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Introduction: “Sometimes the Gay Issue is Used Against Us”

It was an otherwise uneventful ceremony. When the Teacher of the Year celebration in Broward County, Florida began at the county convention center one night in February 2002, there was no indication that it would make history. The school district awarded the top honor to Connie Hines, a social studies teacher at Sunrise Middle School, one of those rare educators highly revered by students and fellow teachers alike. She arrived on stage to deliver her acceptance speech and began running through the usual list of acknowledgements, giving a nod to her principal and students and recognizing her mother and father. She then took “a big gulp of air” and concluded by thanking Becky Neiswender, another female teacher at her school. Becky, as Connie would explain after the ceremony, was also her partner of four years.

A teacher praising her life companion in an awards speech hardly seems newsworthy, but by acknowledging her same-sex relationship, Connie had crossed a threshold that few teachers in South Florida had ever traversed so publicly before. Her speech soon captured the attention of the country’s leading LGBT magazines, becoming the top national news item in The Advocate and landing her in Out’s 100 Greatest Gay Success Stories of 2002. If the media placement of Connie’s announcement evidenced its deep significance, Connie herself perhaps understated its symbolic value for the area’s queer teachers. “It’s important,” Hines suggested, “because

---

3 In this thesis, I use “South Florida” to refer to the area encompassed by what is now Miami-Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties. Dade County, alternatively called Metro-Dade, became Miami-Dade County only after a voter referendum in 1997. Together, these three counties are typically referred to as the Miami metropolitan area. All three have separate public school districts coterminous with county borders. Miami-Dade receives particular focus in this thesis as the birthplace of the “Save Our Children” campaign and the center of much of the action.
4 I use “queer” in the spirit of reclamation to refer to a spectrum of sexual and gender minorities, including but not limited to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. History, of course, dictates who within this umbrella term was particularly active or targeted at any given time. It bears noting that gay, lesbian, and bisexual teachers are the primary actors in this narrative. Moreover, when teachers turned their focus to “queer” students, they first tackled discrimination and harassment based on sexual orientation, but quickly became attentive to issues of gender identity and expression, as well. I occasionally use more specific terms than “queer” for precision.
sometimes the gay issue is used against us.”

In fact, from the 1950s to the moment Hines stepped on stage, queer educators in South Florida served as the target of an unrelenting history of state repression and public derision. In 1956, the Florida Legislature established the Florida Legislative Investigation Committee (FLIC), a body tasked with excising communists and civil rights sympathizers from state government, which came to focus on terminating the employment of homosexuals working in public education. Known colloquially as the Johns Committee after its chairman state Senator Charley Johns, FLIC was the state-level incarnation of a nationwide scare over public safety initiated in the McCarthy Era of the early 1950s. When it came to homosexuals, FLIC was particularly concerned about the safety of children. A report the Committee produced in 1964 quoted a veteran investigator warning, “We must do everything in our power to create one thing in the mind of every homosexual, and that is ‘Keep their hands off our children!’ The consequences will be terrible if you do not.” The Legislature shuttered FLIC that year on grounds that its activity overstepped “established statutory procedures for dismissal,” but many teachers had already been fired and stripped of their professional credentials. Those queer educators remaining grew increasingly wary of the right’s characterization of homosexual educators as threatening to Florida’s youth.

The language of child protection aimed against homosexual teachers resurfaced in South Florida in 1977 when the Metro-Dade County Commission voted to pass a human rights

---

9 I use “right,” “religious right,” and “religious conservatives” to refer to local political factions that supported socially conservative and anti-queer policies based on their religious beliefs.
ordinance banning discrimination based on a person’s “affectional or sexual preferences.”\textsuperscript{10} The measure followed the enactment of similar laws across the country beginning in 1972.\textsuperscript{11} Reacting to the vote by the Commission, an evangelical Christian woman named Anita Bryant, famous for her career as a beauty queen, singer, and Florida orange juice spokeswoman, launched “Save Our Children” (SOC), a campaign aimed at gaining enough signatures to force a referendum vote for the ordinance’s repeal. While the law applied broadly to private discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations, Anita Bryant and her followers narrowed the rhetorical terrain of the dispute to the employment of homosexuals as school workers while expanding it to include both public and private education.\textsuperscript{12} Bryant popularized the notion that “homosexuals cannot reproduce—so they must recruit. And to freshen their ranks, they must recruit the youth of America.”\textsuperscript{13} She targeted the classroom—the workplace of gay and lesbian teachers—as the primary recruitment ground, relying on conceptions of homosexuality as both mutable and predatory to strike fear into the minds of parents that their children could be corrupted by “sexually deviant” educators.

The attacks on South Florida’s queer teachers continued unabated in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s, relying on the same conception of teachers as threats to innocent youth and of parents as children’s ultimate protectors. When Connie Hines took the stage in February 2002, she undoubtedly knew this damning history of discrimination better than most. She not only taught American history to her eighth grade students, but she lived this particular chapter day in

\textsuperscript{10} “UTD Sets the Record Straight on Human Rights” advertisement, \textit{The Miami Herald}, May 24, 1977.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
and day out. How could she possibly feel comfortable, then, defying decades of policy and practice that relegated queer teachers to the shadows of the closet?

Importantly, she was not alone. Despite being a singular public face, Hines represented a maturing movement of queer teachers who dared to be out, to organize, and to stand on the front lines of the fight to secure their rights. Yet the motivation of teachers like Hines extended beyond a concern for their own protection. When Hines revealed she was a lesbian, she was actively thinking about the example she could set for queer youth in her classroom and in schools across the region. “Coming out as a teacher,” she explained, “makes me a better role model for my students.”¹⁴ The idea of a queer teacher serving as a “role model” was exactly the fear that religious conservatives played to their political advantage throughout the second half of the twentieth century.

The history of South Florida’s queer teachers is not merely a story of repression, but also one of resistance and reclamation. Queer educators turned from being the targets of the religious right’s effort to “Save Our Children” to the leaders of a movement to protect queer children from dangerous school environments that the religious right had helped instigate through this very campaign. Queer educators took hold of the rhetoric of child protection and safety, reinvented assumptions about who constituted responsible caretakers, and won their own employment rights in the process. They struck down the argument of parental rights by demonstrating how some parents, not queer teachers, were “unfit” to deal with queer youth and showed how queer children needed support from the greater LGBT family when their own families opted to neglect them. Propelling this rhetorical tug-of-war was a shift in organizational style from behind-the-scenes organizing in the late 1970s deemphasizing queer identity to front-line agitating in the 1990s and early 2000s that openly identified teachers as queer in the public sphere.

¹⁴ Hall, “Teaching by Example.”
This analysis will first examine the tumultuous period of the Bryant campaign in 1977, when religious conservatives reconfigured the language of civil rights adopted by queer activists to instead argue for the rights of parents. In this period, queer educators primarily treated the attacks of the nascent religious right as a threat to their own employment. Afraid to identify themselves individually by coming out of the closet and risking their jobs, they organized within local labor organizations under the banner of their profession. Handily defeated by the Bryant campaign, however, most queer teachers retreated further into secrecy during the 1980s. The second chapter will look at the effects of the repressive environment that calcified in the wake of SOC for both queer teachers and students. It will also discuss the effects of the AIDS crisis, which further stigmatized homosexuality and contributed to the hostility, but also politicized local queer teachers.

The third chapter will detail how a worrying escalation in youth suicide and schoolyard harassment motivated queer teachers to take action. It also served as the basis on which they could assert a new claim to their own rights. Equipped with organizing prowess from the AIDS battles, queer educators stepped in at the turn of the 1990s when parents and the state turned their backs on children and let them suffer in silence. They fought for employment protections so that they could be open resources for children in the school system and successfully used this leverage to fight for policies and programs that would help protect students. Every step of the way, the religious right intervened, but queer educators had successfully pulled the rug of their child protection argument out from under their feet.

---

15 I define a “labor organization” as any group of people with a shared profession that advocates for the material security of its members in relation to their employment. This distinguishes labor organizations from professional associations not interested in economic justice, but is not so narrow a definition as to exclude groups of professionals that may not be engaged in collective bargaining. Queer teachers groups from the 1970s to early 2000s located outside of unions are still classified as labor organizations since their interest in being able to retain their jobs despite their queer identity was fundamentally material in its motivation.
Historiography

While historians have given SOC due treatment, no scholar has thoroughly documented the local organizing of queer teachers before and after the June 1977 election. Nonetheless, a wide variety of scholarship informs this work, including twentieth-century American histories of queer teachers and Florida-specific histories from the Johns Committee era of the 1950s and 1960s. This thesis also inserts itself into the growing body of scholarship on “social justice unionism” and queer labor history.

Numerous queer histories address SOC in passing, often mentioning the ascendance of Anita Bryant in Miami before moving on to battles elsewhere in the country. In their efforts to cover an extensive swath of history, some fail to mention the centrality of queer teachers as Bryant’s targets, portraying SOC only as a broad assault on homosexuality. Michael Boucai (2002) and Fred Fejes (2008) independently composed local histories of the campaign. Both authors anchor SOC as a pivotal moment in queer history by tracing the terms of the national debate on homosexuality in the 1980s and 1990s—rights versus morality—to Dade County in 1977. They also show how SOC focused on the teaching profession, but mostly overlook the activism of teachers. Patrick McCreery builds on their early work by evaluating why gay activists, in relying on an appeal to “rights,” failed to defeat SOC as a moral crusade. He claims that dependence on rights-based rhetoric did not adequately address SOC’s more compelling

---


argument of child protection. Focusing on the work of gay rights organizations, however, McCreery does not examine how teachers made the same strategic error in their activism. Only Miriam Frank begins the process of placing teachers and their responses to SOC at the center of the story, but she limits her discussion to a summary of the run-up to the election in Dade County and its immediate national influence.  

