' to participate in the Washington protest. août, Eugene L. Notkin saluted anti-busing activists in a letter published in the Boston Herald American. Notkin claimed that those who opposed busing were 'no less heroes than those patriots who resisted the tyranny of King George III'.

The 1960s influence on the gay rights and anti-busing movements was not simply a matter of tactical approach, style and rhetoric: the decade also provided an important ideological legacy. Among the more significant ideas to emerge from the 1960s New Left and civil rights movements were the insistence that the 'personal' was 'political', the advocacy of 'participatory democracy' (defined in the Port Huron Statement as the notion that the individual should 'share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life'), and 'identity politics' as a basis for organizing. These ideas remained important throughout the 1970s and influenced both the gay rights movement and the struggles against busing.

The transformation in the meaning of 'coming out' symbolized the gay rights movement's embrace of the personal as political. Previously, it had 'signified the private decision to accept one's homosexual desires and to acknowledge one's sexual identity' to other homosexuals. In the post-Stonewall era, however, 'coming out' came to symbolize the 'shedding of self-hatred', promised psychological and spiritual rebirth, and became the basis of political organizing. In his 1969 tract 'A Gay Manifesto', former Students for a Democratic Society activist and labor organizer Carl Wittman explained that 'if we are liberated, we are open with our sexuality... Being open is the foundation of freedom.' In similar vein to second-wave feminism, the gay rights movement utilized consciousness-raising sessions as a path to personal transformation and political mobilization grounded in authenticity.

Both the gay rights movement and the anti-busing struggle took seriously the civil rights and New Left's maxim of effecting participatory democracy by building social and political movements from the bottom up. They therefore placed significant emphasis on local communities as the focus for organizing. The gay rights movement worked to establish alternative institutions such as bookshops, churches, and newspapers, for example, and retained a strong commitment to activism at the local level. Campaigns to introduce municipal
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anti-discrimination laws, running candidates for local office, working for progressive community policing, and activism based around gay bars were central features of gay rights organizing throughout the 1970s. In New York, for example, the GAA lobbied the City Council to pass ‘Intro 475’, a bill designed to extend to homosexuals existing protection in the fields of employment, housing and public accommodations by amending the city’s Human Rights Act to include discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation. They also organized against police entrapment and harassment, and campaigned against State Liquor Authority discrimination in the granting of licenses to gay bars.

Among the anti-busing forces, the championing of neighborhood schools and the defence of local democracy against the ‘tyranny’ of judicial, bureaucratic and political elites reflected a commitment to participatory democracy and community control. The National Association for Neighborhood Schools, for example, which was founded in 1976 and claimed 350,000 members by 1978, stressed the importance of ‘parental control’ over children’s education and emphasized the ways in which ‘forced busing’ impacted upon everyday life. Neighbourhood schools could serve to inculcate pupils with a sense of community and reinforce shared values: busing, then, was often seen as a challenge to a community’s traditions, history, and customs.

It is interesting that, in Boston, the movement against busing grew in part out of earlier struggles over urban renewal in the city: struggles that had pitched neighborhood organizations (‘ordinary people’) against technocrats, liberals and city planners (‘elites’). In Charlotte, North Carolina, where comprehensive two-way busing began under court order in 1970, a flyer produced by the Concerned Parents Association (CPA) explained that ‘The plain and tragic fact is that, in this vital and major area of life, freedom of decision is being taken away from the American people.’ This sense of powerlessness, which operated alongside a desire to reassert influence, was encapsulated in the decision to name Boston’s major anti-busing organization ROAR (Restore Our Alienated Rights).
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The civil rights/Black Power movement's championing of African American identity and group-based rights, and the New Left's emphasis on authenticity as a basis for political organizing, augured a wider emergence of political and cultural mobilizations during the late 1960s and 1970s that were rooted in identity. The gay rights movement, for example, became increasingly confident in championing homosexual lifestyles. In 1968 the North American Conference of Homophile Organizations adopted the slogan 'Gay is Good'; while the GAA worked to foster a vibrant gay subculture and was unapologetic in its defence of gay sexual practices. The late 1960s also saw a revival of white ethnic identity in the United States, which helped fuel the anti-busing movement in places such as Boston, Canarsie and Pontiac. Working-class Irish, Italian and Jewish Americans, for instance, organized on the basis of their ethnic identity, portrayed themselves as victims, championed their neighborhood institutions and cultural traditions, and demanded their 'rights'.

Americans, wrote the historian Van Gosse, 'live in a world the Sixties made'. In many ways the divisions that have characterized the United States over the past quarter-century are rooted firmly in that decade. This short era inspired new forms of activism and organizing, generated new issues and agendas, and continues to shape contemporary political debate. While liberals and progressives have sought to protect the gains already made and fulfill what they view as the decade's unfinished agenda, conservatives have railed against it — often to great effect.

Studying social movements helps us to understand more about the changing political culture of the post-1960s era, enabling us to look beyond national political figures and the traditional emphasis on Watergate, stagflation and malaise, to explore some of the ways in which ordinary Americans attempted to re-shape, and exert control over, the world in which they lived. We see how the 1960s provided models for organizing, generated a language of
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protest, and bequeathed political ideas to 1970s activists of varying political stripes espousing very different causes. The activism of both homosexuals and those who opposed busing illustrates the complex ways in which 1960s strategies of direct action and concepts of community organizing, authenticity and participatory democracy transcended the political spectrum and helped power both the conservative revival and progressive politics during the 1970s.
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