While queer teachers play little active role in the existing histories of SOC, current scholarship does address their lives more generally. Karen Harbeck provides an exhaustive legal history of LGBT rights in the teaching profession, but her account touches little on teacher organizing. Jackie Blount traces the experiences of queer educators in the United States throughout the twentieth century, focusing on the manufacturing of a teacher threat over time and the resulting history of repression. She devotes some attention to the formation of queer teachers groups and the pressure they exerted on the teachers unions. While her work is impressive in its scope, its coverage of South Florida follows the same course as general American queer histories. She documents SOC’s attacks on queer teachers before departing to narrate other conflicts that emerged in its wake. In the process, she leaves behind the stories of queer teachers in Dade and neighboring counties who were left to pick up the pieces.  

Several works in sociology and education studies also document the experiences of queer teachers. Their focus is mostly on personal experiences in the classroom, overlooking collective action. Rita Kissen’s work on the individual experiences of gay and lesbian teachers does have a chapter on the rise of local gay teachers groups and the formation of LGBT caucuses.

20 Frank, Out in the Union, 86-7.  
21 Harbeck, Gay and Lesbian Educators.  
22 Blount, Fit to Teach.  
in major educational associations.\textsuperscript{24} Kissen, however, provides little information about the work these organizations perform and does not discuss the experience of South Florida.

The release of the Johns Committee’s records in 1993 spurred a new interest in scholarship about Florida’s queer teachers, focusing on the Committee’s period of activity from 1956 to 1964. Karen Graves places the resistance strategies of educators under state investigation at the center of her account.\textsuperscript{25} She delves into the transcripts of individual interrogations, showing how state agents worked to corner teachers into admissions of their same-sex desire or activity, while also demonstrating the artfulness of teachers who evaded questions and challenged the Committee’s methods and presumptions. Nonetheless, she discusses the limits of individual acts of resistance, noting that since they lacked “a group sensibility, let alone a powerful political organization, gay and lesbian teachers’ sense of individual power vis-à-vis the Johns Committee had to have been minimal.”\textsuperscript{26} She later draws a connection to the Bryant campaign, arguing that the extent of queer teacher organization had not changed by the late 1970s. She writes, however, that the defeat of Dade County’s human rights ordinance fueled “a national mobilization of gay and lesbian activism, including teachers who began to organize to end school employment discrimination.”\textsuperscript{27} Graves leaves this history of organizing open for future scholars.

Stacy Braukman’s account is less interested in the responses of queer teachers than in the actions of the Johns Committee and its supporters. Importantly, she documents how the teacher organizations in place at the time worked in cooperation with the Johns Committee, rather than

\textsuperscript{24} Rita M. Kissen, \textit{The Last Closet: The Real Lives of Lesbian and Gay Teachers} (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1996), 142.
\textsuperscript{25} Karen Graves, \textit{And They Were Wonderful Teachers: Florida’s Purge of Gay and Lesbian Teachers} (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 48.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 143.
serving as vehicles through which to assert the rights of queer educators.\textsuperscript{28} This thesis will build on the recent scholarship of the Johns Committee by extending the narrative of teacher resistance provided by Graves, demonstrating how it took the form of group organizing rather than individual acts in the wake of the SOC campaign. It will also show how queer educators grew to assert power within teacher organizations that had earlier stood against them during the course of the Johns Committee proceedings.

By showing how queer teachers worked within their labor organizations to secure protections for both themselves and the children they served, this study contributes to a broader historical investigation into “social justice unionism” in the United States.\textsuperscript{29} At times, organized labor has struggled to articulate its important place in fighting for a more just society for all and not just its rank-and-file. One of the greatest challenges for teacher labor in particular has been demonstrating how the collective activism of educators is not a purely self-interested task or one that extends benefits only to organization members. Sara Smith launched the study of queer teachers in relation to this movement, demonstrating how rank-and-file queer teachers in California labor organizations worked to oppose Proposition 6, or the Briggs Initiative.\textsuperscript{30} Briggs was the SOC-inspired state ballot measure introduced in 1978 to forbid the employment of queer teachers. Smith shows how the unions, prodded by queer teachers, moved beyond collective organizing to successfully take on a pressing social issue. The earlier South Florida outcome was a defeat, but it later extended the aim of organizing to include child protection, an aspect that Smith’s account of queer teacher organizing in California does not address. The organizing of

\textsuperscript{28} Braukman, Communists and Perverts Under the Palms, 141.


queer educators to fight for the safety of queer students provides a clear example of how workers have harnessed their collective power to fight for causes that benefit consumers of their labor—in this case, students—and that positively transform society.

American queer labor history as an independent field accelerated quickly over the past two years with the publication of several important works. In 2013, Philip Tiemeyer released *Plane Queer: Labor, Sexuality, and AIDS in the History of Male Flight Attendants*, which details the personal struggles and political triumphs of airline workers whose sexual orientation and gender transgressions shaped their lives in the workplace. In spring 2014, Anne Balay published *Steel Closets: Voices of Gay, Lesbian, and Transgender Steelworkers*, which lays out the struggles that queer steelworkers continue to face on the job. In summer 2014, Miriam Frank unveiled *Out in the Union*, the first substantive historical survey of LGBT persons organizing around labor issues in the United States. Many scholars await Margot Canaday’s upcoming work *Perverse Ambitions, Deviant Careers: A Queer History of the Modern Workplace*, which seeks to discredit the notion that workplaces in twentieth-century America were “straight zones” absent of queer employees. My thesis continues the study of this burgeoning historical interest.
Chapter One: “There is No ‘Human Right’ to Corrupt Our Children”

The fight over Dade County’s human rights ordinance began with queer activists staking a claim to “civil” and “human rights,” which local religious conservatives refashioned into a declaration of “parental rights” to save their children from homosexual educators. Failing to adapt to the debate’s rhetorical shift from “rights” to child protection, queer teachers fell short in their efforts to resist the religious right’s attacks.

Starting with the homophile movement of the 1950s and continuing with Gay Liberation in the 1960s and 1970s, LGBT people began entering the American political arena as quers. Starting in 1972, anti-discrimination ordinances protecting homosexuals were adopted in dozens of American cities and counties.\(^31\) South Florida’s queer culture was lively, but not politically oriented.\(^32\) That changed in the summer of 1976, when Jack Campbell, the owner of a popular bathhouse, led local gay groups to form the Dade County Coalition for the Humanistic Rights of Gays.\(^33\) Campbell pushed for the group to distribute candidate questionnaires in advance of that year’s election and to endorse individuals who shared their views about gay rights.\(^34\)

With the support of the new Coalition, Dade County voters elected Ruth Shack, a recent migrant from New York, to the Metro-Dade County Commission. A close friend of the gay and lesbian community, Shack agreed to sponsor a human rights ordinance similar to laws being passed in other areas of the country.\(^35\) Shack’s version – proposed Ordinance 77-4 – would bar discrimination based on “affectional or sexual preferences” in the areas of housing, employment, and public accommodations.\(^36\) Stuart Simon, the Dade county attorney who wrote the law at

\(^32\) Clendenin and Nagourney, Out for Good, 293.
\(^33\) Ibid.
\(^34\) Ibid., 294.
\(^35\) Ibid., 295.
\(^36\) “UTD Sets the Record Straight on Human Rights” advertisement.
Shack’s request, drew from the language of the first gay rights bill introduced to Congress by Bella Abzug in 1975. Simon’s draft of the ordinance aimed to protect gay identity without sanctioning homosexual acts then illegal as “sodomy” under state statute. The Commission’s first reading of the proposal resulted in a unanimous vote in favor on December 7, 1976, but the body’s operating rules required another opportunity for public testimony and a second vote by the Commission before final passage.

Local religious leaders took notice. Before the final hearing and vote by the Commission scheduled for January 18, 1977, preachers and rabbis from evangelical Protestant churches and Orthodox Jewish synagogues across South Florida spoke to their congregations about the supposed moral threat posed by the ordinance. Southern Baptist Anita Bryant first heard about the ordinance from her pastor, who “noted the effect this ordinance would have on private and religious schools” since they would not be able to discriminate in their hiring of teachers on the basis of sexual preference. After Bryant expressed further interest in the issue, her pastor asked if she would help spearhead the effort to block the ordinance from passing.

On the day of the final hearing, Bryant stood at the podium and delivered her first public testimony on the issue, stating “I especially address you as a mother. I believe I have a God-give[n] right to be jealous for a moral environment for my children. … I believe I have that right. That I can and do say no to [a] very serious moral issue. That would violate my rights and all the rights [of] all the decent and morally upstanding citizens.” Bryant pitted the discrimination that homosexuals claimed to face against the discrimination that she believed that “decent” parents

37 McCreery, “Miami Vice,” 25.
38 Ibid.
39 Fejes, Gay Rights and Moral Panic, 71.
40 Blount, Fit to Teach, 131.
41 Ibid.
42 “Transcript from County Commission Meeting Concerning Gay Rights Ordinance,” box 6, series 5, folder 25, Ruth and Richard Shack Papers, University of Miami Special Collections, 17.
would experience if the ordinance passed. She reclaimed the language of “rights” emanating from gay rights supporters and established a claim to the rights of parents. Very early in the dispute, she demonstrated how the parental rights argument not only repeated rights-based rhetoric from the opposing side, but transformed it into the entirely new argument of child protection.

Bryant’s testimony also foreshadowed her later focus on education. She reframed the letter of the ordinance, asking “just when did the word, discrimination start meaning that I as a citizen and as one of your citizens, can’t say no, or the people of Dade County, in the area of housing employment and education.”

Bryant’s speech introduced “education” as a protected arena, when the law only specified housing, employment, and public accommodations. Shortly after the hearing, educators became the primary target of Bryant’s political strategy.

The final passage of Ordinance 77-4 in a 5-3 vote by the Commission activated Bryant and local religious leaders to formalize their opposition to gay rights. Many conservative activists from the religious sphere had political experience from the anti-busing battles of the early 1970s, when they drew on the rhetoric of child protection to warn against desegregation. During the busing protests, worries about sexual contact between children across racial lines inspired fear of integration. “Save Our Children from the Black Plague” was one common slogan.

In the wake of court-ordered busing, many religious conservatives withdrew their children from the public school system and placed them in private and parochial programs. They viewed Ordinance 77-4 as another incursion into the protected sphere of education that they had

43 Ibid.
44 By the end of January, Anita Bryant’s husband Bob Green was actively referring to his wife’s activism as an effort to repeal the “homosexual teacher ordinance.” “Telegram from Bob Green to Barry Drucker,” January 27, 1977, box 6, series 5, folder 7, Ruth and Richard Shack Papers, University of Miami Special Collections.
already carved out and as an attempt to impose another sexually charged “civil rights” measure into that sphere. The same parents and religious activists who had fought busing programs now redeployed the rhetoric of child protection to battle the area’s queer teachers. In February, Bryant and her supporters established the organization Save Our Children, Inc. and held a press conference announcing SOC with the primary goal of circulating a petition to force a referendum for the ordinance’s repeal.46 Relying on the tight organization and numerical strength of large religious congregations to mobilize support, the call to “Save Our Children” quickly succeeded in winning enough signatories to secure a special election scheduled for June 7.

Official communications from SOC located the teaching profession as its specific target. Their main pamphlet stated that “Metro’s dangerous ordinance would allow openly proclaimed, flaunting homosexuals to teach our children.”47 The idea that “openly proclaimed” and “flaunting” homosexuals were the problem suggested that it was acceptable for teachers to be gay so long as they remained in the closet. Bryant validated this claim, suggesting that “what the homosexuals want is to create role models so they could be looked up to by young children. If a teacher—especially a teacher—can legally say ‘I’m a homosexual,’ that presents a plan that God says is not [H]is plan for our lives.”48

The campaign insisted that the human rights ordinance passed by the Commission was not actually concerned with the civil rights of teachers. SOC’s primary pamphlet quoted the Florida Action Committee for Education as saying, “We do not believe that under the guise of avoidance of discrimination in employment, they [homosexuals] should be allowed to use the

46 Fejes, Gay Rights and Moral Panic, 57.
47 “Save our children from homosexuality!” pamphlet (side 1, incl. outer covers), ca. 1977, box 11, folder 7, Collection #7439, James M. Foster Papers, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
schools as a vehicle for employing their perverted ideas with impunity.”SOC rejected the civil rights claim of teachers with a child protection argument cloaked in parental rights, asserting that “there is no ‘human right’ to corrupt our children.” According to SOC, Ordinance 77-4 would allow homosexuals to promote their agendas in the classroom and give them free rein to have sex with students. To clarify this point, SOC compiled a file of newspaper clippings that they used in campaign material to suggest that homosexual teachers were natural sexual predators.

![Figure 1. “Save our children from homosexuality!” pamphlet (side 2), ca. 1977, box 11, folder 7, Collection #7439, James M. Foster Papers, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.](image)

49.“Save our children from homosexuality!” pamphlet (side 1, incl. outer covers), ca. 1977, James M. Foster Papers.
50. “Save our children from homosexuality!” pamphlet (side 2), ca. 1977, box 11, folder 7, Collection #7439, James M. Foster Papers, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
51. See Figure 1. Ibid.
Ordinance 77-4’s jurisdiction did not extend to Dade County’s public schools. The exemption dated back to the adoption of a Home Rule charter by county voters in 1957 that partitioned the powers of the County Commission and the School Board in setting employment law.\textsuperscript{52} Public schools still maintained license to discriminate against queers in the hiring of teachers. Nonetheless, while the law only prohibited employment discrimination in private and parochial schools, SOC took on “sexually deviant” teachers in all schools.

The attacks on all teachers—public, private, and parochial—were a gross misunderstanding of the limits of the law. John Fitzgerald, counsel for the Archdiocese of Miami, incorrectly believed that the ordinance was all-encompassing and committed his errors to public testimony. “I don’t think their rights mean that they should be involved in a school system… both public and parochial,” he argued. “I don’t think these people have any rights in the school system anymore than a fox would have in a chicken coup [sic].”\textsuperscript{53} Even though public schools would not be affected, SOC found other ways to make the ordinance important to all Dade County parents. Warning individual voters that “[t]he entire nation is watching to see what you and your fellow Dade County citizens will do June 7,” the campaign claimed that “Members of the Congress of the United States are especially interested in your decision—because Congress is considering passage of House Resolution 2998, \textit{a bill which would impose on the whole country the dangers of Metro’s ordinance}. H.R. 2998 would require all \textit{public} schools, kindergarten through 12th grade, to hire practicing homosexuals.”\textsuperscript{54}

Queer teachers began to organize. They worked with labor organizations representing educators in Dade County from the inauguration of SOC in February until the polls closed on

\textsuperscript{53} “Transcript from County Commission Meeting Concerning Gay Rights Ordinance,” box 6, series 5, folder 25, Ruth and Richard Shack Papers, University of Miami Special Collections, 18.
\textsuperscript{54} “Save our children from homosexuality!” pamphlet (side 1, incl. outer covers), ca. 1977, James M. Foster Papers.
voting day in June. While operating in these groups, queer teachers chose to collectively identify themselves to the public by their profession rather than as individuals agitating on the frontlines.

Seeking to deemphasize the organization’s focus on homosexual identity and reframe their campaign as one centered on “human rights,” the leaders of the Dade County Coalition for the Humanistic Rights of Gays relabeled their group the Coalition for Human Rights and alternatively as Citizens for Human Rights in the run-up to the June vote. As the referendum battle heated up in spring 1977, the newly rebranded group established an Educators’ Task Force, which drew its membership from parochial and private schoolteachers, as well as public school educators and administrators and faculty members from local Florida universities.

The Task Force worked carefully to frame its opposition to the ordinance’s repeal as part of a larger concern for the profession. It announced that “[u]nder the guise of the ‘Save Our Children from Homosexuals’ campaign, the rights of all teachers are being threatened, as some members of the teaching profession have become a focal point of the present scapegoating process.” Placing the Bryant campaign within historical context, the Task Force noted that such scapegoating “is not without precedent, for teachers have only recently been afforded the same rights, private and professional, that other citizens have traditionally enjoyed.” By linking SOC’s rhetoric to the vulnerability of the teaching profession, queer educators forwarded their cause as an enduring labor issue. Members referred to themselves only as “educators,” affirming their professional status without a specific identity. They repeatedly stated, “we, as educators are disturbed by the homophobia manifested as a result of the passage of the ordinance,” “we, as

57 Ibid.
58 Ibid.
educators deplore the use of smear tactics, ugly stereotypes, and unfounded fears as a basis for continuing discrimination against homosexuals,” and “we, as educators reject the social, legal, and religious condemnation of homosexuality.” 59 They emphasized their identity as educators even within a gay rights organization, suggesting that these teachers sought respect for their opinions, which they might not find if they identified as gay or lesbian. They figured they might have more success if they rallied behind their profession and drew on the history of assaults on teachers’ rights to defend themselves against this new barrage. In this first public document of labor solidarity against the ordinance’s repeal, no teacher put an individual name to the statement.

Other queer educators voiced their opposition to the repeal effort by organizing within the local public school teachers union – the United Teachers of Dade (UTD), American Federation of Teachers (AFT) Local 1974. The UTD had a history of involvement in civil rights struggles under its Executive Vice President Pat Tornillo, Jr. In 1962, Tornillo was elected to the presidency of the National Education Association (NEA)-affiliated Dade County Classroom Teachers Association (DCCTA) after running on a platform calling for collective bargaining rights and merging the county’s then-separate black and white teachers unions. 60 He led the nation’s first statewide teachers strike in Florida in 1968 alongside Janet Dean, a close ally in the DCCTA. 61 Frustrated with the NEA’s lack of militancy and empowered by a new collective bargaining law for public employees secured in the strike, Tornillo merged the DCCTA with a new AFT affiliate in Dade to form the UTD in 1974; the year marked the name of the local. 62

59 Italics added. Ibid.
61 Ibid., 210; Tom Lander interview. --- in this interview, Tom Lander identified Dean as a lesbian
Despite the union’s creed of democracy, Tornillo was notorious for running Local 1974 with an iron fist. Queer teachers appreciated Tornillo’s political liberalism and his forceful leadership.

Throughout the SOC campaign, queer teachers had no formal caucus within the UTD, but those who were active in the union knew each other, even if they were not out publicly. One such teacher was Helene Linn, a lesbian who was out to a few friends but remained closeted in the school system. 1977 marked Linn’s third year on the UTD Professional Staff as a bargaining agent representative. Working alongside Tornillo in the union, she consistently urged him to consider addressing SOC’s attacks on teachers. She believed the UTD should offer a public statement on the issue as it had on desegregation. Linn appealed to Tornillo using the language of “civil rights.” While Tornillo expressed private support, he was reluctant to have the union take up an issue that could so easily divide the local’s membership in its early years. He agreed to lobby for an addition to the UTD’s contract with the School Board that would put “the question of out-of-school activities on the part of teachers purely on a professional and ethical basis,” with the decision to engage in certain activities “entirely in the keeping of the conscience of the individual teacher.” As the union’s chief negotiator, Tornillo secured the change under Article XXXVIII of the contract with no explicit reference to sexual orientation. Nonetheless, Linn and other lesbian and gay teachers still wanted the union to take an explicit stance on Ordinance 77-4.

Linn called Edda Cimino, a lesbian, an English teacher, and a union activist. She had seen Cimino at early meetings of the Dade County Coalition for the Humanistic Rights of Gays
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before Cimino quit the group, and she knew her to be an effective organizer.\textsuperscript{69} Cimino agreed to contact other queer teachers in the union. She pressured prominent members such as Janet Dean to place their own calls to Tornillo and members of the UTD Executive Board. Bombarded by messages, Tornillo arranged for the teachers to present their cause to the union’s leadership. At the presentation on May 19, it made Linn “physically sick” to see so many colleagues at the UTD opposed to the ordinance.\textsuperscript{70} Tornillo spoke persuasively against repeal and urged the Board to produce a position paper in favor of the queer teachers’ stance.\textsuperscript{71} The final document stated that “The United Teachers of Dade by formally endorsing and supporting the issue of human rights and the dignity of the individual in the conduct of one’s personal life, equally does not support or condone the proselytizing of children (students) by adults towards the adult’s sexual, religious or political preferences or activities.”\textsuperscript{72}

The position paper still required approval from the Council of Representatives, but Tornillo knew that opening the issue up to everyone in the union could slow down or stop its passage.\textsuperscript{73} He scheduled the vote for the end of a long and controversial meeting over his pay raise and left it off the agenda, hoping that most people would grow weary and depart before the vote on the position paper was taken.\textsuperscript{74} Tornillo’s plan worked; the Council of Representatives approved the paper that night without objections. In the next few weeks, dozens of teachers frustrated with both Tornillo’s pay raise and the vote to oppose Ordinance 77-4’s repeal resigned.

\textsuperscript{69} Cimino objected to male chauvinism within the Dade County Coalition for the Humanistic Rights of Gays. Helene Linn interview.
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid.
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from union membership. But the union’s queer teachers now had the UTD’s official endorsement.

To publicize their position, supportive union staffers pooled their money to run an advertisement in *The Miami Herald*. It was published on May 24, 1977 and announced that the “UTD Sets the Record Straight on Human Rights.” The advertisement repeated the language that queer teachers had used in their “civil rights” pitch to Tornillo, framing their argument as part of a long tradition of “human rights” advocacy in the union dating back to its days as the Classroom Teachers Association. It situated opposition within the context of the UTD’s leadership in the fight for academic freedom in 1959, the integration of black and white teachers unions in 1963, desegregation in Dade’s Schools in 1967, when it “petitioned as a ‘Friend of the Court’ on behalf of school desegregation,” as well as its 1969 support for “the integration of school faculties.”

The advertisement emphasized how the “United Teachers of Dade has always, in the past, and will continue in the future, to maintain [a] posture of respect for the rights of the individual in defense of human rights.” Citing contract provisions such as its nondiscrimination policy (which did not yet include sexual orientation) under Article XXX and its recently adopted protections for “out-of-school activities” under Article XXXVI, the UTD portrayed its stance as an extension of the work it was already doing, rather than as a whole-hearted and novel embrace of queer teachers. In fact, the advertisement afforded queer teachers no explicit recognition, with the public statement coming from the voice of all educators rather than queer teachers.
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76 Helene Linn interview.
77 “UTD Sets the Record Straight on Human Rights” advertisement.
78 Ibid.
79 Ibid.
80 Ibid.
specifically. Importantly, there existed no publicly visible effort by queer educators to speak out as a group by themselves. Rather, they worked quietly within the union to get a statement in support of their rights on behalf of the teaching profession at large.

Interestingly, while the UTD eschewed arguments of child protection in its defense of Ordinance 77-4, the union engaged child-centered rhetoric for its other organizing efforts throughout spring 1977. The front cover of the union newsletter from March demonstrated how the union linked its work to caring for children, noting that “[t]eachers have found precious few things important enough to have changed the world. One is children. The other is UTD.” In the midst of their bargaining campaign that year, members at a march carried signs with messages such as “Walking for Your Children” and “We Care About Your Children.” At another event on June 8, only one day after the vote for repeal, teachers held posters pushing for “More Instruction Time for Students!” Clearly, the UTD knew how to defend teachers’ rights using arguments about the effects of policy on children. However, the union did not deploy similar rhetoric in their defense of queer teachers’ rights.

Queer teachers could not yet make an affirmative argument for child protection. Many of them had survived hard times as young people, but they could not formulate a role for themselves in the lives of queer students. In the absence of an affirmative argument, queer teachers could only have responded to SOC’s child protection attacks by claiming they were not true. Yet at least one member of the Coalition for Human Rights believed such an approach would be counterproductive:
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[O]n paid TV and radio advertising, I did not want to spend time denying the child molesting and recruiting allegations made by Save Our Children’s advertising. I did not make the theme of our campaign, ‘No, we don’t molest children.’ I was afraid that if all the voters heard every day was, ‘Gays molest children,’ followed by, ‘No, gays don’t molest children,’ that all the voters would remember would be, ‘molest children, molest children.’ If that happened, by the end of the campaign they would want to put us all in cages.  

One alternative was to focus on arguments about their “rights” as educators.

Throughout the campaign, only a handful of queer educators played identifiable roles as “queer teachers.” Many of them were visiting activists, such as Hank Wilson, Tom Ammiano, and Ron Lanza, who co-founded the San Francisco Gay Teachers Coalition in 1975. When SOC started up, they flew to South Florida to join the Dade County Coalition for Human Rights. While Wilson, Ammiano, and Lanza afforded queer teachers a public face, as outsiders they did not feel the kind of threat that local teachers did.

During the campaign, The Miami Herald was unable to find any queer educators willing to speak on the record. Only one local queer teacher entered the fray, and late in the campaign: “Eleanor.” Her story was published in The Miami Herald on April 17, alongside a major article on SOC’s attacks on teachers. Eleanor testified to the environment of fear faced by queer teachers and intensified by SOC’s propaganda. She dismissed the child protection argument at the heart of Bryant’s campaign. She argued her status as a “queer teacher” could benefit students, stating that she was a “better teacher” for “blacks and Cubans,” because she “know[s] how it feels to be oppressed.”

In the late 1970s, issues for racial and ethnic minority students
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were obvious and constant; but queer children and the unique struggles they faced were invisible.\textsuperscript{89}

While Eleanor stopped short of asserting that gay teachers could help gay students, her student-centered argument demonstrated sophistication and prescience. Making the claim that job protections for queers could help rather than harm children diverged substantially from the rights-based of the official teachers’ organizations, an understandable difference given that Eleanor may have been a lone actor. In stating that she had “no way of knowing” if there were other homosexual teachers in the county, she revealed the extent to which queer teachers remained isolated and unorganized despite their collective advocacy on the repeal issue.\textsuperscript{90}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{An anonymous woman identified as “Eleanor” was the only queer teacher from South Florida who spoke out individually during the SOC campaign. “Teacher: Her Gay Life Won’t Lure Students,” The Miami Herald, April 17, 1977.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{89} Edda Cimino interview, January 6, 2015.
\textsuperscript{90} Due to the repressive environment for queers in South Florida in spring 1977, it is also possible that Eleanor was lying about not knowing other queer teachers. “Teacher: Her Gay Life Won’t Lure Students,” The Miami Herald, April 17, 1977.
In the face of Bryant’s crusade, queer teachers never directly confronted accusations of child endangerment. Their own claims to “civil” and “human rights,” repeated again and again, had been hijacked early on by conservative activists who asserted the “civil rights of parents.” Unprepared for the intensity and dynamism of the onslaught, queer teachers continued to assert the “civil rights” claim based on the history of discrimination in their profession. However, they failed to adapt to the new direction of right-wing rhetoric. The Greater Miami Organization for Human Rights, an organization unaffiliated with queer activists or teachers, attempted to salvage the situation at the last minute. The day before the repeal vote, they placed an advertisement in The Miami Herald declaring, “We will vote against repeal because we too want to save our boys and girls… Save them from bigotry, fear, hatred, and injustice.” Only in the aftermath of SOC did the local queer community recognize the importance of addressing the child protection argument. At South Florida’s first gay pride parade on June 27, 1977, marches carried signs proclaiming “Hi, Mom! Hi, Dad!” and “We Are Your Children.” For queer teachers, however, it was too late. The successful repeal of Ordinance 77-4 on June 7 initiated a period of intense repression in South Florida’s schools, both public and private. In the weeks after the Dade County defeat, neighboring Broward and Palm Beach counties swiftly voted down similar laws, extending the same atmosphere of legalized hostility to queer teachers throughout the region. The effects would reverberate throughout the school system, touching the lives of teachers and students.
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Chapter Two: “Some of Us Are Dying to Be Ourselves”

In the 1990s, queer teachers created a haunting poster that they urged counselors to hang in schools across South Florida. The sign depicted a young girl sitting on the ground in front of her locker, her face hidden, her arms wrapped around her knees, and her body surrounded by papers and books sprawled across the floor as if they had been hastily dropped. The source of the girl’s anguish could be found in the word spray-painted on the inside of the open locker behind her: DYKE. Above the picture, the teachers included a chilling quotation. “Some of us,” the message read, “are dying to be ourselves.”

No statement better expressed the new environment that had developed for queer teachers and students over the course of the preceding decade.

In the midst of the SOC campaign, queer teachers limited their activism to anonymous public statements via the Educators’ Task Force and work behind the scenes at union headquarters. After the June 7 defeat, organizing by educators came to a complete standstill. “After Anita Bryant,” high school history teacher Tom Lander claimed, “everyone went underground.”

As Edda Cimino recalled, “not only were we in the closet, but the door was locked against us. She had a very big negative effect – huge. People believed all of her lies.”

Teachers had always been wary of coming out of the closet, but before the success of SOC, teachers who knew each other to be queer often formed friendships and served as private sources of support for one another. These clandestine relationships enabled organizing. Now, Lander explained, “If I thought a teacher was gay, I avoided them.” Queer teachers grew fearful of guilt by association and took extra precaution to hide their identities in the workplace.
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Many had nobody at their job with whom they could converse about their experiences and with whom they were able to establish a sense of solidarity.

The Bryant campaign had made the vulnerability of queers in the teaching profession starkly visible. Con artists took notice and manipulated the fear of queer teachers to their advantage. In the mid-1980s, Lander, who was not out even in his personal life, managed to secure a date with a man to whom he revealed he was a teacher. When he arrived at the date, however, the other man threatened him, demanding that he pay him an enormous sum or else he would call Lander’s school and alert the principal that he was gay.\(^9\) Cimino recalled the time that she and her partner found a neighbor at their window attempting to photograph them engaging in sexual activity. They would later find out that the neighbor planned to blackmail them by demanding a fee for not turning the photographs over to the school district.\(^10\) Threats like these made it dangerous for teachers to meet even outside of school.

As the direct targets of SOC’s attacks, queer teachers in South Florida experienced the most direct repression in the years after the ordinance’s successful repeal. Nonetheless, the campaign’s assault on teachers generated conversations in homes and schools that assailed queer identity more generally, contributing to a toxic environment for queer students. Local media began its first sustained coverage of gay rights after the Metro-Dade County Commission’s first round of voting on Ordinance 77-4 in December 1976. The initial consideration of the ordinance was buried several pages into South Florida’s newspapers, but public resistance from SOC soon afforded queers their front-page debut.\(^1\) Between January and June 1977, editorials raged over
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the ordinance, with opinion pieces and letters to the editor each side of the issue. Since Bryant was a national figure, her campaign also attracted substantial coverage outside of South Florida. Dade County’s gay rights debate was on the cover of Newsweek, in the pages of the New York Times, and on national television.

With the local and national media amplifying the voices of both the pro- and anti-repeal sides, discussions of the upcoming vote were unavoidable in daily life. For the first time, homosexuality became a topic of conversation at family dinner tables in homes across South Florida and around the country. The impact was often far from positive. Queer youth felt the disapproval of their families before they could even reveal their identities, and other children brought the disdain for queers they learned at home into the schoolyard. Some students dared to step out of the closet, but SOC had coached other students in the rhetoric of hate. As a result, “[v]erbal and physical attacks against gay youth … increased … as students [became] increasingly threatened by the presence and openness of peers with a lesbian or gay orientation.”

Queer teachers believed this had devastating consequences. Hank Wilson remembered “following the national statistics on teen suicide, and in February 1977, when [SOC] was launched, the numbers jumped off the scale.” Wilson’s observation is confirmed by data showing a sharp spike in the U.S. suicide rate for the 15-24 age group in 1977. Experts provide no explanation for the rise in youth suicide. Factors ranging from drug abuse to greater
firearm availability could possibly explain the change, but queer teachers had a different idea.\(^\text{107}\)

As Wilson observed, “People don’t know why, but I think I do. When the topic surfaced it affected young gay people. All of a sudden, their parents, the people they counted on for support and love, weren’t there. Their parents were agreeing with the hate.”\(^\text{108}\) Even if the data proved inconclusive, queer teachers spent the next several years observing the real-world impact of SOC in their classrooms and hallways. School bullies, equipped with queer slang from their home environments and from the streets, brought their rhetorical weapons past the school gate. South Florida’s queer teachers noticed the proliferation of terms like “faggot,” “dyke,” and “queer” in everyday talk and marked on building walls. Afraid to generate speculation that they were queer themselves, educators felt powerless to stop it.\(^\text{109}\)

While a wave of bullying and youth suicide swept the country, and South Florida in particular, another catastrophe was on the horizon: AIDS. In 1981, doctors identified the first AIDS case in Florida. By 1982, Miami already had thirty-two deaths from AIDS and was fourth in the number of reported cases among U.S. cities.\(^\text{110}\) As the epidemic escalated, South Florida remained central in its spread.

The disease permeated every facet of daily life in South Florida, and teachers and students felt its effects in a number of ways. The most glaring impact of AIDS in the school system was the death of teachers, the vast majority of them gay men. As more educators contracted the disease, the Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach county school districts each had to confront the question of what to do when teachers got sick. The immediate response was to remove educators from the classroom. Between 1981 and 1985, ten Dade County public school


\(^{109}\) Robert Loupo interview; Edda Cimino interview, January 6, 2015.

teachers received AIDS diagnoses. The School Board decided to grant paid leaves to nine while
the other was permitted to continue working, but all ten soon died.\textsuperscript{111} In 1986, State
Representative Javier Souto, a Republican from Miami, and State Senator Don Childers, a
Democrat from Palm Beach, introduced HB 137 in the state House and SB 44 in the state Senate
to mandate that teachers “suspected of having AIDS” undergo testing, and, if found to be
infected, be required to leave the school system.\textsuperscript{112} The suspicion of AIDS was understood as
code for suspected homosexuality.

The teachers unions were not a center of queer activity in the 1980s, but the locals in
Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach saw HB 137 and SB 44 as a threat to all teachers and took
action to stop the hysteria. Tony Gentile, president of the Broward Teachers Union (BTU), AFT
Local 1975, asked, “How does one suspect that another person has AIDS? That opens up a
Pandora’s box.”\textsuperscript{113} The unions lobbied their respective school boards to take a stand against the
legislation proposed by Souto and Childers. In response, the Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach
school districts presented a united front through the South Florida Consortium of School Boards,
asking the state to leave AIDS-related school employment policy under local control.\textsuperscript{114} After the
defeat of his bill, Childers revived the language of child protection when he said, “I think in four
years, when we have 500,000 people who are AIDS carriers, they’ll look back and say, ‘What
did we do? Back in 1987, we had an opportunity to protect our children.’”\textsuperscript{115}

While some viewed teachers with AIDS as a threat to students, the teachers unions in the
1980s saw students with AIDS as a threat to teachers. The legislation introduced by Souto and
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Childers would also have required the testing and mandatory separation of students believed to have AIDS, but the unions focused their rhetoric only on employment protections for educators. In fact, the unions’ steadfast defense of teachers sometimes led them to support removing children with AIDS from the classroom. In 1986, after a 17-year-old student at the Wingate Oaks School in Fort Lauderdale tested positive for HTLV-III, an antibody that indicated exposure to AIDS, BTU filed two grievances against the Broward County School Board for permitting the student to return to school, which they believed put educators at risk.\(^\text{116}\) The unions’ arguments about the rights of people living with AIDS in the school system differed substantially when discussing teachers and students who contracted the disease. BTU downplayed the threat of AIDS when it came to subjecting teachers to automatic testing. Discussing the Wingate Oaks student case, however, John Sole, a BTU field organizer, said, “We’re not talking about a flu epidemic here. We’re talking about a deadly disease for which there is no cure.”\(^\text{117}\) In 1988, when the Palm Beach County School Board adopted an AIDS policy that allowed students who had come in contact with the virus to remain in school, the Palm Beach County Classroom Teachers Association (PBCCTA) demanded that teachers be told which students in their classrooms had the disease.\(^\text{118}\) The School Board believed that providing this information violated student privacy.\(^\text{119}\) Still driven underground in the wake of SOC, queer educators did not unite within their locals to fight back against the unions’ demonization of infected students.

Instead, queer teachers joined other members of the queer community in new organizations dedicated specifically to securing research and treatment of AIDS. They risked their livelihoods by participating, since educators still lacked protections based on sexual
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orientation and the assumption was that organization members were homosexual. While teachers remained fearful of coming out in school settings, their trepidation turned to action as they witnessed the deaths of family members and friends.\textsuperscript{120} In 1983, a group of volunteers formed the Health Crisis Network (HCN), South Florida’s first AIDS service organization. HCN began small and focused on health services and social support.\textsuperscript{121} For many teachers who joined HCN over the course of the 1980s, meetings of the organization were the first time they met and spoke with with other queer educators since the end of SOC. Tom Coyle, for example, recalls connecting with an educator with AIDS from his own school through HCN, both acknowledging their queer identity to one another for the first time. In turn, the other educator introduced Tom to Robert Loupo, a queer teacher at a neighboring school who he also met through HCN.\textsuperscript{122} Such interactions within the AIDS movement helped build informal networks between educators in the absence of a visible queer presence in the local teachers organizations.

As AIDS swept through the local queer community, HCN became a hub of political organizing. As the 1980s progressed, other organizations, such as South Florida AIDS Network (1986) and Community Research Initiative (1989), joined HCN in the fight.\textsuperscript{123} Years after Anita Bryant’s crusade stifled the local queer community’s first significant foray into politics, the AIDS epidemic reignited and rechanneled queers’ political consciousness. As government at all levels delayed support for research and treatment of the disease, the members of AIDS organizations learned how to articulate demands and put pressure on the political system to respond. They also learned the repertoire of organizing; they recruited members, ran meetings,
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planned marches, and navigated relationships with the press. In performing this work, queer people stepped into public view. For queer teachers, the openness of organizing presented complications at work. Tom Coyle, for instance, attended an AIDS march on Miami Beach, where a local television station interviewed him about his involvement in HCN. After appearing on camera, he “was afraid” that the district superintendent or a parent of one of his student’s might call Coyle’s principal and alert him of his activity. The next school day, Coyle proceeded immediately to his principal’s office and “told him what had happened, what I did, that I’m gay.” Coyle’s principal surprised him by admitting that “he had no problem with that.” By bringing queer teachers into the public eye, involvement in AIDS organizations pushed them to test the boundaries of the closet.

While research and treatment were at the forefront of the AIDS activism agenda, community education was also central to its mission. The AIDS organizations designed their own efforts to inform adults about the threat posed by the disease. For local queers, however, the high death tolls among people their own ages focused their thinking on the next generation. For one, they were concerned that the AIDS epidemic contributed to an even greater stigmatization of queer identity in schools. Educators and school officials confirmed their fears. AIDS accompanied the list of slang terms levied against children by their peers. “One student says to another, ‘You have AIDS,’ said Treasure Island’s [Principal Beverley] Karrenbauer. ‘That’s a very dirty thing to say to somebody.’” Harriet Glick, principal at Biscayne Elementary, “said
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the insult at her school has replaced … longtime favorite[s].”\textsuperscript{129} Local AIDS activists believed that teaching students about AIDS could help alleviate bullying.

In addition to combatting harassment, AIDS organizers believed that the inclusion of AIDS in sexual education programs would prevent children from contracting it. The fight introduced queer teachers involved in AIDS activism to how the language of child protection could be harnessed for their own cause. AIDS organizations asserted that children entering sexual maturity needed to learn about the disease so that they would abstain from sex or take proper precautions. As a health educator from Dade County active in the South Florida AIDS Network avowed, “I don’t want to go in and scare kids. I want to help them process information and think about putting themselves at risk.”\textsuperscript{130} Another teacher from Palm Beach County stated, “We have so many students that are involved in sexual activity and they have to be aware what they can pick up.”\textsuperscript{131} Conservative parents believed that teaching children about the specific ways that AIDS could be contracted was dangerous, claiming that “AIDS is too serious a threat to make children feel it’s hard to catch.”\textsuperscript{132}

The AIDS organizations’ child safety argument proved more compelling. The Dade County School Board pioneered its AIDS education program in 1987 and recruited HCN to produce materials.\textsuperscript{133} The Broward and Palm Beach County School Boards introduced their own programs the next school year.\textsuperscript{134} Through South Florida’s AIDS education battles, queer teachers learned how to lobby local school boards, paying particular attention to the efficacy of
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claims to child protection. One Dade County School Board member nearly copied a line from their presentation, stating, “If we teach children about it, we’re going to save lives.”
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Chapter Three: “It is A Special Interest, because the Interest Is Kids”

The 1980s was a period of fear for South Florida’s queer teachers, and the toll that repression took on queer school children motivated educators in the 1990s to take action. Their work with children helped them to campaign for their own employment rights. Reclaiming the language of child safety from the religious right, queer teachers asserted the need for anti-harassment policies for students so that children could be protected from bullying. Teachers developed nondiscrimination policies for themselves so they could serve as role models for queer youth.

The content of their argument in the 1990s differed sharply from their claims in the late 1970s, when they had based their calls for protection on their own “civil rights” as teachers. By re-centering the basis of their argument on students and proclaiming that these children needed queer adults as resources in their schools, teachers not only won greater support for their cause, but also acquired a reason to organize openly as “queer educators.” Teachers groups emerged that classified their membership as queer and grew willing to assert this identity in the public sphere.

South Florida’s first post-SOC test case of anti-discrimination protections based on “sexual orientation” came in 1990. United Citizens for Human Rights, a Broward County-based gay advocacy organization, argued for an amendment to the Broward County Human Rights Act that would protect against discrimination based on “sexual orientation” in housing, employment, and public accommodations.136 The question was to be put on the September 4 ballot. Local religious conservatives led by a man named Jim Pollard reacted swiftly, drawing on the same imagery of threatening teachers and vulnerable children from the Dade County campaign in 1977. As Pollard said, “It’s an alternative life style that they would be required to teach. … I’m

An ad from the referendum opposition campaigned played on WFTL-AM radio:

Passage of this amendment would give appointed county officials the power to force schools and day-care centers to hire openly gay men and lesbians as guidance counselors and teachers. … There will be nothing to prevent the Broward County School Board from insisting that homosexuality be taught in elementary grade sex education courses as a normal and acceptable life style.138

Just as in the 1977 battle, the local teachers union – in this case, the Broward Teachers Union (BTU) – offered a statement of support for anti-discrimination protections rooted in “civil rights.”139 Ultimately, the religious right’s child protection argument won out as Broward County voters defeated the referendum.

In 1991, the Palm Beach County Human Rights Council (PBCHRC) advocated for the county’s School Board to include “sexual orientation” in its list of protected categories for teachers and students.140 The teachers within PBCHRC did not organize as their own force, and the group advanced its argument as a “civil rights” claim.141 While protecting children from harassment was raised by PBCHRC, the packaging of protections for children and teachers in one campaign focused the attention of local conservatives and eventually the School Board on the danger of allowing queer teachers to be out in the classroom.142 The Board rejected the request.143

Robert Loupo, a resident of Coral Gables, Florida in Dade County, carefully eyed the examples of Broward and Palm Beach counties. He witnessed how easily Anita Bryant’s campaign rhetoric resurfaced well over a decade later. If queer teachers wanted to earn
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protections, he knew they needed to forgo the focus on rights and employ a different strategy.\textsuperscript{144} For Loupo, the answer was a cause he was already interested in – the protection of queer students. Loupo began his teaching career at Hialeah Senior High School in 1985 and had grown up as a queer student himself in South Carolina when the SOC campaign was unfolding in South Florida. Bryant’s crusade was influential across the country, and the South experienced its effects harshly.\textsuperscript{145} Loupo remembered being so personally affected by the resulting repression that he attempted suicide on several occasions. In fact, it was before another planned suicide attempt that he made the decision to visit Key West, a vacation that he thought would be his last. Being from a small town in the heart of the South, Loupo viewed South Florida as a beacon of tolerance in the region. He decided to move permanently in 1980. After a few odd jobs, he became a substitute teacher and then a teacher of English.\textsuperscript{146}

His view of South Florida as accepting to queers shifted, however, once he entered the classroom. As an adult educator, he once again experienced trouble navigating the school system as a gay person.\textsuperscript{147} He worried about his own ability to come out on the job, but he was especially sensitive to what he saw happening to students. He heard queer slurs used in his own classroom, and he witnessed harassment in the hallways. One afternoon he watched one student shove another into a locker and call him a “faggot,” all while other teachers stood by silently. Loupo himself was too afraid to step forward at the time lest he be suspected as queer, but he still remembers the event as a call to action.\textsuperscript{148}
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In 1989, Loupo applied for a Rockefeller Foundation grant to develop a training program for other Dade County teachers.¹⁴⁹ In his application, he stated that as a gay teacher, he was interested in having other educators learn about the needs of queer students. Tom Lander, at the time a closeted Dade County educator, later said that “it blew [him] away that someone dared to be so forthright about their identity in the school climate of that day.”¹⁵⁰ To the surprise of colleagues at Hialeah and queer teachers across Dade, the Rockefeller Foundation approved the grant, and despite having no employment protection for his queer identity, Loupo kept his job.¹⁵¹

Loupo founded the South Florida Educators Group (SFEG) in 1992, an organization for queer educators in Dade County schools and neighboring districts.¹⁵² Queer teachers groups were already active by this time in more liberal areas of the country. New York City’s Gay Teachers Association (later Lesbian and Gay Teachers Association) started up in 1974, and San Francisco’s Gay Teachers Coalition began meeting in San Francisco in 1975.¹⁵³ While these groups fought lonely battles for many years without connections in other areas of the country, the momentum picked up again in 1990, when Kevin Jennings launched the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Teachers Network (GLSTN) in Massachusetts.¹⁵⁴ SFEG’s emergence in the early 1990s was not an anomaly, but its formation occurred independently of the rise of other local groups. Only in the mid-1990s, when GLSTN’s aspirations became national and it started to amalgamate with existing organizations, would these organizations begin to form official bonds with one another.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, while SFEG might be viewed as part of the trend of such groups springing

¹⁵⁰ Tom Lander interview.
¹⁵³ Blount, Fit to Teach, 123-29.
¹⁵⁴ Kevin Jennings interview, March 2, 2015.
¹⁵⁵ Ibid.
up in liberal urban regions, the area’s legacy of homophobia, especially toward educators, made the formation of a queer teachers group all the more remarkable.

The initial name of the South Florida Educators Group gave no indication that its members were queer. Loupo wanted to recruit as many educators as possible, and a group that automatically identified as LGBT was sure to discourage participation by some in the profession. To spread the word at the beginning, Loupo relied on word-of-mouth advertising within the loose network of queer teachers that had emerged during the early years of the AIDS crisis in South Florida. During that time, queers across the region became more visible to one another as they encountered each other during meetings, marches, and lobbying sessions. Despite his best efforts to make use of the network, however, only three people showed up to the first meeting held in his living room in March 1992.

Loupo continued scheduling monthly meetings despite low attendance and kept on notifying people who he knew might be interested. He also began publishing invitations in The Weekly News, South Florida’s primary gay newsletter, where he could advertise without attracting attention from outside the local queer community. Month after month, with new attendees each time, the group started to build a base. In the first years, meetings functioned as social affairs. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual teachers would meet in private homes, host potlucks, and introduce each other to their partners. In these intimate settings, shielded from public view, they forged a stable network rooted in social and professional ties and began building up their collective confidence.

156 Robert Loupo interview, November 2, 2014.
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From the very beginning, SFEG focused not only on the issues faced by queer teachers, but also those faced by students. Opinion varied within the group about where the balance between these two interests should lie. Some, like Loupo, remembered their own difficulties growing up and attending school in the South and wanted to focus first on securing rights for children in the school system. Others, such as Tom Coyle, saw SFEG as an opportunity for social support and mutual protection on the job. Even the latter group recognized, however, that a strategy solely focused on winning rights for teachers could potentially incite the same arguments levied against teachers as in 1977. If the religious right unleashed another battle cry couched in the language of child protection, teachers wanted to preempt the attack with counterarguments of their own.

Teachers studied the composition of the School Board. Among its seven members, they found two possible allies. The first, Janet McAliley, was positioned to reject discriminatory arguments coded as claims to parental rights and framed as appeals to child protection. For one, she was a veteran of South Florida’s desegregation battles, when conservative activists made use of such rhetoric in an effort to halt court-ordered busing. McAliley was a liberal parent activist in Coconut Grove when the governor appointed her to the Dade County Bi-Racial/Tri Ethnic Committee, which was responsible for overseeing desegregation. In 1970, when Dade County began implementation of the plan, McAliley and her husband were among the first white families to transfer their children to primarily black schools. In 1986, now a member of the School Board, McAliley introduced a law to open clinics in Dade County high schools that would
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provide birth control to students with the consent of parents.\textsuperscript{165} She fought against a group called the Committee for Education and Protection of Our Children that emerged in response, countering claims that the presence of family planning resources in the schools would poison the minds of students and that parents had a right to stop it beyond denying consent to their own children.\textsuperscript{166} Moreover, McAlilley had a gay son, so while she might have already been sympathetic to gay rights, she was even more likely to support queer teachers if they pitched their activism as an effort to support queer children.\textsuperscript{167} The other probable ally, Betsy Kaplan, used her School Board position to support liberal causes such as less restrictive immigration policies and call for sweeping free expression protections for students.\textsuperscript{168} Luckily for SFEG, the two people on the School Board most disposed to agree with their line of argumentation also held positions of leadership. In the early 1990s, McAlilley served as the Board chair and Kaplan as its vice chair. While their votes were given equal weight with the other members, they had the opportunity to set the agenda and often frame issues for the full Board.\textsuperscript{169}

Teachers looked for an opportunity to approach McAlilley and Kaplan, and then one seemed to appear out of nowhere. As Loupo flipped through \textit{The Miami Herald} on August 12, 1992, he came across a startling headline: “Gay Students Gain Protection Under Code.” With no knowledge of teacher activism in Florida taking place outside of Dade, the news came as a surprise for Loupo and the other members of SFEG. It turned out that the Florida Education Standards Commission, a state body responsible for setting standards for teacher preparation and certification renewal, had quietly amended the Principles of Professional Conduct, a list of

\textsuperscript{166} Ibid.
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\textsuperscript{169} Janet McAlilley interview.
codified standards for teacher behavior, to include “sexual orientation” as a basis on which teachers could “not harass or discriminate against any student” and on which teachers should “make reasonable effort to assure that each student is protected from harassment or discrimination.”\(^{170}\)

Grace Northrop, a teachers union representative from Alachua County and a member of the Commission, had instigated the inclusion of student protections and presented the Commission’s recommendations to the State Board of Education on July 21, 1992, after which they were adopted and made effective on August 10.\(^{171}\) The Commission, however, did not include “sexual orientation” on the list of categorical protections provided to teachers against harassment and discrimination in their interactions with colleagues. The revisions once again raised the specter of queer teachers as sexual predators, as the Commission moved to tighten its ban on sexual activity between students and teachers.\(^{172}\) SFEG’s members certainly agreed with this aim, but they worried about the continued connection in the minds of lawmakers between queer identity and predatory activity. The decision reaffirmed SFEG’s belief that winning rights for students would be an easier battle than winning rights for teachers.\(^{173}\) The Commission’s revisions did, however, create a tremendous political opening. The Principles of Professional Conduct meant little unless school districts adopted the standards and committed to enforcement.\(^{174}\) Queer teachers in South Florida now had an example to point to when bringing student protections to the attention of the Dade County School Board. But they knew they had to be careful if they wanted to introduce rights not only for students, but for teachers, too.

\(^{170}\) Florida Education Standards Commission, "6B-1.006 Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida."
\(^{173}\) Robert Loupo interview; November 2, 2014.
\(^{174}\) Janet McAliley interview.
SFEG began to organize. The group learned that Tom Ammiano, one of the gay teachers from San Francisco who came to Dade County in 1977, would be back in town in July 1993 to perform at “Out for Laughs,” the first gay and lesbian comedy series presented in Miami. Ammiano was one of a select few comics in the United States who was openly gay in the early 1990s, but his day job was in education. In 1975, he became the first public school teacher to come out on the job in San Francisco. In 1990, he won a seat on the San Francisco Board of Education, the first openly gay person to do so, and he rose to the presidency of the Board in 1992. Queer teachers around the country saw Ammiano’s work as an example of what they might one day be able to achieve in their own districts. South Florida’s educators were no exception, and when he came to town, SFEG planned a reception in his honor.

Loupo invited Dade County School Board members to meet teachers from the organization and to hear from Ammiano at his home. As the teachers expected, McAliley and Kaplan showed up to the event. They began their discussion by talking about the change in the state’s Principles of Professional Conduct. They based their argument not only on precedent, however, but also on the importance of child safety. At the event, they cited the findings from the Report of the Secretary’s Task Force on Youth Suicide produced by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in 1989. A pioneering section on “Gay Male and Lesbian Youth Suicide” challenged school districts “to take responsibility for protecting gay and lesbian youth from abuse by peers and providing them with a safe environment to receive an education.”

Ammiano responded to claims raised by School Board members not in attendance that SFEG
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was a “special interest” group. “It is a special interest,” he told McAliley and Kaplan, “because the interest is kids.”

The statements made by event organizers revealed how the focus on child protection was both a genuine care for student welfare as well as a strategy for teachers to win their rights. English teacher Edda Cimino began by suggesting, "I guess what we want to do is try and stop the bigotry that hurts," but she also hinted at a greater intention for the teachers, noting in the same breath that "[t]his is a step toward letting people know who we are." Loupo underscored the point, stating, “This was a way to make people aware of our existence.” The “we” and “our” referred to recognition of queer educators. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual teachers had been mostly invisible since the lost election of 1977. By discussing the rights of students, however, they could more safely affirm their identities.

The event motivated McAliley and Kaplan to prioritize gay issues. They spent the next month quietly advocating for student protections. On September 22, 1993, the School Board amended its student discrimination and harassment policies, establishing by statute that “hostile treatment or violence against a student because of his/her … sexual orientation... will not be tolerated.” Dade became the first school district in the southeastern United States to add “sexual orientation” as a category to its student protections.

The teachers’ success in securing protections for gay, lesbian, and bisexual students accelerated their organizing and allowed them to explore in new directions. By the fall of 1993,
SFEG’s membership consisted of over two hundred teachers from across Dade County. Anywhere from thirty to sixty educators were now actively attending meetings. SFEG heralded this turning of the tide by renaming itself as the Gay, Lesbian and Bisexual Educators Group of South Florida. The new confidence not only signaled greater numerical strength and a willingness to assert the group’s queer identity, but it also marked a shift in focus. Now that the group had won a nondiscrimination and anti-harassment policy for students, queer teachers turned their attention to securing rights for themselves, rooted in the argument that queer educators were necessary in schools as protectors for queer students.

The shift in activism toward teacher protections was reflected in both rhetoric and organization. Whereas group members had hinted at the desire of queer teachers to gain visibility, the only explicit remarks educators made before the policy changes were about gaining protections for students. Queer teachers now proclaimed their interest in employment protections more outright. In a news report on SFEG’s organizing in *The Weekly News* written three months after the policy change, Loupo applauded protections for students, but lamented that “the code does not provide the same express protection to educators. Once you’re a gay adult, you’re more or less on your own.” The teachers also agreed that while SFEG was its own labor organization, queer educators could benefit from having an established presence in the local teachers union responsible for bargaining with the School Board. They petitioned the United Teachers of Dade (UTD) to form a queer caucus. Pat Tornillo, who teachers had lobbied successfully during SOC, still led the union. While he expressed concerns that the caucus might
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push the union in directions it was not yet ready to move publicly, he could not ignore the
number of signatories and was required to recognize the new group.\footnote{192}{Robert Loupo interview, November 2, 2014.}

The UTD Gay and Lesbian Caucus included the interests of queer students in its mission
statement, but its creation as separate from SFEG despite nearly identical membership indicated
that teachers were strategically positioning themselves to focus more on employment
protections.\footnote{193}{Ibid.} The caucus quickly demonstrated its willingness to enter the political arena to
fight for queer teachers’ rights. In 1993, the American Family Political Committee of Florida
(AFPC) began a statewide petition drive to amend the Florida Constitution, hoping to eliminate
all local laws throughout the state protecting against discrimination for categories other than
“race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, ethnic background, marital status or
familial status,” that is, to eliminate and bar laws outlawing discrimination based on sexual
orientation.\footnote{194}{“Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General—Restricting Laws Related to Discrimination, Case No. 82-674,”
December 6, 1993, loose papers, Florida State University Law School Archive.} If passed, the amendment would potentially forestall action by the School Board
to extend its nondiscrimination policy to queer teachers. Teachers recognized the threat this
presented to their job security and made the amendment a union issue. In its first public political
act, the UTD Gay & Lesbian Caucus was a leading signatory on a brief to the state Attorney
General dated December 6, 1993 explaining why the proposed amendment was
unconstitutional.\footnote{195}{Ibid.} Presented with a challenge to their employment, South Florida’s queer
teachers now rallied publicly behind both their identity and their profession. This stood in
contrast to their work during SOC in 1977, when they urged the UTD at large to make a political
statement on their behalf but without publicly identifying themselves.
In the year after the passage of protections for queer students in Dade County, teachers asserted the need for enforcement through sensitivity training. School administrators agreed that queer teachers were best equipped to lead training sessions guiding other educators in the needs of queer students.\textsuperscript{196} In order to fulfill this obligation, however, teachers in SFEG and the UTD Gay & Lesbian Caucus claimed that they needed protections from the School Board to feel comfortable leading the training without fear of losing their jobs. They wanted to do their best, however, to avoid another battle with the religious right.\textsuperscript{197} McAliley and Kaplan pledged that they would try to work for protections quietly.\textsuperscript{198} They waited until the meeting at the start of the summer to vote on adding “sexual orientation” as a protected category to the School’s Board equal opportunity employment and assignment law (Board Rule 6Gx13-4A-1.01) and its discrimination and harassment law (Board Rule 6Gx13-4A-1.32). During the meeting, however, no one mentioned the phrase “sexual orientation.”\textsuperscript{199} McAliley, who introduced both amendments, deliberately portrayed them as routine updates to the code.\textsuperscript{200} Both passed unanimously with almost no discussion.\textsuperscript{201}

By the mid-1990s, SFEG and the UTD Gay & Lesbian Caucus had accomplished their early goals of winning student and teacher protections in Dade County. They now bifurcated their duties. The Gay & Lesbian Caucus shifted its focus to winning same-sex partner benefits for queer teachers, which it secured by the end of the 1990s.\textsuperscript{202} SFEG now turned its attention to developing quality anti-harassment programming.\textsuperscript{203} The group looked to other queer teachers
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organizations across the country for help in securing training materials. In 1996, Loupo spoke with GLSTN founder Kevin Jennings, who was growing his Massachusetts-based group into a national organization. Jennings recommended turning SFEG into a local chapter of GLSTN. Enticed by the resources of a larger organization, Loupo brought the question back to SFEG’s members.

In December 1996, SFEG voted to become GLSTN Miami. Despite its new affiliation, the group’s commitment to protecting queer children in South Florida’s schools remained chief among its aims. “Our big issue is safety,” said Edda Cimino, now a retired Dade teacher and vice president of the local GLSTN chapter. GLSTN Miami carried on the project of implementing sensitivity training for teachers, but it also took on new endeavors. Inspired by the work of other teachers groups around the country, queer educators in Miami-Dade County helped lobby for queer-targeted student counseling and school-sponsored queer support groups. By 1997, 22 of 31 high schools in the County had counselor-run meeting groups for gay and lesbian students. Students at five schools formed gay-straight alliances. Twenty years after Anita Bryant launched her “Save Our Children” campaign against queer teachers in Miami, South Florida’s schools were finally becoming places where queer children could feel safe.
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Epilogue

On December 1, 1998, the Miami-Dade County Commission voted for the second time in its history to make discrimination based on “sexual orientation” in housing, employment, and public accommodations an illegal offense. According to The Miami Herald, emotions ran high. The event “triggered whoops of joy among supporters,” a crowd consisting of key attorneys, human rights activists, and religious and ethnic group leaders. The New York Times reported that “speakers at today’s hearing included gay police officers, lawyers and others who told of harassment in the workplace and lost job opportunities because of their homosexuality.” The queer community and its allies turned out diverse and wide-reaching support for the vote, but notably absent in journalistic accounts of the 1998 hearing was a group of people who had been at the center of the debate two decades earlier: teachers.

While certainly in favor of the measure, queer educators possessed little stake in the outcome of the vote; teachers in Miami-Dade had already secured workplace anti-discrimination protections based on “sexual orientation” five years earlier. The accelerated pace at which educators won their employment rights was due in part to events that took place in the same County Commission room on January 18, 1977. That day, Anita Bryant first publicized her claim that “sexually deviant” teachers were a threat to children. As queer children suffered in the years after Bryant spread her message across South Florida, queer teachers found an opportunity to justify their unique place in the school system as supporters and role models for LGBT youth. Their organizing paid off. In 1994, the School Board granted them protections. In 1998, Miami-

Dade County was named one of the safest school districts in the country for gay students.\textsuperscript{213} Queer teachers, evidently, were saving our children.

Following the success of GLSTN Miami, queer teachers in Broward and Palm Beach also formed chapters in the late 1990s. They adopted the organization’s new name, the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), dropping the focus on “teachers” to demonstrate how queer rights in schools extended beyond a concern for educators. With new organizations fighting for the rights of queer students and teachers, battles over child protection in South Florida’s schools continued into the twenty-first century and came to a head in 2002.

In April of that year, GLSEN Fort Lauderdale (Broward) sought to formalize a contract with the Broward County School Board to provide sensitivity training for teachers in county schools. When it came to a final vote in front of the Board, the usual battle lines between queer teachers and religious conservatives were drawn. Hundreds of evangelical churchgoers who were bused to the meeting from local congregations wore stickers that said: “Protect Our Children.”\textsuperscript{214} GLSEN supporters, however, countered with buttons proclaiming: “Safe Schools Now.”\textsuperscript{215} In a head-to-head battle of child protection arguments, GLSEN won the day in a 6-3 vote by the Board, which endorsed queer teachers leading the sessions.\textsuperscript{216}

Also in 2002, educators from GLSEN Palm Beach attempted to secure protections for students against discrimination and harassment based on both “sexual orientation” and “gender identity.”\textsuperscript{217} The demonization of “deviant” children by right-wing activists at the final hearing convinced the majority of School Board members that protecting children meant shielding them
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from the views of the religious right.\textsuperscript{218} The Board adopted protections for “sexual orientation” and came close to passing protections for “gender identity.”\textsuperscript{219} Nonetheless, GLSEN Palm Beach laid the groundwork for future fights to help transgender students.

The final showdown in 2002 was yet another repeal battle in Miami-Dade County. Four years after the reinstatement of the human rights ordinance protecting against discrimination based on “sexual orientation,” a group known as Take Back Miami-Dade gathered signatures to put the question of repealing the ordinance on the ballot.\textsuperscript{220} The repeal would not affect the employment rights of public school educators, but fearing a repeat of 1977, queer teachers got involved in the election through the UTD Gay & Lesbian Caucus.\textsuperscript{221} Over the course of the campaign, however, queer UTD members noticed how the religious right’s claims to child protection no longer had the same widespread appeal, and on September 10, voters upheld the ordinance.\textsuperscript{222} South Floridians were growing to understand that child safety meant that children should be safe to be themselves. As UTD staffer Merri Mann stated, “[t]his battle has already been fought.”\textsuperscript{223}
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